

TRIESTE FANS ITALIAN NATIONALISM

EVENTS in Trieste have provided the occasion for considerable international tension, and, as is usual in such cases, the reporting of events is highly coloured by the differing interests involved. The demonstrations demanding Trieste for Italy, plus the counter measures of the police, became a riot with several demonstrators killed and many more, together with some police, wounded. Then began further demonstrations, now of an anti-British character, in other Italian towns, especially the capital, Rome. All this is followed by diplomatic moves: protests from the Italian government against the violence of the police counter measures: strongly worded notes from Eden on the "serious view" which Britain takes, etc., etc. Meanwhile nationalist feeling in Italy is being whipped up in a most unpleasant manner, while the British action is represented to the English reading newspaper public as part of our trusteeship as a great power, and so on.

Now anyone who has ever read any recent contemporary history knows that the actual significance of events is but seldom apparent during the reporting of it at the time that it is happening. The significance of events almost always lies quite elsewhere from what appears at the time. In the last issue of FREEDOM there appeared an account of the ousting of the Sultan of Morocco which showed how public opinion was both prepared and actively used by the French administration to secure it as a political object, though at the time it was represented as a regrettable, but entirely unforeseen, necessity.

Paradoxical Situation

There is every indication that the same kind of "manipulated" history is being enacted over Trieste—if only because the affair has become a matter of high level politics with diplomatic exchanges, special cabinet meetings, special messages to "the people". But there is also a strange aspect which seems to have escaped most political commentators.

Trieste came into the news quite suddenly when the British and the Americans announced out of the blue that they proposed to evacuate

More German Cars

EVERY day one reads of the growing importance of W. Germany's industrial production. With her factories freed from the "necessity" to produce war equipment, they are working for—and finding—new markets in the world for their consumer goods.

It has been announced by the makers of the Volkswagen (Peoples Car) that production will have reached a new record of 1000 cars a day by the end of the year. The output is only exceeded by the Big Three American factories of General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler.

W. Germany absorbs half the production. The other half is absorbed by countries such as Holland, Belgium, Switzerland and Sweden in particular, all customers for British cars. It is not surprising that the British government is anxious that German production should be in part absorbed by a rearmament programme so as to remove some of the competition in world markets.

Zone A at an early date. This action was immediately followed by an outcry—not from Italians, but from Marshal Tito. The more lofty political commentators in Britain criticized this step as one bound to antagonize Yugoslavia by plainly favouring Italy. Yet within a week or so the whole situation is changed and it is the Italian demonstrators who break the windows of the British Consulates and tell the "Pig British to go home".

Of course all this *may* have arisen because the Italians fear that the British will yield to Yugoslav pressure and rescind the Anglo-U.S. announcement. But it seems more likely that other reasons are at work.

FREEDOM pointed out that partition is a political manoeuvre whose history in Ireland, India, or Palestine has shown nothing but trouble. But on the political level that trouble is well compensated for in that the British government, the divider, thereby becomes the *tertium gaudens*, the rejoicing third who sits back and arbitrates between the newly created contestants. In the case of Trieste, the British and Americans contributed nothing: they just divided Trieste between Yugoslavia and Italy, pending solution later. But this action immediately places both the Italian and the Yugoslav governments in the position of supplicants, offering concessions in order to obtain favour in the final share-out (if it ever materializes). For the partitioners, partition is, a method of getting something for nothing.

Counter Measures

Now it goes without saying that no power lies down under this situation. They seek some way of putting pressure on the partitioner. If the Anglo-U.S. announcement ap-

Christian Get-Together

THE *Daily Worker* (26/10/53) reports: "The head of the Russian Orthodox Church, Alexei, Patriarch of Moscow and all the Russias, is sending a pectoral cross to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Geoffrey Fisher, a British clergyman announced here tonight.

"The clergyman, Canon Mervyn Stockwood, vicar of St. Matthews, Bristol, said the cross was handed to him during an hour and a half visit he paid to the Patriarch on Thursday to convey greetings from Dr. Fisher.

"Canon Stockwood, who has been in Moscow for the past ten days, described the talks as 'helpful and encouraging'.

"The pectoral cross is of crystal, encrusted with four amethysts and bearing the figure of Christ in gold. A gold chain is attached.

"With it the Patriarch Alexei enclosed a letter to Dr. Fisher.

"Canon Stockwood preached the sermon tonight by invitation at the Moscow Baptist Church. With the aid of an interpreter he addressed a congregation of nearly 3,000, some of whom had to find accommodation in the church porch.

"After the service in the Baptist church he visited two Orthodox parish churches where he said he saw 'vast crowds'.

"Canon Stockwood said there was a crowd of 8,000 at the Orthodox cathedral last Sunday and 3,000 at early morning service today."

What was it Lenin said about "the opium of the people"?

peared as favouring Italian claims in Trieste, one may be sure that the Italian government is being asked to make some concessions by way of payment. No doubt the Yugoslav government is asked what concessions it is prepared to make to get the evacuation order rescinded. The obvious political response to such a situation is for Italy (and Yugoslavia) to try and put pressure on the British in such a way that they will at least lower their demands.

Accordingly, it seems almost certain that the Italian government did seek to send people from all over northern Italy into Trieste to swell the vocal ranks of protesters. To apply as much pressure from "unrest" as possible, everything has been done to whip up nationalist feeling in Italy. An influential paper like the *Corriere della Sera* devotes the whole of its front page to Trieste and a good deal of the inner pages as well. The unfortunate victims of the riot have become "sacred heroes" and their deaths have been "mourned" in the most nauseatingly calculated way so that they serve as much as possible the ends of nationalism.

Political Bargaining

While all this seething activity, almost certainly manipulated from above, is going on (and regardless of the fact that people get killed and wounded) one may be sure that under cover of "strongly worded protests" and intimations that the "gravest possible view" is being taken, etc., etc., one may be fairly sure that hard bargaining is going on. When these arrangements have been concluded (perhaps before these words are in print) the governments concerned will call off the popular demonstrations, as suddenly as they started. The "people", including those who got killed and injured, will have served their purpose, and can be dismissed until next time they are required and their nationalism, sedulously fostered by education, can be called upon once again. The newspapers will then forget about Trieste just as suddenly and quickly as they forgot Guiana and dismissed it from their front pages.

Dangerous Residue

But such manoeuvres, such governmental manipulation of "public feeling" are not without their dangers. In this Trieste affair the Neo-

Fascists and ultranationalists, with their backward glances to Mussolini and D'Annunzio and Fiume, have received a powerful fillip. And the Communists may have benefited also. The Prime Minister, Peila, has had to look for support among the most authoritarian political tendencies, and in so doing will have increased their influence. He may yet have to appeal to Britain and the U.S. to intervene in order to maintain the influence of the centre bloc, the democrats. In doing so he will be falling back into the dependant position of a supplicant again.

Thus the whole affair is to be seen as a playing field for a trial of strength between the powers, with nationalists and neo-fascists as incidental beneficiaries. Incidents of this kind prepared the way for Mussolini.

Productive Judges?

THE Government and the Trades Union Congress are not opposed to pay increases. They simply want them related to productivity.

The T.U.C. has officially announced that its policy is one of "restraint" in wage claims, and the Government has done its best to establish a wage freeze, but both these august bodies have let it be known that they are prepared to sanction increases in pay *as long as there is a corresponding increase in productivity*.

This of course infers that the existing ratio between productivity and pay is a just and proper one; that the relationship between wages and profits as it is now is permanent, and only if more is produced and hence more profits are made can any consideration be given to the payment of more wages.

What Will They Produce?

These assumptions could be argued and found to be pretty thin, but for the moment we want to stick to the "more pay, more productivity" theme, and see how they apply to one class of wage-earners whose productivity is suspect.

There are the judges. These bastions of the State have just been awarded a pay increase of £3,000 a year. A few months back the proposal was to give them an extra £1,000 p.a. tax free, but this created a precedent for tax-free income (as apart from expenses—the directors' get-out) which might have been dangerous for the Treasury. So it has been decided by the guardians of the nation's purse that High Court judges—guardians of the nation's law—shall be awarded £3,000 p.a. subject to income tax. Or rather, since the judges already get £5,000 a year, super tax.

THE MAN NO COUNTRY WANTED—GIVEN ASYLUM

MICHAEL O'BRIEN, the man to whom the doors of all countries were barred (FREEDOM, 26/9/53) has now been given permission to live permanently in the Dominican Republic. He declared himself "highly delighted" to have been given an opportunity of again "becoming a normal citizen".

Starting in September last year, O'Brien spent 320 days aboard the Hongkong-Macao ferry without being allowed to land at either place by the British or Portuguese authorities. In July the International Refugee Organisation rescued him from the ferry. He was granted a Brazilian visa in Hongkong, was flown to Europe, and early in August boarded the French liner *Bretagne*.

At Rio de Janeiro, however, the police stated that his papers were not in order, and the *Bretagne* went back to Marseilles with O'Brien still on board. He was refused permission to land at Marseilles and at Genoa. His quest for somewhere to live finally ended a week ago when he landed at Rio under a writ of habeas corpus issued by a Brazilian Federal judge.

Tax paid, this increase will come out for most judges at roughly the same as the tax-free thousand. The bastions are being fairly well maintained by their masters, but the question most workers will ask is—what increase in productivity will there be?

Are the judges going to produce *more* criminals? They produce enough already by introducing so many law-breakers into the universities of crime. Or are they going to make a sincere effort to award bigger sentences? Or when the Court rises at four o'clock will they travel down to the jail with the prisoners in the Black Maria and see them securely through Reception and banged up in their floweries? Or will they relieve the hangman of his job?

It's Been a Long Time

To be fair to m'Lud, however, we must point out that he hasn't had a pay rise for a long time. The judges have been struggling along on a mere £5,000 for a hundred years now, while the value of money has been going down and taxation going up. Poor chaps.

But how well-off they were 100 years ago! When an average worker was probably glad to get 12s. 6d. a week. Their Lordships were raking in £100! Mind you, they earned it then, when the death penalty could be awarded for far more offences than now!

But before we break our hearts over their plight, let us remember that judge-ships are awarded to top-ranking barristers, who have been "earning" fantastic incomes for years. And when a barrister leaves the bar—either to go into Parliament, retirement or on to the Bench, *all outstanding accounts owing to him are allowed tax free!*

Obviously then, the wily barrister when he decides to put up for Parliament, draws near retiring age, or hears that he is going to be elevated to the Bench, need be in no hurry to send out accounts or collect his debts. The more thousands owing to him when he quits practice, the better off he is.

Not that we would accuse any barrister of doing such a thing consciously. He might just get a bit forgetful that's all!

So when our legal eagle steps down from the £20,000 a year he may earn as a top-ranking Q.C., to the mere £8,000 he will now get as a judge, he does not do so with empty pockets. Why, they probably don't even have to ask for a sub. from the Treasury to keep them going till the first quarter's pay day comes along!

Workers, however, should note that this pay increase—of 60 per cent.—is not related at all to productivity but to cost of living and taxation. It should then be perfectly legal for workers to use the same arguments P.S.

*Forgive my reversion to prison slang!

"As You Were" in British Guiana

THE Chief Secretary of British Guiana, Mr. John Gutch, told reporters that the interim Government would comprise a single chamber legislature and Executive Council. All members would be nominated by the Governor, Sir Alfred Savage. He said that amendments to the Constitution would probably be laid in the House of Commons next week and, allowing for the 40-day statutory period, the interim Government would be established in the middle of December.

Mr. Gutch said that apart from the three ex-officio members—the Chief Secretary, Attorney-General, and Financial Secretary—he considered it unlikely the Governor would nominate any head of a Government department to sit on the legislative council.

Mr. Gutch, who returned here last night from London, said the British Commission to inquire into recent events was likely to come to British Guiana in

January or February.

The decision whether to prosecute the People's Progressive Party leaders depended on the availability of evidence and the advice of the Attorney-General. "It would be highly desirable for prosecutions to be brought against some of these people provided it has a good chance of success," Mr. Gutch said.

Asked if Dr. Jagan and Mr. Burnham now in London, would be included, Mr. Gutch said if there was sufficient evidence they would be prosecuted. He emphasised these was a difference between evidence to justify the Governor taking the action he did and evidence to secure conviction in a court of law. It was very difficult to get evidence for a conviction.

Mr. Gutch said these was great concern in London over the problem of restoring British Guiana's credit and the confidence of businessmen, who were potential investors in the colony.—Reuter.

Some Considerations on Sexual Offences Involving Children

IN the last issue of FREEDOM a correspondent criticizes a brief comment which had appeared under the title "The Law's sense of Values", on the grounds that the offence for which the clergyman in question got ten years imprisonment (to wit sexual offences against boys) was much graver than our article implied.

This criticism is welcome because it gives an opportunity to consider this question from different angles. Let us therefore briefly recapitulate our critic's argument (readers are referred for the actual text to a letter from Arthur Moyse on p. 4 of FREEDOM for Nov. 7th). First he expresses tolerance (though without sympathy) for adult homosexual activity. But he regards homosexual activity involving children (boys) as in quite a different category. (Later he implies that it is still more reprehensible when little girls are involved). "No one has the right to debauch children and no technical phraseology can justify it . . . it is unforgivably wrong to degrade and debase children for one's personal pleasure whether it be sexual or financial."

Now it is difficult to disagree with the sentiments couched in this way, but it seems advisable to consider whether the activities usually referred to in the Sunday press as "serious offences against children" are in reality always debauches, or are invariably degrading in the way that the writer—in common with the law and the majority of people—seems to assume.

The Criminal

But before analysing this question let us recapitulate some arguments which have appeared in FREEDOM from time to time on the sexual criminal himself. Even the law nowadays (and it was stressed in the present case) regards the man who can only derive sexual enjoyment through children as abnormal. Such people cannot help being the way they are, and have often suffered torments of conscience as well as all the anxiety which comes from knowing the legal consequences of their acts. And moreover they suffer from the knowledge that

people in general regard such activity as repulsive and wicked. Yet despite these very practical reasons for controlling their abnormal urges, they are unable to do so. It has always seemed to the writer that there is something very unpleasant about the way in which people who do not have such abnormal desires, and therefore do not experience the anguish and the conflicts, are so ready to condemn. Condemnation without understanding is easy: but it is not a very edifying spectacle.

It will be said that once again sympathy is shown for the criminal, while his victim is forgotten. We shall consider the victims in a later section, but meanwhile it will perhaps be enough to say that there are enough people (the law, the papers, the populace at large) who show concern for the victims, but few enough to seek understanding for the criminal, himself the victim of desires he cannot control.

The Law

Now a word about the law. In a certain sense the law is also unconcerned about the victim, in that these offences against children are still offences (and still savagely punished, though less so) if the child is a consenting party. In such cases however the victim suffers the moral condemnation of righteous people just because of the voluntary nature of his or her participation. In a minority of cases, the child is shown to be the seducing party, but the law (logically enough) still regards the adult as the criminal and as responsible despite the contradiction that in most cases they cannot control abnormal desires.

Few cases display the ineffectiveness of punishment more clearly than these sexual offences. Homosexuals and paederasts receive sentence after long sentence, and yet come out and do it again. In this very inability of the law to deter, or to treat such people, lies the ground on which such long sentences are imposed. For the judge usually states that to protect society he is going to put a man away for a very long time. Now these men should not be forgotten, and (without forgetting the child victims

either) society—that is, you, me, and the next man—ought to ask himself whether the search for more satisfactory treatment should not be very much more intensely prosecuted. Or whether criminals who are neither deterred or cured, and who are therefore given repeated long sentences ought not to be, like lunatics, deprived of liberty but not of comforts, and not subjected to the rigours of the prison régime. (To raise this latter query is however to open the argument against the whole prison system which is not in place here).

The Victims

In considering the victims of these offences, we approach the most controversial and the most difficult aspect of the question, and we must plead for objectivity and open mindedness in discussing the points we shall raise.

In the case of sexual assault combined with child murder, or with child murder without overt sexual motive, the damage to the victim is self-evident and not to be questioned. But it is different in these "serious offence" cases, for sometimes the children are consenting parties, and very occasionally are the active seducers. It may be indignantly objected that even in such cases the children cannot be regarded as responsible and cannot know the damage done to them. But it does seem to us that the source of this kind of indignation is the conviction that any kind of sexual activity in children is wrong, perverse and degrading. Many people to-day however do not share this conviction, though they would not regard paederasty as in any way a satisfactory or normal outlet for children's sexuality.

It seems certain that if children were universally horrified by the things they are asked to participate in with such bribes as sweets or semi-narcotics like port and cider, the paederast would not even succeed in finding opportunities for his desires. The fact however is that the kind of secrecy with which sex is treated and the rigorous prohibition of normal sexual activities like solitary or mutual masturbation, make children obsessively curious about sex, while depriving them of the experience to judge normal from abnormal behaviour. Thus even where a child feels so guilty about such experiences that it makes the revelations which lead to court proceedings, it is almost certain that such a child has been driven to participate as much by its own morbid obsession with a forbidden activity, as from the seductions of the paederast. Cases must vary but such a pattern, in greater or lesser degree, is probably to be found in every case.

If we are realists, can we truthfully say that each and every child is debauched by such practices? Psycho-analytical case books can indeed show individuals in which such experiences have acted as the trauma which has touched off a neurosis. But for every such case there must be several others whose structure is normal enough to weather such experiences. It is usual to point out that the paederastic pattern of homosexuality in public schools does not in fact produce very dire results although it is an unlovely thing in itself. One may, perhaps draw another analogy with the public schools. Every humane person dislikes the corporal punishment practised there. But although they may point to the occasional individual in

whom such punishment has done lasting damage, the majority are not unduly affected by it. It is a repellent activity but too keen a sympathy with the victims is sentimental and would be derided by most of them.

It seems likely that the damage to the children in sex cases may be very slight or even non-existent, though in a minority it may be decisively damaging. Hence it is misleading to speak about debauches and degradation as though such were universal results.

What is more serious, because wholly overlooked, is the damage done to the children by the court proceedings. The publicity inevitably magnifies an experience which might otherwise have proved trivial, and the damaging sense of shame is enormously aggravated. Nor is the unreal, sanctimonious, vindictive atmosphere of the law courts a proper atmosphere for children. This damage done by the processes of the law is no figment of imagination. It was fully discussed in an editorial comment in so reputable a journal as the *Lancet* some years ago.

In conclusion therefore it seems that what is required is not indignation but understanding. That the greatest advance would come from a radical change in the attitude of society towards sexual activity in children as well as in abnormal people. One reaches the same conclusion if one were to approach the problem of the cause of homosexual and paederastic behaviour, or from considering the sexuality of children in our society—matters which have not entered into the present field of discussion.

J.H.

The Alternative to Material Success

LOVER UNDER ANOTHER NAME, by Ethel Mannin. (Jarrolds 12/6).

ONE of the publisher's advertisements tells us that this, Ethel Mannin's thirty-first novel, is about an "unorthodox personality". It is the "autobiography" of one Tom Rowse a more or less self-taught sculptor who after years of struggling to establish himself as an artist, succeeds in his ambition only to find that he hates the price of success. To escape he throws overboard his art and his friends to seek physical and mental obliteration among those for whom life is unremitting sorrow and pain and struggle.

In attacking the values that have made money the yard-stick of success Miss Mannin has dealt with a theme of considerable importance. Perhaps it is the general insecurity of life (wars, economic crises, etc.) that encourages the preoccupation for material security to be found even among young people to-day. Art for art's sake in its widest connotation, is becoming a lost art, while "time is money" is the all-consuming drive in people's lives. So rarely does success mark the attainment of one's original goal. For the professional person contact with the realities of life soon destroys the illusions they had when they embarked on their careers. In an age of speed there is no place any longer for the craftsman. The managerial revolution is not limited to industry; its grasp on the arts is just as firm. The writer is in the hands of the publisher's expert who is always feeling the booksellers' pulse and by it judges a Manuscript, not on its worth but on its saleability; the painter is in the hands of the dealers and the State; music is ruled by the impresarios. It has been said that no great work of art in our time will remain unpublished. That is probably quite true, but it should also be said that very few of the really considerable contributions to our culture, to our knowledge, have brought the material rewards to their creators enjoyed by the purveyors of mediocrity.

The reason of course is that those who engage in what Mr. Priestley calls Mass Communication are not honest with themselves, for what they create is determined by what they know as "the whims, prejudices and idiocies of the general public" and not by what they themselves would wish to create. But it is Mass Communication that pays; the work of art, on which its creator strives for perfection irrespective of time, popularity and saleability, is doomed from the start. How many writers of non-fiction, or composers of serious music can live by this work alone? As a way out they seem to engage in work in which their ability is turned to commercial ends, joining the "Mass Communicators" in the advertising business, the film business,

the paper back business and last but not least, by being put on show in Radio and Television programmes, and paid to engage in parlour games or answer silly questions. In the process the means become the end; they are engaged full-time in the parlour games and their real abilities are put in cold storage.

★

THIS is the problem that Ethel Mannin makes her hero face up to, for he too has become a success, thanks to the disinterested concern shown for him when he was a struggling artist by an American woman, herself a successful painter. Perhaps it was unconsciously not disinterested; perhaps he, the genuine but economically unsuccessful artist, living in the squalid basement, tormented her conscience (quite apart from the fact that he also moved her womanly heart to thoughts of love), and only by making him into a financial success could she have him in the surroundings she wanted for herself and at the same time save her conscience. She all but succeeded. The death of the hero's lover (an empty-headed little thing who insisted on having the security of her husband's roof as well as the joy's of her lover's bed . . .

Incidentally why do intelligent men, even in real life, so often lose their heads over completely worthless women who are not even interested in their man's work?—in tragic circumstances, brought about the crisis in his life which made him break with "success" and all the circle of friends who had been largely instrumental in "making" his name for him as a sculptor.

Up to this point Miss Mannin's hero had been just about bearable to this reader; after the crisis he becomes intolerable! And one regrets to have to say this since it would appear that Miss Mannin's Tom Rowse is portrayed as a bit of an anarchist so far as his political ideas are concerned; he even starts his working life with an anarchist cabinet maker, who presents him, when he goes out into the wider world, with a 'suede-covered *Rubiyai*' and a "paper-covered copy of Kropotkin's *The Conquest of Bread*", which with the copy of "Bill Blake's" poems already acquired seem to be his only source of inspiration and clichés through the years. Many of his friends also appear to be "philosophic" or "natural" anarchists. At the time of the Spanish Civil War, comrade Rowse was on the right side, the "third front

Continued on p. 3

ALEX WAKEFIELD

IT is with sorrow that I announce the death, at the age of 64, of Comrade A. W. Wakefield of Smethwick, Staffordshire. On Wednesday, 21st October, he collapsed in a local cinema and died from a cerebral haemorrhage the following Sunday without regaining consciousness.

'Alex', as he was known to his many and varied friends, was on the stage as a dramatic elocutionist in his youth, but it was as an organiser and agitator for the unemployed workers' movement that he became well known in the Midlands. He was a member of the National Administrative Council of the Unemployed in the early 'twenties and the organizer of the Smethwick Unemployed Association in the 'thirties. The latter was an independent and self-supporting body under the control of its members and its functionaries were unpaid. As a result of his activities on behalf of the unemployed Comrade Wakefield was arrested on several occasions.

Towards the end of his life he refused to identify himself with any group, maintaining an attitude of extreme individualism. He became a prominent figure in the Bull Ring, the "speakers' corner" of Birmingham and his pointed questions and interjections often disconcerted a cocksure orator. On the rare occasions when an anarchist meeting was held he was always willing to help gather a crowd by asking appropriate 'difficult

questions.

For several years between the wars Alex lived in the U.S.A. and Canada, where he made the acquaintance of Eugene Debs and also attended the lectures of Emma Goldman in Toronto.

In the early days of our friendship the writer asked him what sort of society he would like to see. "One of extreme individualism," came the reply. Alex's individualism was of his own brand. It was broad enough to include such people as Alexander Berkman and Kropotkin and he not only believed in it as a philosophy but practiced it in his attitude towards everyday existence. He had his own method of making propaganda and used to circulate libertarian literature amongst both the workers and the bosses of the factory at which he was employed. He always went his own way and though the more traditional anarchist would not, perhaps, see eye to eye with him in some of the things he did, there was no doubting where his heart lay.

I last saw him in September. Some of his parting words to me as I bade him goodbye were: "For me, anarchy exists here and now," and certainly, in his relations with his comrades and friends, Alex Wakefield displayed those qualities of warmth, generosity and respect for human dignity that we hope will be the common practice of a free humanity.

S. E. PARKER.

Films

MY OLD KENTUCKY HOKUM

"The Sun Shines Bright", directed by John Ford at the Academy.

ALL the world loves a winner but it loves even more a loser who makes a come-back, so remembering the triumphs of *Grapes of Wrath* and *The Informer*, and striving to forget *The Quiet Man*, we had hoped that *The Sun Shines Bright* would be Randy getting off the floor and regaining the title. Instead of which, a tear-stained towel was thrown in.

John Ford says of the film: "I didn't make it for the critics or the public, I made it for myself." If this is true, John Ford has deteriorated more than we thought he had. But all the formulae evoking the stock responses are in this film. Southern judges, generals, good-hearted prostitutes, drinking aristocrats,

adopted daughters of mysterious origin, faithful darkies are all here with a sermon quoting 'let he who is without sin cast the first stone'. The good old Judge finishes up with tears in his eyes and when the premiere was finished there was not a dry sherry amongst all the critics.

On one point alone the film shows how the artistic and cultural standards of Hollywood inevitably spell defeat for anyone with the talent and integrity that John Ford once had. One of the characters in the film is the keeper of a brothel. This is never specifically mentioned but referred to only by hints. Judge Priest, the leading character in the film, is on the bench when Mrs. Mallie Cramp, the keeper of the brothel, is before the court, we never see or hear what goes on in the case but the press hand-out rather ambiguously says: "He has a kindly word for Mrs. Mallie Cramp, whose house on the outskirts of the town is well known, but generally ignored". One might assume from the attitude of the film-makers that the lady ran a brothel without customers.

The goodly Judge further takes the occasion of a funeral of another "unfortunate" to use the word commonly in vogue to deliver the sermon on 'let he who is without sin cast the first stone'. Any devout Freethinker will probably correct me but I think the Judge distorts the scripture so that he talks of a woman taken "in sin" instead of "in adultery" which I believe is the usual translation. It comes to a fine thing if Hollywood can't mention adultery.

Secondly, the brothel keeper is trying to fix up the funeral and is doubtful about getting facilities, she mentions that she has plenty of money but the judge piously says: "The Lord will provide". One wonders whether the Lord or Madame's non-existent customers provided the wherewithal for the horses, the hearse and the plumes.

Finally, honour and the Hays Office are satisfied by the brothel leaving town by the next steamboat after the funeral and before the election.

Contrast this childish sequence with the more adult attitude in *Le Plaisir*, where the whole town is plunged into despondency when the brothel is closed for a day.

It is obvious that Hollywood is badly scared of accusations of being 'Red' so that films of ideas are few but please keep to cops and robbers, musicals or horse-operas if ideas must be put over like this.

J.R.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

OPEN 10 a.m. to 6.30; 5.0 SATURDAYS

New Books . . .

Introductory Lectures on Psycho Analysis Sigmund Freud 18/-

The House that Nino Built

G. Guareschi [Author of "Don Camillo"] 10/6

Kinsey Report on Human Female 50/-

Kinsey Report on Human Male (again available) 47/6

Reprints . . .

The Wayward Bus John Steinbeck 2/-

The Postures of Heaven John Steinbeck 2/-

Cup of Gold John Steinbeck 2/-

Remainders . . .

Morals Since 1900 Gerald Heard 5/-

Second-hand . . .

The Russian Peasant, Etc. John Maynard (2 vols.) the set 6/-

The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas Gertrude Stein 3/-

Satan in the Suburbs Bertrand Russell 3/6

Periodicals . . .

Encounters No. 2 2/6

(Koostler, Yeats, Read, etc.)

Poetry and Poverty No. 5 2/-

Individual Action (Vol. 2, No. 1) 3d.

Obtainable from

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

A REVOLUTION IN ATTITUDE

WHEN the yellow press began its exploitation of the second volume of the Kinsey Report, that report was not yet available to the general public. This made it possible for journalists like John Gordon (former editor of the *Sunday Express*) to describe Kinsey as a "dabbler" and to imply that the purpose of his great book was simply pornographic. At that time there was not the 800-odd page volume with its small close print, its tables and statistics to make these statements ridiculous. And readers of the sensational press are believed—by the editors—to have short memories, probably not without cause.

But the appearance of the report itself enables anyone who has the opportunity to peruse it, to assess not only the book but the kind of papers that attacked it in so libellous a fashion. Indeed the attitude of the press on Kinsey has had considerable repercussions. Leading churchmen have denounced the "exploitation of sex" by the press, and so have some politicians. The higher council of the press itself has also been disturbed by these manifestations and has issued official rebukes against that kind of thing.

Now readers of FREEDOM do not need to have the baser attitudes of the popular press stressed for them for these are always with us and stress themselves daily. What does emerge, indirectly, from all this is the prestige of Kinsey and his co-workers and the recognition that the work he is doing is valuable. The John Gordons may attempt to smear Kinsey in advance but the man and his work remain quite untouched, and in addition to that public men in the Church press and political world have felt obliged to put on record their recognition of the great significance of this work.

This is more than a personal triumph for Kinsey. It is also a most valuable indication of how far general attitudes towards sexual matters have changed. Havelock Ellis was a man of transparent honesty and greatness of purpose. Yet it is only fifty years since he was prosecuted for publishing his six-volume "Studies in the Psychology of Sex", while the book itself was officially dubbed obscene. (It is fair to say that the lawyers have not come out in defence of the Kinsey Reports, and the law unquestionably remains years behind the times). That Kinsey can publish his material, sell it in enormous editions, and have official dependants rebuking his vulgar detractors indicates the magnitude of the change in outlook which has taken place.

Such a viewpoint is confirmed by the fact that Kinsey's work is financed (to the tune of half its cost) by the U.S. National Research Council an official body corresponding to the Medical Research Council in this country. It is yet another personal triumph for Kinsey and his co-workers that they have been able to sway an official body into extending official help for their work.

It might be thought that such support would make Kinsey pull his punches, but there is no evidence from either of the two reports so far issued that any watering-down has occurred or that any "unpalatable" aspects have been suppressed out of deference to officialdom. This reflects credit on Kinsey, but still more on the National Research Council, and it shows that despite the Official Secrets Acts and the whole secrecy which atomic research has imported into scientific enquiry, there nevertheless remains a considerable independence on the part of scientists.

THE STUDENTS' SQUIB

IN many countries university students have always played a prominent part in the forces of progressive change. On the whole this is what one would expect, students are young adults who are open to the influence of new ideas, they have advantages of education, they have few personal responsibilities, much leisure, and they are absolved from the daily grind of earning a living which absorbs so much of the physical and nervous energy of the bulk of the population. In Tsarist Russia the students gave rise to a traditionally revolutionary body opposing the absolutist régime; the same student tradition has had its effect in other European countries. In the awakening of the Asiatic countries against their native despots and against imperialist oppression, student agitation has been a not inconsiderable factor. Under imperial rule student bodies have often taken a decidedly nationalist bias, but as in India and in Egypt, the student resistance is still there against the reaction of their home-grown rulers.

The student movement of Britain appears to be a remarkable exception to this tradition. The university system here seems to preserve schoolboy and schoolgirl immaturity and naïveté long past the teens. This is well known to public speakers; audiences of ordinary young adults who are working for their living show themselves to be far more shrewd and realistic in their reactions

than student audiences. Student audiences are just too easy; the corniest of clap-trap will set them cheering, the silliest of jokes set them giggling. Student debating clubs in Britain are notorious for the poor level of their argument—striving after the *bon mot* at all costs is the summit of their ambition. A big success in an Oxford debate was recently scored by a guest speaker who had the foresight to bring a tame baboon with him. Of course this was just too, too witty and he won the debate by a huge majority. He knew the psychology of the student audience.

In Britain the students as a body are socially ineffective. In the thirties the Oxford Union passed a motion that "This house will in no circumstances fight for King and Country". A few years later these same young men were tamely obeying the peremptory summons to get into uniform or else—which King George sent to them. King George needn't have worried over their act of adolescent defiance.

The only practical social action which British students have taken in recent history was to blackleg the general strike of 1926. That is not to say that they would do such a thing again. "Leftism" has become fashionable at the universities—a kind of castrated socialism that leads a hot-house existence in university libraries, lecture rooms and student clubs. The more daring students, the ones who want to show that they have thrown off the last shreds of bourgeois respectability, join the college Communist Society and carry a copy of the *Daily Worker*. If another general strike were to occur, they would probably hold a series of protest meetings in their colleges and send student petitions to Her Majesty begging that Something Should Be Done.

London students were recently in the news for going out on the streets with explosives (*Pravda* please quote—"British students, driven to desperation by hunger and the oppression of the Yankee war-mongering troops, attempted to storm the fortress of Whitehall where the im-

perialist cutthroats sit plotting against the Soviet Union and the Peoples' democracies"). The occasion for this outbreak was Guy Fawkes night, and the limit of the students' objectives was to throw squibs and squeal with laughter. So entrancing was this sport at one London college the students' union had to abandon their meeting (which was supposed to be choosing delegates to the National Union) for lack of a quorum. The girls and boys had run out to play. The fun and games of squib-throwing went on until about midnight, and over a hundred students spent the night in gaol because of clashes with the police. Can one imagine the students at British universities feeling sufficiently strongly about any matter of real social importance to come out on the streets and clash with the police over it? Have the student bodies in Britain protested in any visible way in recent history over the criminal and lunatic policies of their rulers? No, and the authorities know this perfectly well. The police can afford to use benevolent restraint when thousands of shrieking young idiots block the streets and throw fireworks. If as many workers crowded on the streets together in a haphazard mob to protest about some real grievance, they would be charged by mounted police with batons. But for students—well it's only a rag; they would never come out on the streets for a serious purpose.

The students have their reward. Grants. Such a generally well-behaved and conservative body now receives a large government subsidy. If certain considerations have been fulfilled (notably that of being O.K. with National Service) the young men and women can live for about three years at government expense. They are our administrators of the future, the material of the ever-growing tame bureaucracy which is necessary to the expansion of the State at the expense of the community. And if these children never grow up—well, that is mighty convenient. They will always need Big Brother. F.M.

THE UNHAPPY HOME GUARD

"WHICH one is a good neighbour?" asks the caption in the current series of advertisements for recruits for Civil Defence.

Clever boys and girls immediately see that one of the four jolly chaps portrayed in the advert is wearing a C.D. badge in his lapel. That tells us he is the good neighbour. Not quite the same organisation as the Civil Defence is the Home Guard, but broadly speaking its the same kind of good neighbour that goes into each. With perhaps the difference that those who go into the C.D. may be somewhat more constructive in their outlook than those who join the Home Guard.

The members of the former organisation are taught to be able to dig out the victims of bombing, and tend to their wounds, but this activity is an essential part of a war effort and frees other able-bodied patriots for the fighting services.

The Home Guard, however, are trained for more romantic activity. At least, they see it as such, although there are few more absurd sights than a platoon of pot-bellied, stiff-jointed middle-aged office gents crawling among bushes with twigs in their hats.

What is of interest is to try and understand the underlying motives which persuade these characters into this organisation. When the Home Guard was first revived two years ago, the cartoonists of the Press had great fun on the "getting-away - from - the - wife - for - two-evenings - a - week" theme, and undoubtedly the monotony of the average home-life is such that almost any escape is worth trying.

For those millions for whom both their homes and their working lives are drab and friendless, the memories of the "comradeship" of the army is a continuous nostalgic pin-prick. Those weighed down by cares, debts and responsibilities look back fondly on the devil-may-care irresponsibility of service life. And those with a grudge against life find an outlet by having an enemy presented to them.

All these unstable and unhappy elements are appropriate material for the Home Guard. Especially the last category. The enemy may be distant, but we all know who he is—and that is something for the dissatisfied but unconscious victim of Britain's amorphous authoritarianism.

In a recent debate on the usefulness of the Home Guard, Mr. George Lines, colonel of the 180-strong Dover Battalion said:

"I can think of nothing which would be a better deterrent to a potential invader than the thought that hiding under every tuft of grass and concealed behind every bush is a man with a rifle—who not only knows how to use it, but is only too anxious to do so."

At this illuminating remark, a press report told us, "applause shook the hall". Leaving aside the quaint conception of an army of little men hiding under tufts of grass, it is interesting indeed to get, straight from the horse's mouth, the admission that Home Guards are anxious to use their rifles.

It is, of course, to be expected. After training for months, shooting and bayonetting an imaginary invasion force, it

would be a deflating experience if the Home Guard were to be disbanded. The would-be heroes would go home conscious of the fact that they had wasted their time; that they had been taken in, been made to look rather silly, that all the fuss was about nothing. And they would be going back to the empty, unadventurous world they had tried to escape from, where the enemy could be identified as nothing more solid than the rent-book, the pools coupon—or, of course, the wife, whom you are not allowed to shoot at from behind bushes, however much you may want to.

So, in fact, they have to hope that war will come. It will justify their existence, prove their usefulness, provide the opportunity for them to show what they can do. For as their colonel tells us—they are anxious to use their rifles.

THE ALTERNATIVE TO SUCCESS Continued from p. 2

—the anarchist revolution in Catalonia", and though he refused to sign a petition for the lifting of the arms embargo to Republican Spain he "wouldn't mind giving the anarchists five bob towards a machine gun . . . as a gesture". Only as a gesture though, because he didn't approve of all the fighting.

It was only through pressure from one of his "natural" anarchist friends that he consented to attend a meeting organised by the anarchists at which Emma Goldman was to speak. Unfortunately the whole business was distasteful to our hero. Even the people "handing out leaflets and hawking their party papers" outside the meeting annoyed him. These "under-sized spotted [Mosley] youths", "aggressive looking" communists and socialists, "bearded" anarchists, "gentle-looking" pacifists (what original adjectives!) were "all out to build Jerusalem in one form or another in England's green and pleasant land, and all of them as evangelical and sincere as the Salvation Army", and, so far as our hero is concerned, "as repellent". And the meeting itself annoyed Mr. Rowse by starting at 8 instead of 7.30 quite apart from the fact that he disliked "the unhappy-looking little middle-aged man" (whom some of us recall and dislike!) who appeared to be the secretary and Mr. Rowse is as "catty" about Emma Goldman, who is referred to as "queen of the anarchists, as was Miss Mannin in her novel *Red Rose*. From other references in this "autobiography" we cannot help feeling that Emma Goldman has left a bad taste in "Mr. Rowse's" mouth, and that he had very little time for the rest of the bunch!

HAVING burned his boats, our hero prepares himself for his new life. He gives up art completely and goes back to work with the cabinet maker; he marries a homely girl, whose conversation is of this order: "I don't smoke, thank you ever so much (p.309) and has a child by her. He refuses to accept a £5,000 bequest on moral grounds, and is so wrapped up in saving his own soul that he is contemptuous of his wife who, not sharing his search for the Truth via squalor and poverty, takes a poor view of this sweeping gesture of refusal. That same night he leaves her, and the process of auto-flagellation of the mind starts good and proper!

He rents a room "without 'service' because I like to be solitary". But soon he has to move again because he becomes friendly with the little boy in the house, and this creates difficulties since "I am as pledged to silence as a Trappist monk. An elected silence and an elected poverty", and because "I am self-committed to the renunciation of all possessions, even friendship and love. I must move on because I still have too much, materially . . . I am rich in this child's love". On completing his autobiography Mr. Rowse was proposing to move to the "common lodging houses" and such women friends as he might have would be "common prostitutes, not sweet women like Mickey's mother" . . . and by all this he will be clear of possessions and privilege with no man's need on his "conscience".

It is a characteristic of these seekers after the sainthood that in the process of divesting themselves of their material possessions and intellectual attainments they become more and more engrossed in their own egos. As one admirer of

Simone Weil has so well put it:

"In so far as she despises herself, Simone Weil forgets to forget herself. Her humility is still partly inspired by a negative preoccupation with self: she carves her ego by hollowing it out as the proud carve theirs in relief."

Technically speaking one feels Miss Mannin has defeated her own ends. Many of her hero's social and political ideas could be quite convincing, or at least disturbing to the general reader—which presumably it was her intention they should be—but because his alternative to material "success" is a masochistic cult of poverty and death of the mind it is impossible to feel any sympathy or warmth for him or his ideas. How much more impressive and inspiring are the Albert Schweitzers (who has recently been awarded the Nobel Prize for Peace and has already announced that the money will be used to start a hospital for lepers) the Kropotkins and the Malatestas (who renounced wealth and position so that he might more effectively speak to man's conscience). And the lives, and thoughts of these men live and will go on living as shining examples of man's struggle against false values, of class privileges and all the negative values Miss Mannin attacks. But one cannot feel the same about her Mr. Rowse with his cult of the doss-house as the way out from the corruption of material success, any more than we think of such people as Simone Weil will survive the present fashion, which is in any case largely restricted to intellectual circles with bad consciences!

V.R.

*"Simone Weil as we knew her", by J. B. Perrin & G. Thibbon (Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1953).

A PAGE OF READERS' VIEWS ON—
THE CLASSLESS SOCIETY THE LAW AND THE HOMOSEXUAL

ANARCHISM means that daily bread will be guaranteed to everyone. It offers bread to all men, while preserving their freedom for them, and without alienating their conscience from them. Socialism offers bread, and takes away a man's freedom; it deprives him of freedom of conscience. Whatever its inception, Socialism strengthens governmental power at the expense of individual rights. Anarchism, on the other hand, is founded on the absolute supremacy of the individual, of each individual over society and over the State, the supremacy of liberty over equality. But Socialism is based upon the supremacy of society and the State over the individual, on the supremacy of equality over liberty. Socialism would sacrifice individual liberty for economic equality. And as Benjamin Tucker wrote: "The moment we invade liberty to secure equality we enter upon a road which knows no stopping-place short of the annihilation of all that is best in the human race." Socialism would lead to centralization and dependence upon authority. In the name of Society, it would regulate, impose, define, prohibit, command. Anarchism would allow the individual to find out for himself what was best, without restraint or coercion.

A class society is based upon falsehood and wrong. Anarchism is the rejection of class society. It is not a matter of class, but of the people, of the human, that is, free from the power of class society which gives rise to a new slavery. But Socialism desires the establishment of a proletarian society. The failure of Socialism to acknowledge human individuality as the supreme value is an inheritance from capitalism. It is a continuation of the capitalist destruction of values. There will be no proletariat in an Anarchist society, which will restore human dignity to all men. Anarchism is the victory of humanization over dehumanization. The existence of the proletariat is an injustice and an evil. Proletarian is simply another name for slave. The essence of slavery is that a man's physical powers are employed not for himself but for others; the making of a proletarian is

due to taking his instruments of production from the workman and obliging him to sell his labour as an article of commerce.

In our present society it is not the proletarian only, but the bourgeois himself who is crushed and dehumanized and persecuted by the State. The bourgeois stultifies his real character for fear of being looked at and attracting attention; he buries himself in nonentity in order to escape the peril of being talked about. He sacrifices three-fourths of himself in order to become like other people. He loses the freedom of the spirit; he is a slave. Government is an outrage upon, and the persecution of human personality, of every human personality. Rule is evil, and is none the better for being majority rule. Anarchism wants the removal of all artificial obstructions which past centuries have piled up between man and his liberty.

Life under Anarchy does not mean general levelling. It means quite the contrary. Equality does not mean an equal amount but equal opportunity. Far from levelling, Anarchy differentiates and diversifies men and women to bring to light personal qualitative distinctions which are concealed and suppressed by a class structure of society. Classes set up distinctions and inequalities among people, gradations of rank and position which are frequently diametrically opposed to those Nature establishes, and are not based on their personal worth and qualities. The bourgeois is defined not by what he is but by what he has. Nature sets very wide differences between man and man in respect of character and of intellect; but the class society ignores them and effaces them, or rather sets up artificial differences in their stead. Because Anarchy is a classless society, it opens the door for the greatest variety of activity and development. A classless society is the only society where each member can fully realise his own self, i.e. his individual talents and abilities, wishes and needs. Anarchy is by no means a utopia, it is an inescapable reality, it denotes the humanization of society.

DOUGLAS MUIR MACTAGGART.

I WAS interested in your comments on the appalling viciousness of the current legal attack upon homosexuality, (particularly repellent in view of the fact that the magistrates of to-day have not the excuse of their predecessors, namely that its psychology and sociology had not been investigated) since I have recently taken issue with a local magistrate over this (but let it be understood, not in any professional sense!) Almost simultaneously with Kinsey's release of his second report, a man whose knowledge falls short of Kinsey's by half a century and whose compassion predates his by several millennia, was reported thus in the *Manchester Evening News* (this paper, which is published independently from the *Guardian* offices, has said of Kinsey's report that it will give it no publicity because it is "disgusting" and cannot be true anyway!):—

"When the Recorder, Sir Noel B. Goldie, Q.C., to-day dealt with the first of 32 prisoners whose names are in the Manchester City Sessions calendar charged with gross indecency, he said there was 'a perfect spate of these revolting cases'.

"I have sat here for many years" [sic] he said, 'and I have said before that this wave of absolute filth has spread over Manchester'.

"In past years these cases have been due to sexual abnormality but they have now become completely unmanageable and I am going to stamp this out as far as lies within my power."

After hearing that two accused were of previous good character, he imposed fines of £20 on each. He added: 'I do not want to send young men of previous good character to prison'. The whole thing was headed in 9 millimetre type:—
RECORDER: I SHALL STAMP THIS OUT—The *News* knows what interests its readers all right!

Presumably the decision not to send the young men to prison was inspired by post-prandial well-being and not by the fact that the monotonous, ugly, monosexual prison life breeds homosexuality—something he probably doesn't know or doesn't believe. Officials at the prison of which he makes most use, Strangeways, told a psychologist friend of mine that in order to counter the incentives to homosexuality cells contain either one or three—never two—and since prisons are overcrowded it is quite

likely to be three. Whether this reliance on the modesty of the prisoners is effective I don't know! Returning to the Recorder's remarks, it is hardly necessary to draw the attention of readers of *FREEDOM* to the *sort* of words he uses.

Forgetting that magistrates, who sit in judgment upon us, live incommunicado and free from the "corruption of public pressure, I wrote to him: "Dear Sir Noel,

My attention has just been drawn to the *Manchester Evening News* report of your statement at Sessions on Sept. 29, that you will 'stamp out . . . this wave of absolute filth', referring to 32 charges of gross indecency to be brought before you.

I am not in possession of the full facts of these cases, but I assume (and hope you will correct me if necessary) that the 'gross indecency' here means homosexuality. If so I am a little surprised by the vigour of your denunciation, for a man in your position and culture (I had the pleasure of meeting you in Warrington during the 1945 election) [he was Conservative candidate in a permanent Labour seat, and lost] must surely have read, for example, Plato's 'Symposium', and other works which make it clear that this sexual variation is not objectionable *per se*, unless hostility and revulsion have been deliberately nurtured. If, then, the activity in question is conducted in private, and participation is completely voluntary, we cannot reasonably interfere. We have no right (though we may happen to have the power) to thrust ourselves into other people's lives to such an extent. At the most we may persuade or exhort—even then at the risk of a snub! The people living alongside us *do* have some autonomy and can claim *some* freedom from us.

But their sexual activities, of course, certainly become our concern when they make them public. This wouldn't upset me (I think), and I might even do them the courtesy of looking the other way, as we have all learned to do with courting couples; but many people, including yourself, would be upset and respect for the feelings of most people can reasonably be demanded. Their activities also concern us if one of the parties is being coerced—that cannot be tolerated as a matter of human solidarity with the victim; particularly reprehensible is

coercion of a minor, for the bullying is added to selfishness. But these are offensive because they are cases of assault, not because they are instances of homosexuality.

By arguing in these human terms we can reach a *modus vivendi* on this issue which will secure the minimum of unhappiness, rather like the continental approach: if the activity does not involve a minor or public display or coercion, then it is no concern of the law.

When society equips itself with impressive powers of coercion to suppress its unorthodox members it is most important that these powers shall be used with humanity. A certain amount of protection is afforded by the fact that, in turn, the policeman and the magistrate are human, but the most effective safety valve is that a law which flaunts too freely human needs and wishes will simply fail to work. The law on betting (which does not affect me personally) is one such case. And from your remarks that '[these cases of indecency] have now become completely unmanageable' it seems that the law on homosexuality will be another.

Yours etc."

FREEDOM readers will note, I hope, that a letter to a Tory magistrate cannot be couched in the same terms as one to a more sympathetic reader. I do in fact go further than the letter suggests, but as it is I probably spoiled his breakfast and caused a few sentences to be more vicious than otherwise! As a finale to all this, I received a note from the Clerk of the Peace:

"The Recorder has handed me your letter, and has instructed me to say that any such communications sent to him concerning the proceedings at the City Sessions are most irregular and will not be replied to." One can see the point of this, say in regard to intimidation of magistrates, but it has the consequence of making even more absolute the power of these very fallible, elderly men of question psychology who sit in judgment upon us.

Manchester, Nov. 1. VIC MAYES.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

OPEN AIR MEETINGS

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

NORTH-EAST LONDON

DISCUSSION MEETINGS
 IN EAST HAM
 Alternate Wednesdays
 at 7.30 p.m.

NOV. 18th—Philip Sansom
 SEX, SYNDICALISM & THE EGO

TYNESIDE ANARCHIST GROUP

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

GLASGOW

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

Points from Letters:

Anarchists in Korea

An American soldier writes from Korea:

"It may interest you to know that I've made the acquaintance of a number of Korean anarchists here in Taegu. Who would have thought of meeting anarchists here! Though not an anarchist myself I nevertheless enjoy their company and would like them to receive some of your literature."

Anarchist Communities Wanted

H.F.C. of Cambridge writes:
 "Personally I should like to see an Anarchist community in being, however small. I think it would be a good thing to start one somewhere, even if it was in some remote part of South America or somewhere.

If there is one anywhere I would very much like to visit it. I hate regimentation and all people being of one pattern, and the stifling of all individuality in present society. However, I am not in favour of a new scheme of things to be started by force, only by persuasion."

The Limits of Propaganda

Wesley Knapp of London, referring to the recent article in *FREEDOM* on "Why so few Anarchists?" writes:

"A. Uloth advances several quite feasible reasons for the scarcity of Anarchists but overlooks the basic cause, that the fear of originality, of the authorities, of being free, springs from an early conditioning which creates a subconscious resistance, therefore most people are impervious to propaganda which tells them to be free, to take life into their own hands etc. Is not history studded with really great men who have preached freedom in their several ways and have they all had much effect or rather have they not been as voices crying in the wilderness. Whilst propaganda has a place in the struggle for freedom, for Anarchism, it is necessary to appreciate its limited value and not let it become a substitute for action."

F.P. Publications in Your Library?

P.G. of Workshop writes:
 "I have not as yet attempted to enquire my local library to purchase *FREEDOM*. They have however obtained at my suggestion, a copy of *The Expanding Environment*."

CAPITALIST DECAY

IN one of our rather less delightful national dailies, I noticed an article glorifying the latest example of capitalist lack of taste. This takes the form of an offer by some ill-advised firm to amateur painters, indicating first how easily they can execute first class pieces of work.

Apparently all our budding Rembrandts must do is to purchase, at a nominal fee, a piece of canvas, etc., on which competent commercial (to a nauseating degree) artists have encribed the outline of a set scene and upon each detail is a number. With the kit is

generously provided various paints, also with numbers. The rest is obvious; take up the brush, follow the all-so-easy numbers and there you have a masterpiece, suitable, claim the makers for hanging in your home, illustrating books or making Christmas Cards. To complete this jolly affair, the writer of the article anxiously queried the event of some unscrupulous character submitting such a painting to the Royal Academy. Having gone to the trouble of enquiring, however, he was able to reassure us that the very comprehensive rules of this noble institution would rule out such a possibility. Yet I find myself wishing that someone would succeed in fooling the worthy Academicians until the opening of the display, when eventually, no doubt, someone would discover it. One could envisage the many delightful scandals that would follow.

One has, reluctantly become hardened to canned music, canned literature, canned education, etc., but canned art . . . !

Is this all a sign, however, that capitalist society is plumbing the depths in degeneracy? The ever-increasing wave of capitalist propaganda, glorification of the sordid lives of industrial magnates and violent abuse of any questioning of the moral aspect of our sacred democracy, is, I feel, the inevitable panic-stricken attempts at revivification of a decaying civilization.

Assuming there is some truth in this, it is far from being a time when revolutionaries can sit back complacently, awaiting the inevitable. For rest assured, there will be innumerable claimants to the souls of an all too gullible public. Anarchists, especially will have to face a great deal of violent abuse, threats of force and all the usual red-herrings put forth by religious fanatics, Marxists, Moral Re-Armers, Fascists and the like.

But this will be our greatest, and perhaps our only chance. Let us waste no time in preparing for it. Let us ignore the banalities attached to any contemplation of capitalism's secure position and by so doing we will defeat our greatest enemy—**APATHY**.

PATRIC GOODHEAD.

Special Appeal

Oct. 24th to Nov. 7th.

Cardiff: H.W.D. 3/-; Dudley: C.B. 2/9; Lghtham: M.S.F. 2/6; Northwood: E.H. 1/-; Rochester: D.J. 14/8; Glasgow: A.McD.* 4/-; London: C.B. 13/-; London: Anon. 2/6; Bournemouth: P.H.S. 1/6; Luton: J.A.L. 3/-; Cleveland: T.H. 10/6; Stirling: R.A.B. 5/-; London: V.T. per V.R. 1/-; Per O.M.: Part proceeds picnic Pleasanton £52/10/0; San Francisco: A.P. 11/10; Detroit: L. Raffrattari 17/10/0; W. Somerville: P.C. 7/-.

Total	76	10	5
Previously acknowledged	392	1	5
1953 TOTAL TO DATE	£468	11	10

GIFTS OF BOOKS: Preston: W.A.L. London: Anon.

* Readers who have undertaken to send regular monthly contributions.

Reader!

Don't wait for another Reminder.

Send your Subscription Renewal NOW!

FREEDOM PRESS

- E. A. GUTKIND:**
The Expanding Environment 8s. 6d.
- V. RICHARDS:**
Lessons of the Spanish Revolution 6s.
- MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI:**
Neither East nor West cloth 10s. 6d., paper 7s. 6d.
Workers in Stalin's Russia 1s.
- SELECTIONS FROM FREEDOM**
Vol. 1, 1951, Mankind is One paper 7s. 6d.
Vol. 2, 1952, Postscript to Posterity paper 7s. 6d.
- TONY GIBSON:**
Youth for Freedom paper 2s.
Food Production and Population 6d.
Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.
- PHILIP SANSON:**
Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step 1s.
- ERRICO MALATESTA:**
Anarchy 6d.
Vote—What For? 1d.
- M. BAKUNIN:**
Marxism, Freedom and the State. cloth 5s.
- HERBERT READ:**
Art and the Evolution of Man 4s.
Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism 3s. 6d.
Poetry and Anarchism cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d.
The Philosophy of Anarchism boards 2s. 6d., paper 1s.
The Education of Free Men 1s.
- PETER KROPOTKIN:**
The State: Its Historic Role 1s.
The Wage System 3d.
Revolutionary Government 3d.
Organised Vengeance Called Justice 2d.
- RUOLF ROCKER:**
Nationalism and Culture cloth 21s.
- GEORGE WOODCOCK:**
Anarchy or Chaos 2s. 6d.
New Life to the Land 6d.
Railways and Society 3d.
Homes orhovels? 6d.
What is Anarchism? 1d.
The Basis of Communal Living 1s.
- F. A. RIDLEY:**
The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age 2d.
- JOHN HEWETSON:**
Sexual Freedom for the Young 6d.
Ill-Health, Poverty and the State cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.

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

FREEDOM
 The Anarchist Weekly
Postal Subscription Rates:
 12 months 17/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)
 6 months 8/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)
 3 months 4/6 (U.S.A. \$0.75)
Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies
 12 months 27/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)
 6 months 13/6 (U.S.A. \$2.25)
 Cheques, P.O.'s and Money Orders should be made out to **FREEDOM PRESS**, crossed a/c Payee, and addressed to the publishers:
FREEDOM PRESS
 27 Red Lion Street
 London, W.C.1 England
 Tel.: Chancery 8364