

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"Men who are not free . . . always idealise their bondage, so it was in the Middle Ages, and the Jesuits always played on this."
 —BORIS PASTERNAK.

Vol. 19, No. 49.

November 29th, 1958

Threepence

Parliament Debates the Advertising Industry REPORT ON A RACKET

FROM the excavated ruins of lava-buried Pompeii and Herculaneum there is evidence that advertisement was used even in the time of the Caesars. On the walls of what are presumed to be the most frequented thoroughfares were found advertisements of various kinds of shows, announcements of gladiator-fights and of plays. In Rome, at the same period, a daily gazette contained public notices and advertisements and in Greece public criers were employed to announce the wares of the shopkeeper. Advertising has been, and always will be, an essential service in the life of an active human community—that is advertising which, to quote the concise Oxford Dictionary, serves to "notify, warn, inform; make generally known".

Of course times have changed! Last Friday the subject for debate in the House of Commons was the Advertising Industry. Yes "Hansard" heads the 117 columns of its verbatim report thus, and this is, in fact what Advertising is. A huge, ever-expanding industry employing directly or indirectly tens of thousands of people, and which will this year have spent about £400 millions exhibiting itself on hoardings and walls (£29m.) in the Press (£182m.) interrupting commercial television programmes (£50m.), not to mention its uninvited intrusion into our homes through the letterbox. More money is spent on advertising than is paid in wages to our 600,000 farm labourers!

For more than 90 minutes, Mr. Francis Noel-Baker, Labour M.P. for Swindon spoke on the motion:

That this House, noting the increasing power of the advertising industry and its influence upon our national life, and the growing impact of advertising on the individual, calls upon Her Majesty's Government to recommend the appointment of a Royal Commission to consider whether further safeguards are desirable in the public interest and, if so what form such safeguards should take.

Being a politician, Mr. Noel-Baker had to preface a devastating,

because carefully documented, indictment with such remarks as "my motion does not imply a general attack on the advertising industry." And he could not associate himself, all he could do was "sympathise" with, those people "who dislike most forms of advertising". How difficult it is to be oneself and at the same time a cog in the wheel of the Establishment, is tortuously demonstrated in his opening remarks:

People who dislike it [Advertising] may say that it is bad because mainly it seeks to exploit base human instincts, encourages envy and deliberately sets out to inflame acquisitiveness and greed. Whatever my personal feelings in the matter, and I have some sympathy for that point of view, that is not the position that I propose to take up in the House to-day.

I accept that in a modern industrial state, a number of aspects of which probably, at any rate, most of us dislike, advertising is an integral part of business life. It is perfectly legitimate and reputable. Most of the people working in the advertising industry are doing a decent and reputable job, but it is a highly controversial matter, and I believe that in their own interests the advertisers as much as the general public would be wise to welcome an inquiry such as I propose and to co-operate with it.

HAVING maintained that in their own interests the advertisers would be "wise" to welcome an inquiry he spent over an hour piling fact upon fact to show that when advertising was not used by out and out "racketeers" it was used to mislead the public or to encourage such things as gambling, alcohol† and tobacco, especially among young people, at a time when the govern-

*He quoted a firm which had been fined for misrepresenting the goods it advertised. Yet the same firm is still in "legal business . . . and spends about £60,000 a year on these advertisements".
 †Some years ago a director of the Brewers' Society declared: "We want to get the beer drinking habit instilled into thousands—almost millions—of young men who at present do not know the taste of beer."

ment was expressing concern with the increased incidence of drunkenness and had publicly expressed itself on the connection between lung cancer and smoking.

We cannot do justice to Mr. Noel-Baker's eloquent catalogue of rackets and misrepresentations. The reader is recommended to spend a shilling on the issue of "Hansard" for November 21. He denounces the "dishonest" advertisements of the oil companies who spend millions trying to persuade the public into buying "high-grade" petrol simply because British refineries are over-equipped for the production of high-grade petrol. He debunks the much advertised "additives" which are said to make a difference to a car's performance. "I am advised by experts that this is what one might fairly call a lot of nonsense". He was advised by a "leading dental surgeon" that the much advertised GL70, that "important new bacteria fighter" in the dentifrice Gleem, "is simply an ordinary detergent like the others by Messrs Hedley & Co., and that it has no special medical significance whatsoever". As for the detergents, on which over £7 millions are spent

each year in advertising, Mr. Noel-Baker had tests carried out "on the results of using three of these products, Persil, Tide and Fairy Snow" and it was found that

if an ordinary fabric is washed six times in each of these products, far from making the fabric cleaner there goes into it an optical dye. This optical dye cannot be removed from the fabric and not only is the fabric not cleaner, but actually it is made dirtier with a substance which there is no way of removing.

"Everyone understands—concluded Mr. Noel-Baker—that detergent advertising is a racket."

Like the Press Council which exists ostensibly to defend the integrity of a free press and is composed of the Press barons themselves, so the Advertising Advisory Committee which advises the Independent Television Authority includes 14 advertising men in a Committee of 18. The Advertising Association too, has a Consumer Advisory Committee which, it told Mr. Noel-Baker, represents the interests of the consumer. Yet what did he find?

I found Lady Barnett and Sir Frederic Hooper, the Managing Director of

Schwepes, Ltd.; Mr. Sidney Hornblow, the Managing Director of Service Advertising Ltd.; Mr. Ivor Cooper, Marketing Adviser to Unilever, Ltd.; Mr. More O'Ferrall, Managing Director of one of the biggest poster companies; Mr. Emrys Roberts, director of The Branded Textiles Group; Mr. Varley, Chairman of Colman, Prentis and VaVrley, Ltd.—and so on. It is not nonsense to claim that a Committee of this kind, on which at least 12 members are connected with the advertising industry out of a total of 19—even excluding Lady Barnett—can be expected to function in an independent manner?

Of the various organisations examined by Mr. Noel-Baker the "strongest" was the Joint Copy Committee of the Newspaper Proprietors' Association and the Newspaper Society who decide whether advertisements shall go in a newspaper or be left out.‡

This body protects the interests of the newspaper industry. It has legitimate interests which it is perfectly entitled to

Continued on p. 3

‡As a matter of interest to FREEDOM readers. When we published the article on "A 100% Sure Birth Control Method?" last year (reprinted in Freedom Selections Vol. 7, 1957), we felt it deserved to be given as wide publicity as we could afford in the "progressive" weeklies. Though the New Statesman and other periodicals accepted our advertisement it was refused by Tribune! We have often wondered who advised the enfants terribles of the Strand.

After Quemoy — Berlin

THE venue for the next round in the unceasing cold-war is now established as being Berlin, the winter offensive has begun and it's all hands to the air-lift. Perhaps, on this occasion, it will not be necessary for the planes to drone into Templehof and Gatow, the "crisis" may not get that far, but it is quite certain that for the next few weeks or months there will be all the usual diplomatic flurry, the curt notes from one nation to another, the pseudo high-minded statements of motive and intention, and the downright accusations of war-mongering. Where will it all end? In another crisis somewhere else of course. . . .

But, understandably whilst it lasts, the people of Berlin can hardly avoid a very unpleasant feeling of discomfort, or worse. They are in fact in an uncomfortable situation before anything starts; isolated in a city governed by four governments, none of whom really agree on one policy for any length of time, one of which is automatically opposed to

the other three and vice-versa, and none of which has interests which may be considered to be similar to those of the Berliners.

It is however probably true to say that most Berliners would rather the Western Powers stayed in Berlin than not—at this moment. They have visions if the West leaves, of becoming integrated into East Germany under the communist régime which is no doubt quite as repressive as the other puppet régimes under Soviet control. The alternative is none too attractive either: a sinking feeling that if anything drastic happens it will certainly happen to them first.

What can in fact happen to the people of Berlin? Of the two main possibilities, hot war (most unlikely) and cold war (varying degrees of coldness), and the first does not warrant discussion as being quite obvious and horrible in its results. The second varies from the probability of a sharp increase in anxiety neuroses to the vague possibility that in certain circumstances all means of physical communication between West Germany and East Berlin (about 80 miles at the closest point) could be cut off. That is to say, an extension of the 1948 blockade from a cutting off of all land and water communications to include those by air. This would lead to starvation, surrender or war. Between the two extremes lie a variety of unpleasant prospects for the Berliners, all of which will be risked if necessary in gambit and counter-gambit by the opposing nations in careless oblivion of the feelings or needs of the people concerned.

For the record should perhaps be stated the facts and furbelows of the present situation. How has it all come about? If we return far enough into the past it could be blamed upon the fortunes (or misfortunes) of war which found the Soviet Army far more advanced into defeated Germany than the Western allies had intended. (Montgomery, the Ardennes and all that). Thus it

was that Germany was carved up piecemeal by the victors as a "temporary" measure. Now, 15 years later Germany remains carved, no longer into four pieces it is true, but into two which is just as fatal. What of the peace treaty to be signed by the Four Powers with re-united, whole and wholesome Germany—a Germany not to be rearmed (said Churchill) for 50 years at least?

As would be expected neither side stuck to the bargain, both fully intended and proceeded to carry out the intention, of retaining their slice of conquered territory. Neither trusted the other (and both with equally good reason), and proposed to maintain control over as much foreign land as possible between himself and the hostile force. And so was built up the European cold-war with Germany a fortress cut in two with guns pointing in each direction one against the other. In the East an armed puppet dictatorship controlled from Moscow, in the West a dubious democracy required to furnish 7 divisions of troops and designated as a launching platform for nuclear missiles to be directed eastwards on behalf of London and Washington.

The German Federal Government and the West will not recognise the German Democratic Republic (sic) of the East, and will continue not to do so until the Republic holds democratic elections. (Or so it says, despite a happy recognition of Spain, "our respected ally"). The Republic has no such intention, nor will it unite with Federal Germany until Western troops (N.A.T.O.) depart from the land—nor in all probability would it do so should that eventuality actually take place. And what is more the Soviet Union will not move its troops from East Germany (22 divisions) unless the West moves its troops from West Germany (19 divisions).

Now Krushchev throws a firework—he states:

"The time has come when the powers who signed the Potsdam agreement

Continued on p. 4

Finchley Liberals Point the Way A Free Bus Service

THE Crisis in London Transport and the withdrawing of services all over London has left many areas of our great capital with means of public transport unworthy of its claims to be World City Number One, and inadequate for the needs of its citizens.

London's claims need not worry us very much, but the satisfaction of our needs is—or should be—a concern of us all. We therefore wish to publicly congratulate the Liberals of Finchley who have organised a free bus service to replace one withdrawn by the bureaucrats at 55 Broadway.

Mr. Frank Davis, leader of the fraction of seven Liberals on Finchley Borough Council hit the headlines a couple of years ago when he led a protest against the Tory-dominated Council's 'No Jews' rule for the local golf club. The adverse publicity made the Council back down on that one, and now Mr. Davis is at it again.

The bus service the Liberals have

organised consists of two 35-seater coaches manned by licensed drivers and unpaid amateur conductors—Mr. Davis and his colleagues and their wives—and it operates at rush hours in the mornings and evenings. So far all the cost is being borne by the operators, rides being free to the public. Mr. Davis says the cost works out at 14s. a day for himself and his six fellow-workers, since that is surely what we can now call them.

These militant Liberals arrived at the anarchist conclusion that if you want a thing done you must do it yourself (only unlike so many anarchists, they actually do it!) after their petition to London Transport for return of the official service had been turned down. Now, in providing a free service they are giving the LTE a headache. If unofficial bus services start springing up all over London—where will London Transport's monopoly be? It is of course protected by law against any commercial, fare-taking service being started, but a free service has it worried!

Six Weeks to Find £321!

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!

WEEK 47
 Deficit on Freedom £940
 Contributions received £729
 DEFICIT £211

November 14 to November 20

London: J.G. 4/9; London: J.S.* 3/-;
 London: J.A. 2/-; London: Hyde Park Sympathisers 1/3; Birmingham: N.J.B. 6/4; Los Angeles: "Men" Group, per A.R. £5/5/0; Sheffield: P.L. 7/-; Thornton Heath: P.J.H. £1/1/0; Birmingham: H.N. 5/-; Preston: R.M. 12/9; New York: J.S. £1/15/0; London: P.H. 2/-.

Total ... 10 5 1
 Previously acknowledged ... 719 4 9
 1958 TOTAL TO DATE ... £729 9 10

GIFTS OF BOOKS: London: C.W.; London: L.D.; London: A.U.

*Indicates regular contributor.

NATIONALISATION

NATIONALISATION IN BRITAIN: The End of a Dogma, by R. Kelf-Cohen. Macmillan, 25s.

HOW far have the nationalised industries succeeded? One may regard success in terms of money or in terms of people, of how big a profit an industry makes or of how far those who work in the industry are responsible for it. After ten years or so of nationalisation in this country it seems that it has not succeeded on either count: most of the industries concerned are not 'efficient' (in conventional economic terms) and none is controlled by its workers.

Mr. Kelf-Cohen would put much of the blame for the economic troubles of the nationalised industries on the lack of proper planning by the Labour Party before it put forward the necessary legislation. Flushed with the success of gaining a substantial majority in the House of Commons in 1945 and of defeating the party of Winston Churchill into the bargain, the Labour Government was understandably anxious to put into practice its theory of nationalisation. In its 1945 policy statement, *Let us Face the Future*, the Labour Party said that "the coal industry, producing Britain's most precious raw material, has been floundering chaotically under the ownership of many hundreds of independent companies. Amalgamation under public ownership will bring great economies in operation and will make it possible to modernise production methods... Public ownership of gas and electricity undertakings will lower charges, prevent competitive waste, open the way for co-ordinated research and development... etc., etc." By a few Acts of Parliament it would seem that an era of industrial peace and economic plenty would be ushered in. But the reality did not come up to expectations.

There is a story that when Mr. Shinwell, Minister of Fuel and Power in 1945, had his first meeting with the senior civil servants of the ministry he informed them that the most important task before them was the nationalisation of the mines. On being asked for the Labour Party's plan as to how it should be done Mr. Shinwell said that his party had worked out no detailed plans—it was up to the civil servants to produce them! Coming from the party which had always been so full of talk of planning the nation's economy, of rationalising industry, of socialisation, and nationalisation, this was surprising.

It apparently even surprised Shinwell himself who wrote in his memoirs (*Conflict Without Malice*, p. 172): "I had

believed, as other members had, that in the Party archives a blue print [for the nationalisation of the mines] was ready... I found that nothing practical and tangible existed. There were some pamphlets, some memoranda produced for private circulation, and nothing else."

In fact for nearly thirty years the Labour Party had been bluffing! Since 1919, when the Sankey Report recommended it, the Party campaigned for the nationalisation of the mines; yet no one had really considered how such a policy should be applied and what difficulties it was likely to meet with.

★

Labour's case for coal nationalisation was based on two main arguments: firstly, that the industry under 'private enterprise' was inefficient, fragmented, there was no overall control exercised in 'the national interest', and there was wasteful competition between companies; secondly that nationalisation was in itself a Good Thing and would transform both workers and management into self-less Stakhanovites.

As Herbert Morrison said in winding up the debate on the second reading of the coal nationalisation Bill, "I appeal to... miners and management; and particularly to the miners I would say, emancipate yourselves from the understandable inhibitions created by the past. Emancipate yourselves from the mentality thrust upon you by a crude capitalism. This is vital, this is essential, if this socialised industry is to take with it miners and management, to become co-operators and partners in a great and worthy adventure for the common good." These are fine words—but how far has nationalisation meant that miners and management have become partners or co-operators? There is, of course, machinery for joint consultation, from the Colliery Consultative Councils upwards; but on the committees the miners have 'representatives' (usually union officials) and never delegates. The fact that, in 1956 alone, there were 38,000 separate disputes in the industry, is a measure of the ineffectiveness of these committees.

And as Mr. Kelf-Cohen says, "why should a miner suddenly develop a change of heart because the colliery owner disappears and is replaced by the nation, personified in remote Board Members, whom he may never see?" How did Mr. Morrison imagine that miners and management would become partners when, at the pit level, so little that was fundamental was changed by nationalisation? In many instances the management personnel remained the same, though they were now responsible to other officials instead of to a board of directors. One result of this was a decrease in the personal element at board level with the consequence that it was often more difficult and time-consuming to get decisions. In addition, there were many more regulations to be taken into account and more joint consultation. Each of these factors may slow up the process of making decisions with consequent and justifiable impatience amongst the miners with the cumbersome, hierarchical set-up of the nationalised mines.

★

How many signs are there of democracy or co-operation in the nationalised industries? The basic unit, so to speak, of the Labour Party's idea of industrial democracy is the joint consultative committee: the nationalisation acts directed

Book Reviews

that the committees be set up by the national boards and the appropriate unions to consult on "the organisation and conduct of the operations in which [the workers] are employed and other matters of mutual interest to the Board and [the workers] arising out of the exercise and performance by the Board of their functions." (Coal Nationalisation Act 1946).

Although this wording clearly suggests that the committees should have executive powers, in practice this was resisted by the national boards so that the committees, as far as the running of the industry is concerned, became merely advisory bodies. In matters of 'welfare, health and safety' they seem to be more effective, principally because the Acts directly enjoined them to be responsible for such matters.

There seems little doubt that the joint committees are the Labour Party's idea of industrial democracy: it is equally

clear that the Party intended that the real power should remain with the management. In spite of this most unions were determined to make their weight felt on these committees; they had been pressing for nationalisation for a long time and now that it had been achieved they wanted to enjoy the fruits. Unfortunately most Trade Union officials were not fitted to advise about executive matters, particularly in the higher ranks, for many of them several years had passed since they were directly involved in the industry; their concern had been with the health, welfare, and safety of their members, not so much with the whys and wherefores of the industry itself. Also their work on the joint committees was additional to their normal duties; it was not surprising therefore that the committees have not proved an unqualified success (witness the 38,000 disputes mentioned earlier).

★

Mr. Kelf-Cohen has written a lucid and well-argued criticism of the nationalised industries. Although he was an ardent supporter of nationalisation before the war, now that, as a senior civil ser-

vant, he has seen it in operation, he thinks that the Labour Party's plan was mistaken and that the record of nationalised industries has proved it.

He outlines the history of the idea of nationalisation, the cases put forward by Labour for nationalising certain industries, and the legislation which brought it about. He examines the record of each industry and assesses success—mainly in terms of productivity—he criticises their staffing, financial labour relations, and lack of responsibility to Parliament.

His main criticism is that the Labour Party before 1945, regarded nationalisation as a dogma, a cure-all; the result was that little serious thinking was devoted to its possible shortcomings and the necessary legislation was pushed through the 1945 Parliament in much too great a hurry. The Party saw nationalisation as the means to achieve socialism—the common ownership of the means of production, distribution, and exchange. I wonder how many Party members now believe that nationalisation has brought the socialist society significantly nearer.

M.G.W.

Nature, Man and Woman

NATURE, MAN AND WOMAN, A New Approach to Sexual Experience, by Alan W. Watts. Thames and Hudson, 18s.

IT is an extremely gratifying experience to read a book, which clearly states ideas that one has had oneself for a long time, without being able to formulate them clearly, or work them out. I had this experience when reading Kropotkin's *Memoirs of a Revolutionist*, which was the first book I had ever read which treated anarchist ideas seriously and sympathetically. I have had this experience again in reading this book.

Alan W. Watts is the author of *The Way of Zen*, and other works on Taoism and the doctrines of Zen Buddhism which grew from it. He sees the malaise of man as due essentially to his disharmony with Nature, both outside and inside himself. This disharmony shows itself in the troubled relationships between men and women. Although he does not say this, it seems fairly plain to me that authoritarian society is just another symptom of this disharmony.

"When the great Tao is lost, we have 'human-heartedness' and 'righteousness'. When 'wisdom' and 'sagacity' arise, we have great hypocrites. When the six family relations are not in harmony, we have 'filial devotion'. When the nation is confused and disordered, we have 'loyal ministers'."

—LAO-TSE.

The author deals with the problems he discusses from the point of view of "Western society". Although East and West have always had much in common, in spite of Kipling, although the natural harmony has been greatly lost in the East as well as in the West, the terms "East" and "West" do have some meaning. Medieval China for instance was very different from medieval Europe, and this difference has persisted till modern times. Western Man is probably more alienated from Nature than Eastern Man.

Mr. Watts traces the roots of modern European thought back to the rise of Christianity in the urban society of the Roman Empire. Not till the end of the seventeenth century did Christianity finally conquer the countryside, where pagan and heathen cults survived. ("Pa-

gan" means "countryman" and "heathen" one who dwells or worships upon a heath). Our own urban society is much like the Roman urbanism, but the rôle played in Roman times by Christianity is now taken by scientific humanism, many of whose adherents may be Christians as well, just as many Christians used to practise pagan rites.

The trouble is that both Christianity and its modern rival see Nature as something vaguely threatening. To the Christian it has become, since the Fall, the abode of the Devil. To the scientific humanist it is too often something to be conquered. Both Christian and humanist see it as something *outside* man.

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries scientists studied Nature in order to understand God's laws. As time went on, it began to become apparent that the laws went on working whether God was there or not. Laplace had no need for the hypothesis of a Deity. The concept of immutable natural laws has been abandoned by the modern thinker, but is still firmly rooted in the mind of the layman. The old authoritarian outlook persists.

"... there is something to be said for philosophical vagueness. Strangely assorted people join forces in making fun of it—Logical Positivists and Catholic Neo-Thomists, Dialectical Materialists and Protestant Neo-Orthodoxists, Behaviourists and Fundamentalists. Despite intense differences of opinion among themselves, they belong to a psychological type which takes special glee in having one's philosophy of life clear-cut and rigid. They range from the kind of scientist who likes to lick his tongue around the notion of 'brute facts', to the kind of religionist who fondles a system of 'unequivocal dogma'."

One fact stands out a mile in any study of the history of Europe, religious persecutions have been much more savage there than in other parts of the world, and this savagery follows the rise of Christianity. Persecution was known before. Socrates had to drink the hemlock. The Moslems sometimes persecuted, so it is not wholly a matter for Christian Europe, but it has been much worse there than anywhere else. Others have massacred, but only the Christians have massacred over minute points of dogma. Other peoples have killed for power, for food, for nationalism, but not about whether one should make the sign of the Cross with two fingers or three.

"... there is a type of personality which approaches the world with an entire armoury of sharp and hard instruments, by means of which it slices and sorts the universe into precise and sterile categories which will not interfere with one's peace of mind..."

"I asked the boy beneath the pines. He said, 'The Master's gone alone Herb-picking somewhere on the mount, Cloud-hidden, whereabouts unknown'."

"... there is a kind of brash mental healthiness ever ready to rush in and clear up the mystery, to find out precisely... what herbs the master is picking and where... We fail so easily to see the difference between fear of the unknown and respect for the unknown... Respect for the unknown is the attitude of those who, instead of raping nature, woo her until she gives herself."

We must know Nature as we know a woman, by embracing her.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

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

New Books...

- The Psychology of Social Class M. Halbwachs 16/-
- The Charm of Politics R. H. S. Crossman 18/-
- Social Change Ian Hogbin 21/-
- From an Abandoned Work Samuel Beckett 2/6
- Kurt Schwitters in England S. Thémerson 25/-
- Penguins and Reprints...**
- The Man who was Thursday G. K. Chesterton 2/6
- Safe Conduct Boris Pasternak 11/-
- The English Novel Walter Allen 4/-
- Hiroshima John Hersey 2/6
- The Uses of Literacy Richard Hoggart 4/-
- The Master Builder &c. Henrik Ibsen 3/6
- Voyage of the 'Lucky Dragon' R. E. Lopp 2/6
- Second-Hand...**
- Rural Rides (Abgd) William Cobbett 3/-
- Secret Siberia Emil Lengyel 3/6
- The Duty of Empire Leonard Barnes 3/6
- Men Against the Desert Ritchie Calder 3/-
- Independent People Haldor Laxness 4/6
- Beds Reginald Reynolds 5/-
- A Point of Order Gwyn Thomas 3/6
- Rolling in the Dew Ethel Mannin 3/-
- Jehovah's Witnesses Royston Pike 3/-
- Why Was I Killed? Rex Warner 3/-
- England, Your England George Orwell 3/6

Periodicals...

- Fortnightly, No. 2 9d.
- Organic Functionalism, No. 6 2/6
- Dissent, Autumn 3/6

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

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

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

Death of a Good Comrade

MORRIS FELDMAN

THE anarchist movement is never short of persons who, having been brought up in the Jewish faith, have rejected all identification with a particular race or religion. It is the world in general which is short of such persons and for this reason the death of our comrade Morris Feldman of Leeds is to be specially regretted.

It was a shock to me to hear that he died last month while undergoing an operation. Every few months this tall, thin-faced man would come up to me behind our platform at Hyde Park and renew our friendship with his quiet sense of humour and soft-spoken self-confidence. He was a true freethinker. He arrived at the anarchist standpoint through his long association with the Rationalist movement but, unlike many rationalists, he extended his freedom of thought to the rejection of all authority over the sovereign individual.

He was a generous and a practical man

and he knew the way in which he could best help the movement, as the many entries in our Press Fund after the initials 'M.F. (Leeds)' will testify. He was happy to give to the movement (and to individuals in need), content that the ideas he held dear should be propagated and our way of life lived up to as far as possible.

The last time we met was at the Summer School, where he took part in discussion and told me how pleased he was that the international congress had been held in London this year. Conversely he was sorry to hear of the demise of the Malatesta Club and he had ideas for helping us there, but now death has robbed us of his support.

We shall miss Morris Feldman very much, and we send our condolences to his widow and son who, we are sure, will miss him even more.

PHILIP SANSON.

Continued on p. 3

Report on a Racket

Continued from p. 1

...but one cannot imagine that such a racket can adequately safeguard the public interest which, in some cases, may run counter to the interests of newspaper owners.

...to this barrage, strengthened by Labour speakers, the Minister of State, Board of Trade, Mr. Hugh Morgan had no answer except to deny that there was anything wrong or warranting the setting up of an independent Commission of Inquiry. The "industry" is "successful" and "functioning". Did the Opposition dislike it, asked, because "it is an integral part of a private enterprise society, in my opinion, of a free society?"

...ADVERTISING is indeed, an integral part of the free world; Advertising Industry is not. The advertiser, as we said in our first pamphlet, is an essential service in the life of an active human community. It is no more than a weapon in the hands of industrialists to convince the public into desiring goods and services which otherwise they would often well do without. As the Advertising Association puts it in its leaflet for speakers:

Advertising must be invoked in the place to mobilise or preface a demand for a new product and to make production economically possible.

Advertising to-day not only "pre-conditions demand". No speaker in the debate mentioned that it also appeals to blackmail shopkeepers small and large, into stocking goods and becoming willing or unwilling salesman for goods which they know to be of inferior quality but which national advertising campaigns "obliges" them to keep in stock. And once the goods are in stock they must persuade the public to buy. Thus the retailer becomes an unpaid agent of the advertiser instead of someone to whom the consumer can confidently turn for advice.

The Advertising Industry is an integral part of the capitalist system. Only in a capitalist system is it the rôle of the industrialist to create demand. In a rational society it is the consumer who will determine what the factories shall produce. To-day they produce as an end in itself, or at least as a means to providing profits for a limited section of the community. True one Conservative member sought justification for the Advertising Industry on the grounds that "it employs a great number of people" and that the eye-sore to our landscape caused by billposting and posters was justified in that "they created a great deal of employment". Another speaker drew attention to the fact that advertising

is responsible for about 40 per cent. of the revenue of the Press. That is a useful saving to the cost of printing and producing newspapers, periodicals, the provincial Press and so on.

BUT what has all this to do with advertising as advertising? Is the Press any better for being subsidised by the oil companies and the manufacturers of detergents, dentifrice and brassieres? Most thinking people think not.

However even those who denounce the advertising racket in the

Incidentally the two "serious" Sunday papers, the Observer and the Sunday Times between them devoted 5 1/2 inches to the debate on the Advertising Industry. Curious this lack of interest in view of the fact that more than 90 out of the Observer's 192 columns were paid for by advertisers and the proportion so far as the Sunday Times was concerned is even higher. Perhaps the silence is not so curious!

PEOPLE AND IDEAS:

TRIBAL ANARCHISTS

THE anarchists have always been interested in the reports of travellers and ethnologists on those human societies which were once called savage, and then primitive, and now, as we learn more about them, simply pre-literate. There are both historical and ideological reasons for this interest—links through Godwin and even through Bakunin with those 18th century French thinkers who began the cult of the 'Natural Man' and 'Noble Savage', while in later generations, anarchist thinkers themselves, in the persons of Kropotkin and the brothers Elie and Elise Reclus, made important contributions to geography and anthropology.

The knowledge that human societies exist or have existed without government, without institutionalised authority, and without social and sexual codes quite different from those of our own society, is a comforting thing for the advocates of anarchy when they are told that their theories run contrary to 'human nature', and you will often find quoted in the anarchist press some attractive description of a tribal anarchy, some pocket of the Golden Age (seen from the outside) among the Eskimo, innocent of property, or the sex-happy Trobrianders. One could, and perhaps should, make an anthology of such items, as the travel books roll off the presses. This year has produced a fine crop—from Akua-Aku to Wal-Wal.

Several anarchist writers of the past did just this—Kropotkin in his chapter on Mutual Aid Among Savages, Elie Reclus in his Primitive Folk and Edward Carpenter in an appendix to his essay

House cannot escape from the contradictions of their own political approach, and in the end they must recognise the "need" for the Industry. Thus one Tory M.P. was able to quote Mr. Noel-Baker as saying, last July, that

With modern conditions and modern marketing methods it is obvious that advertising is an essential ingredient. One cannot get a new product on to the market without modern advertising techniques.

The same M.P. quoted Mr. C. A. R. Crosland, another Labour Party "hope", in which he wrote in the Listener that no large manufacturer could "afford to stop advertising, for if he did he would go out of business" (where does the consumer come into this?) and he concluded that:

In such cases the advertising is essentially defensive, a necessary condition of survival in a harshly competitive world. But would it not then be better to forgo the luxury of the money now spent on competitive advertising to lower prices. The answer, in my view, is usually no. Competition does act as a spur, as an inducement to initiative, enterprise, innovation, and as a protection for the consumer; and if advertising is the price we have to pay for retaining competition, it is usually worth paying.

It is clear that the advertising racket will not be stopped if and when a Labour government comes to power, however vocal individual members may have been in last week's debate (which petered out in a wrangle with the Speaker over points of order). But even if there is no possibility of driving the advertising industry into liquidation at present there is nothing to prevent consumers from joining forces, to create their organisations for protecting themselves from the misrepresentations and the rackets on which the Advertising Industry has spent some £400 millions of the public's money this year and will undoubtedly spend ever more in the next twelve months.

"Present day marketing", declared the chairman of a large group of Marketing and Advertising Companies at a conference earlier this month, "is like a military operation and the big companies are able to employ every weapon."

Do we, the public, need more warning than that before we do something to strengthen those organisations that exist already as well as creating others to cover every aspect of consumer interest?

If so then we are indeed more stupid than the advertising boys think!

on Non-Governmental Society, but anthropology has developed its techniques and methods of analysis greatly since their day, and the anecdotal or anthropological approach, with its accumulation of travellers' tales and subjective observation, is now frowned upon as unscientific. Nowadays too, we view the simpler societies from a more objective standard of reference than that of nineteenth century children, what was in fact a different kind of family organisation, so certain societies have been described as anarchistic when in fact a more thorough and systematic examination may show that they have as effective methods of social control and its enforcement as any authoritarian society, or that certain patterns of behaviour are so rigidly enforced by custom as to make alternatives unthinkable.

The anarchist in making use of anthropological data to-day has to ask more sophisticated questions than his predecessors about the rôle of the law in such societies. But what constitutes "the law"? Raymond Firth, in his Human Types writes:

"When we turn to the sphere of primitive law, we are confronted by difficulties of definition. There is usually no specific code of legislation, issued by a central authority, and no formal judicial body of the nature of a court. Nevertheless there are rules which are expected to be obeyed and which, in fact, are normally kept, and there are means for ensuring some degree of obedience."

ON the classification of these rules and the definition of law anthropologists are divided. By the test of the jurist, who equates the law with what is decided by the courts, "primitive people have no law, but simply a body of customs"; to the sociologist what is important is the whole body of rules of all sorts that exist in a society and the problem of their functioning, and amongst anthropologists themselves there are a variety of points of view. Malinowski included in primitive law "all types of binding obligation and any customary action to prevent breaches in the pattern of social conformity". Godfrey Wilson takes as the criterion of legal action "the entry into an issue of one or more members of a social group who are not themselves per-

NATURE, MAN & WOMAN Continued from p. 2

The Taoist believes that to strive and strive for a thing is the very worst way of trying to get it.

The subjugation of women and the hatred for sex is due to the curious identification of woman with Nature, as, for example, the Earth Mother, and with sexuality, as if men would not have sexual desire but for woman, as if men did not have sexual desire innate in them just as women do. (The Victorian ideal of the sexless woman is a later development, originally the woman was seen as the temptress. She could only achieve her emancipation by sacrificing her sexual nature.)

Much of what Mr. Watts has to say comes very close to the ideas of Dr. Reich. Reich must have been a Taoist without knowing it. Or perhaps he did.

I remember my surprise when reading, years ago, the following passage from the Tao Teh King:

"Man when living is soft and tender; when dead he is hard and tough. All animals and plants are tender and fragile; when dead they become withered and dry. Therefore it is said: the hard and tough are parts of death; the soft and tender are parts of life. This is the reason why the soldiers when they are too tough cannot carry the day; the tree when it is too tough will break. The position of the strong and the great is low, and the position of the weak and tender is high."

This seemed to me to fit in very well with Reich's theories of the "body-armour". The stiff body is a sick body. It is impossible to do justice to this work in a review. One would like to quote so much of it. But it is to be recommended to those who feel that what I might perhaps call the "Kropotkinian" view of life is inadequate for them, and that authoritarianism is itself no more than a symptom of something deeper, and that the problem requires to be dealt with on a deeper level.

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

Laura Bohannan contributes an essay on the Tiv, a society of 600,000 people who live on either side of the Benue River in Northern Nigeria. The Tiv political attitudes are conveyed in two expressions, to 'repair the country' and to 'spoil the country'. "Any act which disturbs the smooth course of social life—war, theft, witchcraft, quarrels—spoils the country; peace, restitution, successful arbitration 'repairs' it". If we try, Dr. Bohannan writes,

"to isolate certain attributes of the rôles of elders or men of influence as political, we falsify their true social and cultural position. . . I mean this in a positive and not a negative way: a segmentary system of this sort functions not despite but through the absence of an indigenous concept of 'the political'. Only the intricate interrelations of interests and loyalties through the interconnection of cultural ideology, systems of social grouping, and organisation of institutions and the consequent moral enforcement of each by the other, enables the society to work."

The Mandari, described by Jean Beux are a people of 15,000 souls living in isolated groups of villages in the savannah forests of the Equatorial Sudan. They never had any form of centralised political administration until the recent imposition from without of six administrative chiefdoms. She is concerned with the organisation of the former chiefdoms in which the Mar, the hereditary chief "crystallizes and expresses the views of the elders after general discussion" at the toket (shade of a tree) or council, which she describes thus:

"The toket of the Mar has always been the appropriate place for male activities not specifically associated with horticulture and herding. Youths and adults whose homes are within reach of the meeting place may spend the day there, repairing and refashioning weapons and artifacts and hearing the discussion of the cases and the affairs of the chiefdom. . . The toket in the context of a group of elders does not constitute a council in the sense of a specially selected or regularly meeting body. The people who compose it are spending the day at the tree with the Mar and at such times complainants come and put their cases. . . The carrying out of pronouncements made by the toket was in most cases left to the individual concerned. . . Settlement was often, however, dependent on the ability of the injured party to exercise self-help in getting his dues. . . Mandari also say that many cases were never satisfactorily settled and people would wait until the Mar was absent to take their own revenge on their enemies."

Fighting within the chiefdom would however lead to the disintegration of the group and for this reason the landowning lineages would always combine together to intervene between warring segments. There are recognised scales of compensation. Killing and other serious offences within the territorial clan led to the complete separation of the guilty party who fragmented away from the chiefdom, settling with relatives elsewhere or attaching to another landowning line. "The heads of two friendly polities would sometimes share a common toket, forming a combined council to try and settle major wrongs in order to prevent the breaking up of important economic interdependence which was vital to both".

(To be concluded) C.W.

FREEDOM PRESS

SELECTIONS FROM 'FREEDOM'

- Vol. 1, 1951, Mankind is One
Vol. 2, 1952, Postscript to Posterity
Vol. 3, 1953, Colonialism on Trial
Vol. 4, 1954, Living on a Volcano
Vol. 5, 1955, The Immoral Moralists
Vol. 6, 1956, Oil and Troubled Waters

Vol. 7, 1957, Year One—Sputnik Era each volume paper 7s. 6d. cloth 10s. 6d.

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

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

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

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

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

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

HERBERT READ: Art and the Evolution of Man 4s. Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism 3s. 6d.

Poetry and Anarchism cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d.

The Philosophy of Anarchism boards 2s. 6d.

The Education of Free Men 1s.

RUDOLF ROCKER: Nationalism and Culture cloth 21s.

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

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

ERRICO MALATESTA: Anarchy 9d.

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

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

Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications: Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute cloth 5s.

Journey Through Utopia cloth 18s. (U.S.A. \$3)

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

The University Libertarian

DEAR COMRADES,

It is with regret that I have to say that I cannot continue to publish the *University Libertarian*, and hope you will give me space to appeal for successors.

This three-year-old baby (birthday next month) grows slowly and is proving too onerous in time and cash for a single individual. The personal deficit to me has reached £310 with the publication of No. 7 and is still running at over £100 a year. This is more than I could handle anyway, but there are signs also that my financial position may worsen, so that I must be very careful about dissipating my reserves. The deficit is what after allowing for donations totalling £73 over the three years, which have already been acknowledged individually in *U.L.* but for which I again give thanks.

The chief onus however is in terms of time, and in fact if the *U.L.* was more of a success—and it has quickened slightly—I should be overwhelmed. I have had no success in getting a Sales or Circulation Manager to handle the correspondence about sales, despite two requests in *U.L.*; although David Bell has offered to despatch the 200 complimentary and Donald Room to proof-read. Except for the generosity of Derek Stroud in Preston in despatching subscription copies and paying this postage even after he had to some extent fallen out of sympathy with *U.L.*, and the discussion of manuscripts for the early issues by Tony Gibson, Philip Holgate, and Philip Lewis as an Editorial Committee, the *U.L.* has been a one-man band. Formerly the satisfaction and hopes of the enterprise were reward enough for the chores and heavy loss,

but now I must disengage myself completely, since I can hardly expect to have the joys and kudos of editing while handing over the chores and deficit to someone else.

But I deplore infanticide, and if possible would sooner arrange an adoption. I would like to hand *U.L.*, complete with ownership, control, financial liability, stocks of back numbers (over 2,000, face value £100), stationery, and goodwill, over to a group prepared to continue it as a publication of broad libertarian appeal, revisionist and empiricist in temperament, and aimed at the universities and colleges of the English-speaking world. The group should number at least three and preferably more so as to be able to handle the work and share the deficit of perhaps £40 per issue, and preferably should have some past or present connection with, or interest in, universities and colleges, not only so that they will realize what is required and what is possible, but also so that the *U.L.* can claim right of entry to colleges as an internal initiative which will be more difficult to squash than an apparent "invasion". A non-university periodical would be a superfluous addition to those existing, and there is a specific job to be done in universities (and reciprocally by universities in the libertarian movement, if we have any humility).

The group should be in geographical contact with each other, which presumably means London, although I would be well pleased if some non-metropolitan group were strong enough to do it. Offers are not confined to the UK—there has been almost more support for *U.L.* from America than from Britain, and an

American group would be most welcome. I will write off the accumulated deficit, so that you will start from scratch.

A quick response is called for as the January issue should go to the setters about December 1st, if anyone can be found to afford it and thereafter to distribute it. It would be quite a good issue too. That at least is one problem which has been solved—there is no shortage now of good MSS, and it would be possible to fill five issues a year as I once hoped to be able to afford.

Failing a successful adoption, I must wind up *U.L.* In which case people who want particular issues in quantity (e.g. contributors), should let me know. The remainder can be given to Freedom Bookshop for disposal as pamphlets or free propaganda or otherwise.

The latter paragraph brings me naturally to a tribute to *FREEDOM*, which, as my offering this letter to you reaffirms, is the forum of the anarchist movement in Britain. *FREEDOM* and the Bookshop have been friendly and helpful to *U.L.* from its inception. It was *FREEDOM* (in the person of Lilian Wolfe) who provided the first list of potential subscribers; *FREEDOM* has published several friendly reviews of particular issues of *U.L.*, and many established contributors who had shown their journalistic merit in *FREEDOM* agreed or offered to write for *U.L.*, while Freedom Bookshop has sold about a quarter of the total sales of *U.L.* As a small return *U.L.* has regularly left two or three inches of space for Philip Sansom to devise a cunning advert for *FREEDOM* (he forgot last time). Very many thanks, comrades!

And as for your readers—is it to be infanticide or adoption? Well-wishers should write to 5 Hitchin Road, Stevenage, Herts, or phone Stevenage 333.

Yours fraternally,
Stevenage, Nov. 19. VIC MAYES.

Politics in Argentina

IT is over three years now since Peron was relieved of his job as the Dictator of Argentina. In that time we have seen few signs which would justify the Western claim that Peron was replaced by more "liberal" minded men. As we pointed out at the time there was no evidence that the new rulers were going to allow any freedom of expression to the opposition. On the contrary a few days after General Eduardo Lonardi seized power a statement was issued which we now quote from *FREEDOM* reprints (The Immoral Moralists, 1955):

The provisional Argentine Government to-day (Oct 14th) threatened death to any supporters of Peron who demonstrated next Monday, the anniversary of the 1945 general strike...

Notwithstanding the accounts of bloody repression at the time the West hastened to favour the new régime with the same opportunistic speed with which they recognised the new Iraq government after its ruthless seizure of power a few months ago.

Recent reports from Argentina give us another glimpse of the real nature of the régime which demonstrated its Peron-like methods in dealing with opposing factions.

The President, Arturo Frondizi, "elected with the help of Peronista votes" recently negotiated millions of pounds worth of development contracts with foreign oil companies, mostly from the United States including Pan American International Company and Union Oil Company. To placate the Peronists a number of concessions were granted by the Argentine Government; amnesties, the restoration of confiscated property, allowing them to hold control of the labour movement under a plan drawn up by the Secretary of Economic and Social Affairs. This particular piece of political bribery was not very successful because after the first group of oilmen arrived from the United States in Mendoza Province, oil workers gave the President 48 hours to cancel the oil contracts. When he refused the men struck and the National Oil Workers' Union called for a nation-wide strike.

There was no thought of negotiation in the Government's response which was to declare a 30-day state of seige and a nation-wide arrest of

strike leaders. It is reported that the army promised the President support if he stopped "wooing the Peronistas". The fact that President Frondizi was voted into power with the help of Peronists to carry out their wishes is a democratic right which is ignored by dictators as well as the "democracies" who support them when workers attempt to exercise it in unfavourable conditions.

One U.S. paper states that the Argentine President had lost the "dubious Peronista support" but he had gained the prestige of "demonstrated firmness"—an acceptable description for throwing workers in jail who oppose their government. According to one account the union has decided to postpone its strike threat, but the workers who originally struck in Mendoza are still out.

With all that U.S. money invested in Argentina, President Frondizi's dictatorial methods will be supported by interested parties inside and outside the country. Since the Argentine government oil monopoly has only enough resources to produce 35% of the country's requirements, although an estimated 2.3 billion.bbl. oil reserve lies underground, it may be that development contracts with these oil companies will bring temporary economic benefits to the workers (the Argentine oil workers do not seem to think so!), but at the moment we are primarily interested in the methods used in dealing with opposition which are given wide publicity and condemned when used by countries outside the Western bloc.

It may also be true that strike leaders who are now imprisoned are Peronists, or Communists who would not strike if economic aid was supplied by the Soviet Union or from some other source (any devout Peronist is probably only interested in harrasing the existing government), and who would no doubt support a tyranny under a different name, but "we in the democracies" are supposed to be offering an alternative to dictatorship and suppression, and should be protesting to the Argentine government on its imprisonment of strike leaders. Capitalist investments apart, we are at the moment objecting to the hypocrisy which labels open force "firmness" and to the dishonest ruthlessness of governments everywhere.

Protesting Through Authority

DEAR COMRADES,

What is the attitude of members of the anarchist movement to activities of protest against tyrannical actions by foreign governments?

It seems to be felt that petitions, letters to M.P.s or ministers are of no avail, but that public meetings and demonstrations are sometimes useful. Practical action, such as boycott of articles of trade, or even of "prestige" cultural or sporting events is obviously more in line with anarchist ideas in general, but the chances of putting such action across are limited and appear ineffective and in the case of cultural events, the effect of one person staying away seems only to be that he misses the enjoyment, and inflicts no effective harm on the government involved.

This question was raised by the fact that recently the Bulgarian movement in exile asked libertarian groups and individuals throughout the world to protest about the death in mysterious circumstances of a comrade Manol Vassev, in a Communist concentration camp. In their letter listing various possible activities they make the point, obviously with an eye on a possible anarchist reaction, that one should not regard any of these activities, such as writing to the Bulgarian Prime Minister, as being of no use.

We usually make the claim that direct action is far more effective than petitioning and letter-writing, but the end result is quite often that the anarchists, in theoretical purity, do absolutely nothing.

Is there any value whatsoever in approaches to authority? Can we approach authority at the same time as advocating its absolute destruction? If the anarchist movement is not sufficiently strong to bring about effective direct action should we swallow our theories for a bit and at least do our bit in other ways?

Or is there any chance of really trying to put our theories to the test?

London, Nov. 19. SYNDICALIST.

FREEDOM needs many more New Readers

What's Happened to Socialist Indignation?

VISITORS to Freedom Bookshop this week might have noticed a fine display on the outside 'racks' of the current issue of *FREEDOM* with its headline—*British Brutality in Cyprus*. On enquiring if there had been any favourable reactions from passers-by, the ever vigilant Bookshop staff said that to date (Monday 24th—so there is still time!) there had been none. They did tell us however that a regular socialist visitor to our shop was uneasy and was quite unable to settle down for the afternoon to discourse on the wonders of Marxism as is his custom because of those provocative copies of *FREEDOM* in full view of the public!

The display reminded us of a question posed by R. H. S. Crossman in last week's *New Statesman*. Writing about Cyprus he asks: "Who apart from Sir Compton MacKenzie can afford to be on the side of the terrorists?" We do not think it is a question of who "can afford to be on the side of the terrorists", assuming "the terrorists" in this instance to be members of EOKA, but who has the guts to openly condemn the terrorist tactics of British troops in Cyprus safeguarded by military uniform when their function is supposed to be the restoration of "peace" by civilised methods. One of the answers is to be found at Freedom Bookshop.

Mr. Crossman makes one or two pertinent points in the same article on the change in public opinion, and the whole Labour movement, to imperialism. Even up to the Palestinian war there was still "a small but vocal section of public opinion which denounced Ernest Bevin for waging an unjust war against the Jews". He considers that the difference is due mainly to peacetime National Service, and writes:

So long as the British soldier was thought of as 'a drunken private of the Buffs', it was possible for left-wing par-

ties to side with subject peoples fighting against us for their freedom. Now the suggestion that National Servicemen are fighting an unjust war outrages even father and mother in the land. If Gaitskell and Mr. Bevan had gone as far as the *Manchester Guardian* on the Cyprus issue, they would have expected Labour's flank to the Tories. And that case, who can believe that I Hailsham—not to mention Julian Am—would have resisted the temptation to smear them as anti-British? So, ironically enough, the Radical protest—which in the past atoned partly, at least, for worst evils done in our name—is now muffled by the workings of parliamentary democracy.

It is surprising to read such an opinion from a socialist on parliamentary democracy. But even if Bevan and G. skell had exposed Labour's flank to the Tories by going as far as the *Manchester Guardian* how much more respect they would have gained as individuals both in this country and in Cyprus. naive anarchist observation? Perhaps but we do not think a decent society be built on political expediency.

What of the changing attitude to imperialism. Is it not also true that in 1900 when, as Mr. Crossman says, whole Labour movement and a section of the Liberal Party were imperialist, Britain was such a confident imperialist power that attacks in this direction were not taken seriously (in the same way as attacks on the government to-day in this country are not taken seriously). As days as Britain loses absolute control over entire colonies is it not possible there exists a mass "unconscious" that loss of colonial power will lead to economic insecurity and domination by 'foreign power'. And is it not this fear that politicians are playing for apparent success? R.M.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENT

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

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

NOV. 30.—Rashad Gool on AN EVALUATION OF 'DR. ZHIVAGO' (Pasternak)

Dec. 7.—Donald Room on THE BOMB-TROWER MYTH

DEC. 14.—Max Patrick on AN ANARCHIST ANALYZED.

DEC. 21.—Philip Holgate on EDUCATION AND THE FUTURE

EAST LONDON DEBATING COMPETITION

1st Round at University House, Victoria Park Square, Bethnal Green, E.3. (Bethnal Green, Central Line Underground) at 8 p.m., Friday, November 2. London Anarchist Group will debate the motion that "Government should be abolished".

CROYDON LIBERTARIAN GROUP

For details of meetings and other activities, please write to:

S. E. PARKER,
228 HOLMESDALE ROAD,
LONDON, S.E.25.

FREEDOM

The Anarchist Week

Postal Subscription Rates:

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

Special Subscription Rates for 2000

12 months 29/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)
6 months 14/6 (U.S.A. \$2.25)

Cheques, P.O.'s and Money Orders should be made out to FREEDOM PRESS, care of Payee, and addressed to the publisher.

FREEDOM PRESS

London, W.C.1. England

27 Red Lion Street

Tel.: Chancery 8364