

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"It is difficult to free fools from the chains they revere."
—VOLTAIRE.

19, No. 50

December 13th, 1958

Threepence

"The Future Labour Offers You" - Or PROSPERITY - ON PAPER!

THE Labour Party's Election manifesto presented in the form of a "Personal Guide to The Future Labour Offers YOU" is a slick production with cellophane cover (impressive to sully by workers' filthy hands) and neatly thumb indexed for quick reference (which surely appeal to white collar workers accustomed to ledgers and press books or who are daily irritated at having to wade through thick indexed volumes of rules and regulations). Furthermore, what has accounted for the huge success of this Guide (650,000 copies in the first fortnight) is that it is a bargain-happy public something for nothing—or very nearly. For six coppers one is offered a brochure which has probably cost ten times that amount to produce. As to our minds the price of the brochure was determined less by considerations of mass circulation than in creating just this impression of offering the public something for nothing: for sixpence you have a pamphlet "outlining the plans which the next Labour Government will turn into reality" declares a smiling Hugh Gaitskell on the first page; and to get that Labour government which is going to do so much for you, all you have to do is to make sure to put your cross against the name of the Labour candidate at the next general election!

For that cross the Labour Party offers you full employment, a home of your own (with bathroom and kitchen), "first-rate" education for your children, more hospitals, more nurses, free chiropody (for the aged) and free drugs. For that cross for

Labour you will be protected from hire-purchase ramps and will get value for your money, your children will get a good start in life (careers and culture for everybody) and the old folk will be so happy they won't want to die. Public control of industry and finance will solve the problem of unemployment and small farmers will be cared for by Big Brother. Under Labour, Taxes will go down (except for the "spivs and the stock exchange gamblers") and the prospect of Peace will go up (nevertheless "Labour fully accepts the duty to maintain the military defences of Britain"). The future of the Commonwealth and the Colonies, presented in four colours, is almost too good to be true: "fair shares for the hungry people of the world", protection of the African majorities, encouragement of the growth of co-operatives and trade unions, and one per cent. of the national income for raising the standards of living in these territories.

★

THESE are the thumb-nail bargains in the Labour Party basement all at a cost of sixpence and (and it is a very important "and") your cross for the Labour candidate when the time comes. But we have not come to the end of the Guide. A light green arrow directs us to turn the page to "and now the Future" where . . . no, it's not Old Moore himself waiting for us, nor even a picture of the milky way. A double page photograph of a view across a lake, loch or perhaps an artificial reservoir under which some charming village is buried, is lighted up in

one corner by a shaft of sunlight which has penetrated a beautiful but nevertheless ominously clouded sky. But the text which follows makes it clear that it won't rain—indeed it will be a permanently blue sky—if Mr. Gaitskell and his friends run the government. The plans are no "blueprint for Utopia" but what *can* be done (their italics) in "the next five years of Labour Government". Theirs is

a practical assessment of the jobs to be done, and a realistic account of the way we propose to do it.

But in fairness to the boys of Transport House, under their practical black three-piece suits and watch chains beat hearts not of gold but full of socialism and brotherly love.

A political programme is not just a statement of intentions. It also expresses an attitude to life.

We in the Labour Party are Socialists. This means that our whole approach to politics is different from that of the Tories. What is this difference?

Whereas the Tories believe that the "major economic and political

decisions should be taken by the rich and the powerful—government by 'top people', Labour's approach is based on two Socialist ideals: "Mutual service—the story of the Good Samaritan in terms of everyday political life" and "the enlargement of personal freedom" for others as well as for oneself. "There can be no true freedom without social justice".

These Socialist ideals have shaped our present programme. We express our ideals, first of all, in the material care of those who most need it. . . .

We know that true happiness does not come from material prosperity. (But poverty causes an immense amount of human unhappiness). Happiness comes from a full, free, satisfying life—a decent home, a secure job that you like doing, leisure richly filled with the good things of civilisation.

But all this must be "planned" and "fought for by all those who understand the modern world better than the Tories do", and who have "seen the vision of a just society and are inspired by the purpose of helping to create it".

"It is they who have sustained the

Labour Party in the battle against war and want and ignorance. We believe that the British people will soon decide to take, with Labour, another great step in the exciting future" (our italics).

So fellow workers, ladies and gentlemen "sustain" the Labour Party and see the new world in glorious technicolor. Price sixpence and your cross!

★

THE Future Labour Offers You is too slick both in its presentation and its content to be Socialist or true. The production, left to the professional publicity boys is in the most expensive traditions of proprietary medicine advertising, suitable for selling pills and panaceas but not socialism, the content, cooked up by the successful journalist-intellectual-economist bright boys of the Party aims at the lowest common denominator both in human intelligence and petty materialism. We quoted at length the "idealistic" passages in the brochure in the interests of fair reporting, not because we believe them when they say "we in the Labour Party are socialists" or that they believe in socialism ("democratic socialism in action" is how Gaitskell describes the plan). The Labour Party hierarchy is out to win the sweet fruits of power; for this they

Continued on p. 3

Immigration & Labour Problems

"BRITAIN is not an immigration country." That is the form of words which can be, and is used by watchdogs of the police at the ports and airfields leading into Britain, to turn back a potential immigrant without needing to give any further explanation. At the same time this country is the centre of our great multi-racial commonwealth, etc., which places absolutely no restrictions on any person at all if there is a chance to exploit his labour, and as a consequence immigration from commonwealth countries is comparatively free.

Perhaps this is one of those practical paradoxes of the British political system, so beloved of democrats and parliamentarians, and it is expressed currently in the facts that while feeling in some conservative quarters is running high on the question of the freedom enjoyed by the West Indians; a smaller and inevitably less powerful group of people is expressing concern over the interrogation methods to which individuals coming for visits or short stays in England are subjected on arrival, and the fact that recently some have been summarily turned away. Mr. C. Osborne, a Conservative, expressed one of these trends in Parliament when he introduced a Private Member's Bill in the Commons on December 5th, designed to give the government powers to exclude or deport commonwealth citizens on grounds of being "idle, unfit or criminal". Even the official spokesman for the government denounced this Bill for the anti-coloured sentiment thinly veiled behind its provisions, and it was defeated. The opposing trend is represented by Viscount Stansgate, who is introducing a motion into the Lords on December 9th to limit the arbitrariness with which the Immigration Officers wield their powers, but it is not felt that his valiant attempts

to extend the realm of individual liberty through the channels of the House of Lords hold much chance of success.

Although in numbers, culture, and social class, the streams of immigrants from the colonies and hopeful immigrants from Europe stand miles apart, there is one factor common to both situations—the need of governments to control the supply of manpower. And when anything seems to be going wrong in that direction the insular British pull the draw-bridge right up; unions and workers, governments and employers, each react in a characteristic way if they see the slightest threat to their interests in the run of the labour market.

A good deal of absorption of West Indian workers has taken place, mainly into occupations where the pay and conditions were not of the kind to attract English workers in a period of favourable employment. Only rarely have white and coloured people been in a position of competition for any job. Furthermore, if it had not been for the supply of labour so readily available, the British economy, guided by its Labour-Tory economic wizards, would have been unable to make its astonishing leap from the depths of inflation to the brink of deflation (for all the good that has come of it).

Now that this has happened, the question of possible unemployment is lurking in everyone's mind, politician as well as worker, and some rethinking is being done apace.

In Mr. Osborne's speech introducing his Bill, although he was calling for the exclusion only of those "idle, unfit and criminal", his arguments showed that his concern lay more with the normal, able-bodied men who were only too willing to work.

Continued on p. 3

Direct Action Against Rocket Sites

Demonstrators Hosed by Security Police

THE organisers of the 'direct action' demonstration at the Norfolk rocket launching site last weekend have every reason to be proud of the results of their attempts.

They have shown that one determined attempt to invade a government installation and obstruct work can get more publicity for their cause than any amount of petitioning or more 'constitutional' methods of propaganda. Not that any of the Press were sympathetic to the demonstrators, but in the generous headlines given to the story millions of readers became aware of the Nuclear Disarmament Campaign—and of the existence of a group of people prepared to suffer violent ill-treatment, discomfort for many

hours and the possibility of arrest through the fervour of their opposition to the foul weapons of destruction being prepared for use.

The demonstration took the form of a meeting in the market place of Swaffham, Norfolk, followed by a march to nearby North Pickenham. The marchers were divided into two parties, the first being the direct action squad and the second supporters whose function was to line the road outside and picket the entrance with notices and banners.

The direct action squad were briefed before the meeting left Swaffham with strict instructions to remain non-violent under all circumstances. Those who could not trust themselves to keep their arms rigidly by their sides even if physically attacked (and that included the present writer) were asked not to join the party attempting to enter the site, in order that the non-violent character of the demonstration should not be affected.

Ordeal by Water

From the beginning of their entry, over the barbed wire with a specially prepared wooden banner providing a bridge, the demonstrators were met with violence from the guards and workers on the site. Forty marchers made the initial invasion at 2 p.m. Saturday afternoon, evading the handful of guards, to be greeted by a shower of water from the hose of a fire tender specially brought to the site from an aerodrome that morning.

Braving this soaking, the demonstrators continued on to their objective, a huge concrete mixer which towered above the site's buildings and from which went a continuous stream of trucks to the construction points.

There the work of obstruction began and there the violence against them began also. First reports indicated that the local police and RAF police were content to leave it to the workers to deal with the

demonstrators, who were roughly pulled away from in front of trucks, where they were sitting down, and in at least two cases thrown into muddy, cement sludge puddles and forced to remain there unless they agreed to leave the site, which of course they would not do.

All the time a hose was playing on the demonstrators, and by dusk they had all been carried or hustled out at the gates, where they settled down for the night's picketing and obstruction.

By seven the next morning, having found another way in to the site, the demonstrators were waiting for the workers' arrival, and on this day, the Sunday, a different attitude was apparent among the workers. One of the demonstrators had established himself in the great hopper high up on the mixer and refused to come down on the orders of either the RAF or local police—both in greater strength on the second day—but came down when a local union secretary on the job agreed to repeat to reporters at the gate a statement to the effect that he, and many of the workers there, were ashamed at the treatment meted out by the workers (mainly Irish labourers) on Saturday.

Blood Money

Against that, however, was the marked hostility of the local building trades union secretary who snarled at the demonstrators 'You want us to lose our jobs?' This attitude clearly coloured the behaviour of the workers, who, with overtime and week-end work are clocking up wages of over £40 a week in some cases. With money like that to salve their consciences, if any, and a background of education by the priest to justify a just war against Russia, the murderous nature of their work does not worry the labourers.

Neither does it worry the local tradespeople, who see the site as a potential source of lucrative income when the Americans move in with

Continued on p. 4

Direct Action Against the Deficit!

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 49

Deficit on Freedom £980
Contributions received £768
DEFICIT £212

November 28 to December 4

Bolton: R.T.S. £1/0/0; London: J.S.* 3/-; Barking: B.L. £1/10/0; Chicago: J.K. £5/0/0; Skegness: R.M. 4/7; Glasgow: S.M. 3/-; Geelong: G.P. £2/2/6; Geelong: O.R. £3/18/4; Geelong: T. 7/10; Sheffield: H.W. 1/-; Wolverhampton: J.G.L.* 2/6; London: J.G. 1/-; St. Ives: A. J. McC. 10/6; Radlett: D.S. 1/-; Dereham: J.B. 2/-; Cookham: G.H. £5/0/0; Bolton: W.H.B. 5/-; Stroud: R.C. 17/-; The Refrattari Group, Per M.P. £8/15/0; Bakewell: D.M.* 5/-; Glasgow: M.W.K. 5/-; Newport Pagnell: W.S. £2/1/0; London: J.G. 1/6.

Total ... 32 16 9
Previously acknowledged ... 735 17 10
1958 TOTAL TO DATE ... 768 14 7

GIFT OF BOOK: London: R.E.

*Indicates regular contributor

THE BOMB

THE VOYAGE OF THE LUCKY DRAGON, by Ralph E. Lapp. Penguin, 2s. 6d.
THE DEVIL'S REPERTOIRE, by Victor Gollancz. Gollancz, 5s.

OURS is the age of The Bomb. There is no need to apply any descriptive adjective. Everyone knows which bomb is intended. In the "good old days" bombs, made with gunpowder or dynamite, were associated with anarchists in the popular mind. These were the fantasies of authoritarian people. Secretly these good folk wanted their repressive culture destroyed, but, being ashamed of this, they projected their desires onto the wicked anarchists. Subsequently these destructive daydreams were brought to reality. Needless to say it is the governments of Russia, the United States and Britain who make The Bomb.

Victor Gollancz has many wise things to say about The Bomb, and about war in general. "The Devil's Repertoire" is the name he gives to a series of stock arguments in defence of The Bomb. The bomb-lovers trot them out in every discussion. We have heard them all before: "We don't want emotionalism, we want reason". "It isn't practical" (to give up The Bomb). "You can't apply Christianity to politics."

None of these arguments are of any intrinsic value whatever. They are only rationalisations. Yet I doubt whether any real bomb-lover will be converted by Victor Gollancz's debunking of them. To begin with, such people will not read this book. It will influence the marginal folk, the waverers. The already converted will read it for the pleasure of reading views they already agree with. This is the usual fate of such books.

A more fundamental reason is that the authoritarian sees life as tragedy. It is quite fitting to him that the human race should blow itself up. "What does it matter, so long as the gesture is fine?" He delights in the idea of pain and suffering. He considers them ennobling. If he is of religious bent he will worry still less. There is always Heaven. Better death than national defeat, or the triumph of "Godless Communism" or "Capitalist imperialism".

Victor Gollancz considers that what our age is suffering from is an excess of "materialism". I do not know what this expression means in this context. There is certainly very little love of the material world in modern society. We are surrounded by ugliness and brutality. Nor is it true to ascribe, as our author does, the evils of the present time to the fact that we do not aspire sufficiently for the spiritual world and suppress our

"animal nature". Could any view be more perverse? No animal has ever made an H-Bomb, and, with a few exceptions, animals do not prey on members of their own species or band together in armies to slay each other.

There is no necessary conflict between man's "animality" and his "spirituality". A man may feel himself "split", as a result of his upbringing, but the ideal is "wholeness".

War is one of the consequences of man's rejection of his "animal nature". This is shown by the fact that sexual frustration, which is all part of this rejection, produces sadism, aggression and submissiveness. If man were a healthy animal he would also exhibit the signs of a healthy spiritual being. He would be spontaneously kind and co-operative. I cannot for the life of me see how warfare can possibly be regarded as a product of healthy animality.

In order to resist the defenders and supporters of The Bomb one does not have to be a believer in the theories of Plato, which postulate a "spiritual order" of which the world we know is but a poor copy.

Do we not have to accept the world of the senses and integrate ourselves to it, to, as it were, "swallow it whole", the glory and the pain? It is not easy, but, on the other hand, this agonised effort to escape into a changeless state of perfection has led to religious fanaticism and persecution, thus making matters worse by adding to the "thousand natural shocks the flesh is heir to" the artificial evils of human cruelty.

In one chapter of this book there is the description of how a Japanese died of radiation disease, which developed quite suddenly thirteen years after the dropping of the atomic bomb on his country. These bombs were primitive devices by comparison with the H-Bomb which covered the crew of the ironically named "Lucky Dragon" with radio-active ash. The ship was about eighty-five miles from the scene of the explosion. Thirteen years and eighty-five miles. These figures may give us some idea of the range of these weapons, which, at the present rate of progress, will go on increasing.

Mr. Lapp's book tells the now familiar story of the Japanese fishermen. Everyone knows now about how the seamen who first saw the explosion cried, "The sun rises in the West!" Their first

impulse was to cut loose their valuable nets and flee. They were afraid of being arrested by the Americans as spies, not of the explosion itself. Unfortunately they did not make their escape at once. Two hours after the explosion white ash fell on them. They knew of atom-bombs, but there had been no ash like this at Hiroshima, and besides they thought themselves well outside the official American testing area, as indeed they were. There had been no warning broadcast about an extra-large bomb. They made no attempt to wash off the ash. Some even preserved it in little packets "for luck", which they kept under their pillows. They did not realise that it had any connection with the sickness which smote them.

When they returned to port all Hell broke loose. Women who had slept with members of the crew, as soon as the story got out, rushed round to the doctor, fearing that they had become radio-active, as indeed they had, but mildly. The fish was found to be contaminated, not only aboard the "Lucky Dragon" but on other boats as well. Some of it had already reached the markets. There was an uproar. The results for the fishing industry were disastrous. Some firms went bankrupt as housewives boycotted fish. (Fish is an important item in Japanese diet). Expanding ripples reached the shores of the United States, where people refused to buy imported tuna, even when tinned.

Only one of the crew died, but all of them were very ill. The attitude of the American authorities was as heartless, on the whole, as might have been expected. The usual efforts were made to minimise the extent of the damage and suffering, to make "objective" and "sensible" statements of the kind with which we are all too familiar.

The fate of people means nothing to the ruling groups in society. Just how much rulers care about their own fate, or that of their families, it is difficult to judge. The world is too small for further nuclear bomb developments. Everyone is liable to be affected, no matter how remote the place where the test is made. Why is it that scientific writers continually insist on the "exciting" (their favourite word) nature of the present age? Is it to convince themselves that all is well? Or us? A doomed gladiator was no doubt "excited" too.

This brash optimism seems almost a form of cruelty after the things that have happened to the crew of the "Lucky Dragon". It is deplorable, to put it mildly, that man's ingenuity has made it possible for a bunch of irresponsible and unbalanced fanatics to threaten the entire existence of mankind.

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

Lord Altrincham's Lates

HE is obviously a decent fellow. The dove-cotes were first set a-flutter by his articles criticising minor details of the monarchical set-up, and he has recently written a book which, to judge from extracts which have appeared in the press, seems to be urging the Church of England to adopt the doctrines of Unitarianism. This progressive Lord is also editor of the *National and English Review*, the attitude of which seems to be that we ought to carry on being Tories, but to be a little more honest and reasonable about it.

It was in fact at a meeting of the Oxford University Conservative Association that Lord Altrincham made his latest proposition, that the right to vote should be conferred at the age of sixteen, instead of at twenty-one as at present. Unfortunately, he added a clause to the effect that if this were too large and tough a morsel to be swallowed whole, the age could be reduced to eighteen as a start. If only he had stuck to his guns, and shunned such a shameful compromise, he would have had the honour of being two years more revolutionary than the Young Communist League.

Such a revolutionary idea would undoubtedly have swept the students of Oxford right off their feet, not with enthusiasm to put it into being, but with determination to resist in this case, to the last 'X'.

The correspondence columns of the Liberal press have already been stirred by the suggestion that we might find Tommy Steele in the cabinet, and a counter-attack pointing to Tommy's activities against racial discrimination and suggesting that he might be an improvement on some of the present crowd.

Altrincham maintained that his idea was justified on grounds of justice, and political and social expediency, and suggested forming an association to advocate it.

It is rather more difficult to justify it though, on the grounds that it would do the teenagers any good. At fifteen they are released from the grip of compulsory schooling, and have a little more choice as to how and whether they wish to further their education. Unless they belong to the brainy elite who are going on to higher education, they are threatened with the hand of the State taking an even tighter grip on them for the two years of military service, they want to get away from a drab home but often find difficulty in getting themselves into

a more pleasant environment. In cases, including the University, the problem of finding a job brings inevitable and unenviable choices between independence, and the chance a ladder of promotion, between money and doing something useful and satisfactory. The result is either the sive submission of the nice young or the sterile rebellion of the Teddies.

None of the political parties is interested in providing opportunities for young people to enjoy their lives to full and to live for themselves instead of for an omnipresent society. On the contrary, they are all eager to make much as they can out of youth; to ensure that the process of moulding instruction is efficient enough so everyone will jump into the river of technological progress, working so great England will keep abreast with competing giants, and not to question whether it's worth it.

The theorists of democracy might that with such a block of teenage vote strength, the politicians will have to modify their outlook. That would require that the young people who go into politics were of at least a radical outlook, and a little thought about present political set-up makes it obvious that the ones who would be encouraged to make good would be just those who were of a conservative outlook, and would have a crop of young politicians of the same mould as the old ones.

One of the advantages falling to the agers, and one which they share with anarchists, is that not having helped elect the government, they do not feel so tightly bound by its stupid policies and laws. With the vote, they would find themselves taking part, and assuming responsibility for running the show, which in one way or another gets it down, and would be less free to protest against it. Is this what Lord Altrincham wants? Possibly it is.

How about, instead of an association to fight for the vote, one to use direct action in getting better conditions for teenagers. Not necessarily action of traditional type, but for instance refusal to do work which is offensive to the personality of the one doing it, refusal to obey the instructions in regulations of petty authorities; construction of living space solely devoted to young people. With such work a young one wouldn't need to vote even after the age of twenty-one. P.H.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

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

New Books . . .

- Sexual Behaviour in the Human Female A. C. Kinsey 52/-
- The Guillotine at Work G. P. Maximoff 17/6
- The Political Philosophy of Bakunin 42/-
- Pierre-Joseph Proudhon George Woodcock 28/-

Language Books . . .

- Second French Course for Seniors Kynaston-Snell 6/-
- Third French Course for Seniors Kynaston-Snell 6/-
- Teach Yourself Swedish R. J. McClean 7/6
- Speak French S. Taylor 5/-
- Heute Abend Magda Kelber 7/-
- Heute und Morgen, Book Three Marthe Freudenberg 5/6
- Practical Italian Grammar J. L. Russo 8/-

Reprints . . .

- Great Writings J. W. von Goethe 6/-
- Man: his First Million Years Ashley Montague 4/-
- The Greek Philosophers Rex Warner 4/-
- Birth Control To-day Marie Stopes 4/-

Second-hand . . .

- History of the English People (Pelican) Elie Halévy (6 vol. set) 15/-
- Ancient Law Henry Maine 3/6
- Ape and Essence Aldous Huxley 3/6
- White Fang Jack London 4/-
- Life and Times of Robert Emmet R. R. Madden 3/-

Periodicals . . .

- The Humanist December 1/-
- American Rationalist September 1/-
- Views and Comments November 3d.

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

Theatre

BLACK AND WHITE

THE race riots of Notting Hill and Nottingham revealed conclusively some deep flaws in our social system. Fascists scurried out of their holes to revel in the dirty work. In a poor area all the prejudices and worries over housing, jobs and sexual activity got an airing. M.P.s generally favoured restricting immigration, an attempt to clamp down the lid on a nasty situation. At last there seemed a recognition of the problem after years of petty humiliation for coloured people. We all know examples of coloured students refused accommodation by ignorant landlords and recently I learnt of a friend in London whose landlady will not allow her to have an African, whom she is fond of, in to tea.

The colour problem then is a real and human problem here and now in Britain. It is relevant to our own lives and is one of the issues that divide those who believe in human brotherhood from the fanatical advocates of hatred towards all who are different. These questions could provide the theme for a play that would be more than just entertainment but could illuminate and inspire. There are two plays in London on this broad subject. The first "Hot Summer Night" by Ted Willis tells of a Trade Union leader in the East End (John Slater) whose daughter, an improbable little school-mistress, falls in love with a Jamaican to the horror of her mother. There is nothing wrong with the central idea of the play, black man in love with a white girl. This happens every day and from it Shakespeare made "Othello". Yet Mr. Willis, who writes "Dixon of Dock Green" for TV, has a slick style that reduces his characters to stereotypes. John Slater as the T.U. leader bellows and neglects his wife. Mum is frustrated and hysterical. The daughter (Andrée Melly) is sweet and gentle. There is

even a Grandad with gems of homespun philosophy, e.g. Jesus Christ must have been a coloured man and since the majority of the world's people are coloured the chances are that Adam and Eve were not white either. Mr. Willis should leave this sort of rot to Walter Gabriel and radio's early morning parsons. The author never really gets to grips with his theme and the play fizzles out in the last act with the implication that all will come right eventually.

★

IN contrast is Errol John's "Moon on a Rainbow Shawl". The author is a West Indian and sets his play in a Trinidad backyard. The actors are West Indians too and have the authentic speech of the islands. The backyard looked too pretty but the people were real enough: an ambitious young tram-driver, the prostitute next door and the family across the yard, mother loud-voiced and complaining, father a feckless ex-cricketer who drinks too much and steals some money. The play has humour but also conveys the poverty and struggle of West Indian life. Two particularly sensitive performances were given by the harassed mother and the father who fell foul of the colour-conscious planters in his cricketing days. He achieves great dignity in facing up to his life and responsibilities after his drunkenness and theft.

The play ends with the tram-driver breaking away from the confines of his local environment and leaving for Britain. This is all the more impressive as the author plumps for reality and spurns the stock happy ending. The hero packs and leaves in spite of the entreaties of his girl-friend, who is expecting his child. This is not a great play but it is moving, real and vigorous, which is high praise indeed these days. F.T.

EXHIBITION

DRAWINGS BY MERVYN PEAKE

Line drawings by Mervyn Peake at the Waddington Galleries, 2 Cork Street, London, W.1. 27 November to 20 December, 1958.

THE most recent edition of Lewis Carroll's *The Hunting of the Snark* is illustrated by Mervyn Peake—a most appropriate combination; for Peake as an artist is strictly comparable with Carroll as a writer. Where some artists might have drawn academic figures, or stylised cartoons, Peake has made precise academic drawings of people too far-fetched to exist in real life. His meticulous presentation of the fantastic matches exactly the logical nonsense of the poem, and lines like 'There was also a Beaver that paced on the deck, or would sit making lace in the bow' are illustrated as convincingly as they are written. The same kind of drawing is used in Peake's own *Captain Slaughterboard Drops Anchor*, a children's book which deserves to become a classic, not only because of its fascination for the fantasy-minded child, but also because of the brilliantly original use of coloured letterpress. The drawings are printed, in black, over patches of solid colour: yellow, blue-grey and pink. A whole page may be printed with, say, grey, so that it looks as if the black, is printed on grey paper; except that some small part of the picture, perhaps a pair of shoes or one of the figures, is coloured pink or yellow, giving the page bright colour, mystery and grandeur all at the same time.

Peake is a versatile creator, who has had two books of poems published and a play performed in the West End; but it is as a visual creator that he excels. And the current exhibition of his line drawings, besides proving his skill with a pen, shows much of how his imagination works. These are not the highly worked-up drawings of his illustrations, but simple sketches drawn with a determined economical line, and one can see how the artist 'doodles', starting each drawing with only the vaguest idea, or no idea, of what he is going to draw. A fine line, wandering downwards from a rhinoceros head, suggests that the rhinoceros is walking upright, but if he

walked at that angle unsupported he would fall on his snout, so he gets a heavy walking-stick and a hand to hold it in; it follows naturally that he has another hand, and to give the second hand a reason for being in the picture, a long-necked owl is drawn standing on the extended forefinger; result: a delightful fantasy entitled *Monster and Friend*. Perhaps I have the sequence wrong, but I am quite convinced, looking at this drawing and some others, that pen-wanderings are skilfully turned into drawings, and a pleasantly musing subconscious called upon to fill the blank spaces on the paper. Another delicate drawing, *The Strange Friends*, depicts an animal not unlike a wrought-iron heraldic lion, *passant*, preceded by a fat little man with a monstrous toucan's head and a pagoda-like horn, and a swan-headed snake; there is no feeling of artifice about this drawing, but I suspect, nevertheless, that the small monsters were originally put there to give support to the 'lion's forward-thrusting' neck and head. Another lovely fantasy, *The Entangled Towel*, is a fine, economical drawing of a nude, perhaps from a life class, with rocks and a cat-sized monster added; the special beauty of Peake's monsters—all of them—is that they are not out of place alongside good life drawings. Those in the exhibition are drawn with a very economical line, but they are sound drawings, with form and perspective; one feels they are standing on something.

All these drawings are mounted and framed like wall decorations, but few of them (except for the three bright water-colours) mean much from a distance, and the effective range of the most delightful pen drawings is about reading distance. One of their attractions is that they show how Mervyn Peake evolves his illustrations, and they might themselves look even better in a book than on a wall. D.R.

Labour's Guide
to Prosperity -
on Paper!

Continued from p. 1

votes. Hence they offer a plan which aims at pandering to the special interests of a majority of the population—but then so do the Tories, and so far quite successfully!

Obviously Labour have two trump cards in their pack: the Rent Act and full employment. A decent roof over your heads is a must in the Labour plan. It will "encourage" home ownership. Like their Tory opponents these "socialists" want to see "property-owning democracy" in action! But they will repeal the Rent Act which decontrolled 1,000-rented houses. The Act they put in its place will restore security of tenure to these houses, further decontrol and ensure rents for both furnished and unfurnished lettings by setting up Rent Tribunals.

Second to *Your Home* in this Labour index socialism is *Your Job*. Labour are shown lustily wielding a stick and are reminded that the great ideal of Jobs For All first came into a peace-time reality under the Labour Government. Under the Tories the fear of the sack has returned.

The first objective of the Labour Government will be to restore full employment and to preserve full employment. This is the prime purpose of our plan for controlled expansion.

It is true that "fear of the sack" returned under the Tories, but the Labour Party takes credit for full employment in the "peace years" 1945-1951* then the Tories are equally justified in patting themselves on the back for maintaining full employment between 1951 and 1957! There is not a scrap of evidence to show that the Labour Party has the answer to unemployment.

Full employment in Britain during the post-war years 1945-57 was maintained under Labour and Tory governments because the world markets, thanks to the devastation of six years of war, could absorb, and pay for in cash or raw materials, more than the industrial nations could produce. Even 'old-fashioned' Tories believe in full employment when there is a sellers' market. It is only when markets shrink and price, not availability, decides where orders will go, that the Tory wolf removes his sheep's clothing and looks to unemployment as the incentive for increased productivity (not production).† What do the Labour Party offer as an alternative? It is quite simple, and most revealing.

★

THE Labour Party plan for better this and more of that, of a sprightly Age and a carefree (but career-minded) Youth, all this depends on "our success in achieving year by year a rapid expansion of production". This is how it all works in the "Socialists' capitalist paradise.

The Tories declare that the nation cannot afford Labour's social programme without "crushing increases in the burden of taxes".

*In 1951 under the "peace-time" Labour government an armaments programme of £4,700 millions was announced which Mr. Gaitskell, then Chancellor of the Exchequer told the Commons, would necessitate "some local interference with house building in the interests of defence work". He was announcing cuts of at least £100 million in buildings and in equipment for industry. (See *Freedom Selections*, Vol. I, 1951 (p. 91).

†Only last week the President of the British Employers' Confederation at a glass manufacturers' lunch referred to the unemployment figures and said it was important that the Government "should not re-create the acute shortage of skilled labour which has so long bedevilled our efforts to increase efficiency".

Labour replies by reminding the Tories that if industrial production in the past three years had gone up "as fast as it did under the Labour Government" our national income to-day would be £1,700 million higher and the Chancellor of the Exchequer "would be collecting £450 million more revenue without adding a farthing to existing tax rates". Note the cunning of the argument.

So first, Labour "will end Tory restrictions on production" and it will be "Full-capacity" for machines, factories and workers. Secondly, a plan for capital investment "which will put more horsepower at the elbow of workers in industry and in agriculture", for "to survive in the world's markets we must increase productivity per man", which is, of course what the Tories are also saying! The fact that the Labour plan states that increased productivity

comes from increased horse-power—as well as from higher managerial efficiency, improved planning, more and better scientific research.

but makes no reference to more efficient workers as well, is probably just an electoral oversight, which will be put right if and when they have got all the votes they need to win the elections!

Assuming that the Labour plan is operating thus far† and the miners are producing more coal than ever while thousands of labourers are shovelling the £70 millionworth of Tory coal dumped in quarries during the wicked '50's into trucks for the steelworks which under "Tory stagnation" were only working to 80 per cent. capacity ("Steel" is described as "the thermometer of a nation's health. Would the nation's life-blood be the automobile, perchance?) and industry in general was humming away night and day, horse-powers and elbows combining in happy Socialist emulation, what are we supposed to do with all the goods we produce?

As we write we are feverishly thumbing our way down the *Future Labour Offers You* to find the official answer, but there is none. We have found the following, however:

No wonder Britain [as a result of Tory policy] is falling behind her competitors—Germany, Japan, Russia—in the world race for higher production.

Do we conclude from this that full-employment and all the tantalising tit-bits so tastefully offered by Transport House in their "Personal Guide" depend, after all, on ousting our "competitors" in the "world race" for . . . markets?

Apart from the fact Britain's best markets are among her competitors and potential competitors who, if she filches their markets will have less to spend on imports, it has always been the race for markets which in the past has also invariably led to war which the Guide, if thumbed at "Peace", tells us Labour will take active steps to abolish from the face of the earth. Even assuming such a policy does not lead to war, it means that Labour proposes to achieve its economic objectives at the expense of workers in the competing industrial nations. And where does their "first socialist ideal [of] mutual service—the story of the Good Samaritan in terms of everyday political life" come in?

★

THE answer, without calling for more documentary evidence, is that it doesn't. Capitalism is a system based on privilege and just as it benefits a few at the expense of the many within a nation, so can it serve to benefit the people of a few nations at the expense of the people of many other nations.

It is not by chance, nor for biological reasons, that more than half

†We omitted to add the third prong of the Labour plan for prosperity: "Labour is pledged to maintain the value of the pound and to keep Britain the financial centre of the Commonwealth and the Sterling area". Which is what Mr. Amory declared recently and what poor Mr. Thorneycroft said before him. Probably Mr. Gaitskell said that too way back in 1951 when he was Chancellor.

THE Norfolk people can sleep soundly in future confident that their parliamentary representatives are guarding their interests by making their "secret rocket base" at Swaffham secure against another "mass entry" staged by about forty members of the Direct Action Committee against Nuclear Warfare last week-end.

Mr. Sidney Dye, the local Labour member, has got himself into the news by making a statement to the press which, in the distant past, might have caused the Labour Party some embarrassment, but not any more since Nye and company made the H-bomb respectable.

Mr. Dye writes: "I am asking the Air Ministry why these people were allowed on to R.A.F. property to prevent workmen getting on with their duties." He added: "These people are using unconstitutional methods by trying to persuade trade unionists to go on strike for political ends. The Norfolk people resent it."

A section of the Nuclear Disarmament Committee have already taken 'constitutional' action but so far have made no impression on the Government or the opposition. A leaflet issued by the Campaign For Nuclear Disarmament (President, Bertrand Russell), discussing the purpose of the campaign, contains the following sentence:

The Government should not proceed with the establishment of missile bases in Britain.

The impressive list of responsible people supporting this campaign have not been very successful in 'persuading' the Government of its folly considering that the Thor rocket base in Norfolk is being prepared to receive rockets from America, after which the area will no doubt become prohibited.

This leaflet also contains a statement by J. B. Priestley as follows:

"The answer is, that, while some

of us are still in our right minds, we in Britain should compel our Government, by persuasion, but then if necessary by action, to announce to the world that we British have now had enough of this nuclear madness."

Constitutional methods have been tried, letters by the thousands have been written to M.P.'s and the Campaign has not made the slightest impression on Government policy. In face of this Mr. Dye's talk about 'unconstitutional methods' is childish and dishonest.

We admire the non-political militants who staged last week-end's demonstration, but for demonstrations of this kind to be effective many more people are needed. What happened to the thousands who turned up for the Aldermaston march?

★

IS the U.S. Supreme Court being weak in its attitude to segregated schools in the South, or does its latest pronouncement represent a noose which by clumsy usage will eventually hang the segregationists?

The Alabama law, without mention of race or colour, lays down several clauses of entry to public schools. These include:

(1) "the psychological qualifications of the pupil for the type of teaching and associates involved," (2) "the possibility or threat of friction or disorder," (3) "the possibility of breaches of the peace or ill will or economic retaliation within the community," and (4) "the maintenance or severance of established social and psychological relationships with other pupils and with teachers."

It is clear that any of these clauses can be used to prevent Negroes entering Alabama schools because in an area where there is so much tension it would not be difficult to prove that attendance of Negroes at predominantly white schools would cause "the threat of friction or disorder".

Last week the Supreme Court upheld a decision taken last May by

Immigration & Labour Problems

Continued from p. 1

A source of friction could arise however, if the pressure of unemployment does increase in those undertakings which have a "last in, first out" agreement between union and employers. A very unhappy situation could occur unless there are enough people ready to understand the problems from the bottom, and not leave matters to the Labour Party and union leaders.

When questioned on the immigration procedure at sea ports, a Conservative Minister invited her critics to spend a day at Harwich as she had done, and see what kind of people were being turned back. She quoted a figure of hundreds of Poles arriving in a single day without any idea of where they could find work in England. Clearly then the insults poured on to continental girls coming to

the world's people still live in a state of starvation and ignorance. It is not by chance that as the living standards in the have-countries rise so those of the have-not countries are relatively, and in some cases actually, depressed.

Labour's plan for prosperity and full-employment is capitalist and not socialist, and cannot work except at the expense of the living standards of workers in some other industrial country or countries. It won't work even then because every industrial nation in the world is using similar means to achieve better or worse ends.

The Labour Party's is a feeble, outworn and unimaginative attempt to curb "the excess" of private capitalism by further increasing the powers and functions of the State. This road leads neither to Socialism nor to the abolition of the social injustices which are at the root of capitalism. It simply creates new injustices, and leads to an ever greater concentration of power.

do domestic work, and the formalities which make travellers regard the British as the most difficult frontier to cross are merely incidental to the same root as before; the need of the state to control the flow of manpower. The Poles, Italians and Hungarians who are kept out in this way are just those likely find themselves in competition for the jobs held down by English workers, and in such a way as to stir up the employer-labour relations to the pitch of strife known on the continent which is considerably higher than that over here.

If the state is conceded any rights at all, then surely this must be one of the most fundamental, to give or withhold permission to an alien to reside on its sovereign territory. Together with its other powers, this is in fact essential to the modern state. Yet in the very same thought it is clear that the denial of the right of a human being to move freely about the world according to his wishes, and particularly according to his appreciation of how best he can live and produce wealth and happiness for himself and others, is a denial which strikes at the root of the dignity of a man. In fact glancing round the world, the restrictions which various governments place on freedom of travel are very accurate indices of the degree of oppressiveness of the governments as a whole. Behind it all are the economic factors. Jamaicans, Italians and everyone else are fleeing from parts of the world where it is impossible for them to use their powers to enrich the world, in the hope that such possibilities will be open to them elsewhere. Now more and more governments are calling halt.

There are hundreds of thousands of men and women, in Europe and throughout the world, and particularly including the unfortunate inhabitants of D.P. camps, who would be willing, and who want desperately to settle in a particular country, to live there and to work. They are prevented only by the system of which government is the basis; a system which claims to exist so as to bring order out of chaos, but which stands in the middle of chaos and obstructs the efforts of people to rescue society from it.

a federal panel that none of the clauses "were in and of themselves unconstitutional, unless proved by evidence submitted to the courts, to be administered so as to exclude Negroes from white schools".

Although the Supreme Court has specifically barred any evasive schemes for segregation, it will be difficult to keep a check on the 'unconstitutional' use of the above clauses. Individual Negro pupils can have their education held up indefinitely while school boards and courts wrangle over their "psychological qualifications" for entry into white schools.

Obviously segregationists are going to take full advantage of the Supreme Court decision. Many are beginning to accept the inevitability of desegregation in the South, but backed by powerful lawyers and politicians they can afford to delay the process. Unhappily the future of many a Negro pupil will be damaged in the course of this corrupt fight to maintain white supremacy.

★

THE *Manchester Guardian* ran a detailed report on Friday, Dec. 5th of troop behaviour on October 3rd in Famagusta. Everyone should read this, especially those patriots who are unshakable in their belief that "we" could never behave with the brutality exercised by other nations. Many of course will condone the ill-treatment as a necessary reprisal for the senseless killing of the British woman, which we are now told was the reason why the troops 'went mad', although ill-treatment of prisoners was reported long before this incident. One might suppose that 'responsible' people in high office would condemn, if only to maintain the 'moral standing' of Britain in the eyes of the world, such un-British behaviour, but as we go to press the Government's final decision not to have an enquiry into the conduct of troops has been published:

"To order an independent investigation now, the Government feels, would be taken by the Army as an indication that the country has not complete faith in her soldiers."

News Chronicle.

The coroner at the inquest of a Greek Cypriot who died as a result of treatment by British soldiers, said that: "nothing can justify the assaults on persons who had done nothing to warrant them." But the Secretary of War denied that troops had ever been out of control, and as the *Manchester Guardian* has pointed out, the Foreign Secretary and the Minister of Defence "lavished praise on the troops in Cyprus without so much as mentioning Famagusta."

Are anarchists the only people who can draw the obvious conclusions from the lessons of government, that whether democratic or totalitarian the use of brutal force to maintain power is, in certain conditions, the weapon used by all governments?

But what about the floods of cheap labour? Once again, it detracts from the dignity of a man to be thought of as 'labour', with a price on his head. A free thinking and working man is a producer, and the more there are, then the more will be produced, or else the less work for each. Perhaps these are dreams which seem to have no connection with reality but they have a very strong one, as the alternative is what we are facing to-day, denial of freedom, insecurity and the threat of war. The possibility of choosing the better course lies in the minds of people.

Problems exist throughout the world in plenty, but so does the means to overcome them. The seeming inability of mankind to overcome them is a result of our acceptance of those organisations of power which to serve their blind aims, put destruction in the place of construction, hindrance in the place of freedom. The obstructions to free movement of people is one of the prime examples of this process. P.H.

An Anarchist Nation?

DEAR COMRADES,
The recent crusade in FREEDOM regarding the Welsh and other minority peoples has made me wonder whether it would not be possible to create an anarchist, or at least libertarian, nation.
At first sight this might seem a fantastic proposal. Nevertheless the present means of operation of the anarchist movement are scarcely more practical. We cannot hope to convert the world with our minute resources. Cannot we then create a world of our own? In an escapist sense of course. It would involve hard work and a sense of responsibility.

There are no limits either way to the size of a nation, which I would define as a people with a common culture. There is a tribe in Malaya who number approximately thirty-six persons. A few family couples could at least form the nucleus of one. Such a nation would not necessarily have to have a frontier anywhere, and certainly there is no need for a government in the ordinary sense. Yet I think it would be something more than a community.

Communities are usually unstable, and last but a few years. But a man retains his national attitude all his life. A Jew is always a Jew wherever he goes, whatever he does. On the other hand, members of communities come and go, without it affecting their lives and conduct.

I have always been ready to debunk the crude governments of the present national character. Yet people in one given area do differ from those in another, often next door, although their country may have the same frontiers, or may even be split by one. The two most remarkable peoples in the world are the Gypsies and the Jews. They have no frontiers. If the state of Israel was over-run to-morrow, the Jews would still be a people. They have often fought against themselves, yet they have retained their essential cohesion. They have loyalties to the various nations states they inhabit, but even this does not dissolve their people.

These people are authoritarian to a greater or lesser extent. But we believe that "anarchism is human nature," so

why cannot we form an anarchist society? To a certain extent we have already done so. Anarchism can take place all over the world, where they are not actually proscribed, and meet other anarchists in comradeship, but there is a real lack of cohesion for all.

There are anarchist families, but they are living scattered about, with much contact, and perhaps they don't know it. There are plenty of individuals who meet for discussions and that's about all. There is no sense of being part of an organism at all.

How does one go about creating such an organism? I don't know, and would welcome suggestions. The sort of society I envisage would not be an isolated community here and there, but a constant of a number of communities and groups and families in the town as well as in the country. The country-dwellers could supply food to the town-dwellers, and the town-dwellers could send machinery and tools to the countrymen. No money need pass. The people would deal with each other as much as a private industry of mutual aid (not barter in the strict sense of the word, for there would be no attempt to set the value of one object against another). Money would be used for dealing with the outside world.

The affairs of the folk would be decided at yearly meetings of delegates, or all day if possible, on the anarchist-syndicalist lines laid down in our earlier pamphlets. But this is a suggestion for the here and now, not far after the glorious revolution. The first of these general meetings might take place next year, if enough people are interested.

Disputes between people would be decided at this gathering, or at other lesser ones held at more frequent intervals, and there would be no punishments, but someone who could be shown to have wronged another would be expected to make restitution. The worst offender would be the boycott, which is a pretty severe one. Or expulsion from the society.

I don't want to sentimentalise. I can imagine such a society might sometimes be torn.

This "free society," if it should come into being, must of course be flexible enough to adapt itself to social and technical changes in the outer world, without losing its own identity.

I shall welcome controversy, if it is of a helpful nature, even if critical, but not a mere sharpening of the blades of the various concrete suggestions. Will those interested please write to me at:

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

be torn with dissension. But the Gypsies and the Jews have been so too, and they have survived. It is a poor nation that cannot survive a civil war or two, particularly as in the case of the Jews, a changed will be mostly verbal in all probability.

I do not envisage this "free society" as going forth with banners flying and trumpets blowing to wage war, even by propaganda, against the authoritarian world. To live happily in it is probably the best thing to do. In any case, anarchists speak louder than words. If we were really a free folk other people of independent spirit would come to join us.

There is a danger of classiness developing. Well, that has to be risked. I can see no way round it. It seems worth risking or putting up with anyway. One of the signs of weakness in left-wing movements is the predominance in numbers of males over females. This is not just a bachelor's complaint. It is an intrinsically bad sign. Women, we are told, are inherently conservative. So be it. I will not discuss whether this is true, or just a piece of masculine prejudice or an excuse, but simply say that, if it is true, it is because women want a secure place to raise their families, which is reasonable. The sort of thing I propose is a society which would provide this feeling of security, which I think is an arch psychological need as an economic one. It would not be a society of rebels but a society of free people, who were not in a state of revolt against authority in any sense.

Would there be some kind of uniting religion in this society? Or philosophy of life? I do not know. There would have to be a common attitude to life, and I think this would express itself in the various forms of art practised by the folk, by their customs and the rituals that would be developed. If the end of it all was a slip back into authoritarianism and violence then it would prove, as far as we are concerned, that "anarchism is not human nature." We are not a race of men and women as they now are. In which case we shall at least have learnt something.

Yours fraternally,
ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

43, West Park, Mottingham,
London, S.E.13.

Protesting Through Authority

DEAR COMRADES,
This letter concerns the letter to the Editors in No. 49 of FREEDOM, November 29, 1958, "Protesting through Authority."

I am convinced that "Syndicalist" means well with his letter, but it seems to me that he himself is not quite sure what to do in such a case, and perhaps he has not practical experience. I am a totalitarian government. But Anarchists in Germany have, not only with the Nazis but also with the communist party, a concentration camps, and in the Russian zone of Germany. Allow me therefore to give this comrade a few tips concerning the proceedings of these sorts of governments.

My comrades Germany have had, and I have had, underground relations with political prisoners in Nazi and Communist prisons and concentration camps,

but neither of us has ever expressed ideas to protest to the government question against that.

Because we knew of course that a proceeding would have had for result, at the best, that our protest would have ended in a waste-paper basket forgotten. But that would have been so bad, and that we were in a pinch in a hundred that was coming from Anarchists, would make it worse for the prisoners and families. For the prisoners the torture, and for their families a show the bad treatment of the prisoners had become public.

Totalitarian governments are apparently open court-propaganda, and I have had, underground relations with political prisoners in Nazi and Communist prisons and concentration camps,

The Hostage

While thanking P.S. (FREEDOM 6th Dec.) for his reminder that Brendan Behan's play, *The Hostage*, finishes its run on the 13th, I am not sure that in the course of praising this play one should mention its concentration camps. He writes: "Most people, I imagine, would either dislike it or like it a little." This may be so, but he continues, "If you are the sort who would dislike it I don't know what you are doing reading this paper."

I have not yet seen *The Hostage*, but if the *Quare Fellow*, which I did see is any guide, then I expect to be entertained and stimulated. I thought I would write to any reader of FREEDOM who did see the play but did not 'like' it will not now think that enjoying Mr. Behan's plays is a necessary condition for reading FREEDOM!

It is possible that I have misunderstood P.S. but I am slightly disturbed by his observation "The sort who could dislike it," which implies a "right" and "wrong" category of thought as applied to art.

It is true that one meets the sort of people who after a casual look at a particular painting for example, will assume that little Johnny can paint better than he, and also to many thoughtful people capable of judgment who do not always agree on what is good or bad.

Assuming there is a "social message" contained in a particular art form, many of us might be agreed on the truth of the message, but we may disagree on the way in which it is expressed. Any discussion of art which is stimulated by me can be proof enough of the artist's success, but it won't necessarily prove which critic is "right".

As our course one can fail to interpret the intention of the artist or to "get another" out of his work, but this does not necessarily mean that one's judgment is "wrong." It may mean that the language of the artist is unfamiliar, or that simply that the artist has nothing of substance to communicate.

Finally, I am not suggesting that every subjective opinion on the theatre, the cinema or what have you is valuable to the artist, but if an only one who stands in the field of art or (and) 'entertainment' it is possible to have conflicting intelligent opinions.
R.M.

But neither of us has ever expressed ideas to protest to the government question against that.

Because we knew of course that a proceeding would have had for result, at the best, that our protest would have ended in a waste-paper basket forgotten. But that would have been so bad, and that we were in a pinch in a hundred that was coming from Anarchists, would make it worse for the prisoners and families. For the prisoners the torture, and for their families a show the bad treatment of the prisoners had become public.

Totalitarian governments are apparently open court-propaganda, and I have had, underground relations with political prisoners in Nazi and Communist prisons and concentration camps,

These governments are very sensitive to any sort of critiques concerning them in the form of their government. Every one of them claims the most social, democratic, and moralistic in the world, and its marches at the head of mankind in pursuit of happiness. Yes, and people in countries which are not totalitarian rule believe this bluff become in time adherents of totalitarianism themselves, and if possible elect a totalitarian government in their country. To form groups of adherents and build up fighting legions in their own countries is an important part of foreign policy. That's what the did, and the Communists, Franco, and of South American dictators of day.

To fight the spreading of totalitarianism with the help of the aid of liberal world press which stands yet a bit of justice, humanity, and liberalism and which with all their might totalitarian governments wish to see is the only way for us to struggle for liberation of the prisoners in their prisons and concentration camps.

Therefore has the Anarchist International Congress appealed to the International World press to publish crimes of the totalitarian government Bulgaria, for the liberation of our comrade Manol Vassev, and his co-political prisoners? And that was one way to do something for the prisoners, the other yet to be done, i.e. come into underground relations with them.

Fraternally,
Wuppertal, Germany. W.F.
Dec. 4, 1958.

Direct Action Against Rocket Sites

Continued from p. 1
their Thor rockets, and were resentful of the demonstrators' attempts to frustrate this possibility. The fact that a rocket which the Jews would still make a Number One Target of their town appears not to worry them either. Two pounds in the bank is worth a rocket in the market place.

One interesting twist on this aspect is provided by the situation in the local Co-operative Society. At a recent meeting a member who is also on the district NDC committee moved a resolution that the Co-op should refuse to supply goods to the cartoon on the site, and this was done at present. The resolution was lost as the good co-operators voted overwhelmingly against it—the only voter supporting the move being the manager of the Co-op store himself!

Heads Up to the End
However, the struggle at the base went on all day Sunday with the

FREEDOM PRESS SELECTIONS FROM 'FREEDOM'

Vol. 1, 1951, *Manifesto in One*
Vol. 2, 1952, *Prospect to Pottery*
Vol. 3, 1953, *Colours*, cloth 12s. 6d.
Vol. 4, 1954, *Living on a Volcano*
Vol. 5, 1955, *The Immoral Moralists*
Vol. 6, 1956, *Oil and Troubles*
Vol. 7, 1957, *Year One—Spain*
Each volume paper 7s. 6d.
cloth 10s. 6d.
The paper edition of the Selections is available to readers of FREEDOM at 5s. a copy.

E. A. GUTKIND
The Expanding Environment 8s. 6d.
VOLINE
Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Retrospect) cloth 12s. 6d.
(Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21) The Unknown Revolution cloth 12s. 6d.

V. RICHARDS
Lessons of the Spanish Revolution 6s.
27, Red Lion Street, London, W.C.1.

local and RAF police replacing the workers in man-handling the demonstrators, dumping them in icy puddles, or throwing them into lorries to cart them out the gate.

Finally, by dusk on Sunday, soaking, muttering and exhausted, with two of their members in hospital with cement in their eyes, the men and women (some of them no longer young) decided to call off their protest in an orderly fashion and they marched back to Swaffham with banners and heads high.

We are glad to say that there was a member of the London Anarchist Group with the demonstration from beginning to end, and we hope that their behaviour and their arguments with lorry drivers at the gates and workers on the site will in fact result in some defection from the ranks of unthinking servants of mass destruction.

We congratulate Pat Arrowsmith, main organiser of the protest the Direct Action Committee of the Nuclear Disarmament Campaign and all the determined and courageous men and women who carried out the demonstration.

- They had three main objects.
1. To bring home to workers and their families the need to work and to persuade them to stop working.
 2. To try to persuade local tradespeople not to supply the base with any goods whatsoever.
 3. To gain the maximum publicity for their demonstration that work on rocket and similar sites can be hindered and stopped by obstruction.

Success on the first two counts may be small but will take time to bear fruit. Success on the third is undeniable. The whole country heard of their efforts in the Press and on the radio. Encouragement to like-minded persons everywhere will be considerable.

Thirty-six hours of courageous action by forty individuals has done more to ventilate the issue than thirty-six thousand letters to Parliament. What could forty thousand individuals do!

Homosexuality & Freedom

A RECENT editorial in the *Manchester Guardian* made the proposal that "if two men, living together, give a reasonable man cause to believe that a homosexual act has been privately committed" then they will have to forego the right to privacy suggested in the Wolfenden Report. To this Stephen Spender, in a letter to the editor, properly replied that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a district'." He argued that "if this proposition were made law, it would effectively end not only the 'right to privacy', but also the male cohabitation tolerated under the present law. It would, he wrote, 'put a question in the minds of their neighbours about what was the nature of the relationship of any two men sharing apartments in a