

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"No wonder great entertainers gain more worship than gods or politicians; they touch up your fantasies and leave your life alone."

—WOLF MANKOWITZ
Punch, 17/9/58

Vol. 20, No. 12

March 21st, 1959

Threepence

For You But Not For Me

THE Co-operative Union and the Co-operative Societies are regarded as part of the Labour Movement. Most of their members are trade unionists and would tend to vote Labour rather than anything else.

Except on matters which conflict with their interests as Co-op members.

For example, the *Co-operative Review*, official organ of the Co-operative Union, recently gave a hasty answer to the demand by the National Union of Mineworkers for nationalisation of coal distribution — which the miners rather than the Co-ops think would bring down the price of coal, increase sales, and help to reduce growing redundancy among miners.

Reason for the Co-op's answer is that its members get a dividend from their own retail trade in coal, and they would feel sore if that trade (or, more important, that divi!) were handed over to the National Coal Board.

Unable to disclaim nationalisation altogether, the *Co-operative Review* maintains that "The N.C.B. is run for the public good, and not simply to provide employment for miners and coal dealers, Co-operative or otherwise."

But this seems to be contradicted by another statement in the same editorial, when the journal states that the National Coal Board, "with its virtually monopoly powers," has priced itself out of the market.

The twisting is really an attempt to hide the fact that the Co-op is in favour of nationalisation for other enterprises—but not for themselves. Its arguments, though, are purely economic and, it seems to us, could be answered economically. Neither the Labour Party nor the National Union of Mineworkers have ever suggested expropriation: it's always nationalisation with compensation.

Could not then the dividends which are the principle for which the Co-operators co-operate be met out of compensation, the same as stock-holders' dividends in other state-owned industry? They would then have their principle of nationalisation and their dividend; an ideal solution.

It wouldn't be socialism, it wouldn't even be co-operation any more, it wouldn't make the slightest difference to the amount of coal sold, since the price wouldn't go down, so it wouldn't lead to the re-employment of a single miner. But it might make somebody happy.

FUNDS REFUSED

Six American colleges and universities in the United States—Bryn Mawr, Haverford, Antioch, Princeton, Swarthmore, Reed—have refused to accept federal funds offered under last summer's National Defence Education Act for students loans.

The institutions have refused on the grounds that a student asking for a loan must swear allegiance to the United States and swear that he does not believe in or support any organization aiming to overthrow the Government by force.

Times Educational Supplement 13/3/59

Why Get Worked Up About 'Getting Married'? THE MORAL IMMORALISTS

WITH its uncanny knack of tearing a few "sensational" sentences from their context the popular Press has created the impression that the recent Special number of the *Family Doctor* on "Getting Married" is either a revolutionary or an immoral document whose purpose it is to undermine that most sacrosanct of all our institutions: marriage. The protests from some influential quarters, and the spineless action of the B.M.A. in stopping the distribution of the remaining 50,000 copies, all of which have been given their quota of publicity, have in fact served to push the sales of the 200,000 copies already distributed to the Trade. For the sensation-seeking public has, as it were, forgotten the important fact that the title of the magazine is after all, "Getting Married" and that it is a special issue of the *Family Doctor*. And both title and publishers are a guarantee that there will be no

attack on the institution of marriage from these quarters!

Apart from the two contributions which received so much publicity, Dr. Chesser on "Is Chastity Outmoded?" and Dr. Pilkington on "Marrying with a Baby on the Way" and some commonsense remarks by Dr. Little on "Mixed Marriages" which did not get publicity this *Family Doctor* Special could be described as a pocket guide to conventional marriage: the business and economics, as well as some of the problems which people have to solve to make a "success" of marriage. The tone of the booklet is set by the Editor, Dr. Kok, in her preface who quotes with obvious approval that "marriage is to most people a symbol of happiness and joy" and that "everything that has been set out in this book is designed and intended solely and simply to help you attain this [happiness]". Not only is an attempt made to rehabilitate moth-

ers-in-law and to boost Church weddings ("The Wedding Service is a beautiful one that you should both treasure") but all kinds of hints on hiring wedding dresses, on the wording of invitations and on remembering to send pieces of wedding cake to the absent ones are included in this guide. Getting married, is obviously quite a business even without the problems of the bedroom!

★

AND these, apparently, are numerous. Ignorance of the "facts of life" lies at the bottom of these problems, according to some writers. Dr. Sandler, for instance, is of the opinion that it is wrong to assume that the sex-act can be "performed by instinct". In love-making there is "a technique to be acquired, an art to be learned" and in his opinion "particularly in the case of the wife, it may require months, even years of

patience from both partners before she learns fully how to respond". Dr. Chesser on the other hand declares

The individual feels the need to satisfy his sexual desire and without any religious and social taboos this question of right and wrong might not arise. And there would be little cause for a sense of resultant guilt and shame.

Nevertheless Dr. Chesser makes his position quite clear when he writes

In my opinion the coming together of two people on the sexual plane, whether within or without the framework of a marriage, is immoral unless it be the expression of deep and lasting genuine relationship (our italics).

Yet Dr. Pilkington who writes on *Marrying with a Baby on the Way* points out that

"there are many, many [boys and girls] who have not the slightest notion how tremendously strong and overwhelming

Continued on p. 3

The Redskins Ride Again

AT the time of the American Revolution (Eh? Wassat? *Revolution?*) six Redskin nations, the Mohawks, Senecas, Onondagas, Cayugas, Oneidas, and Tuscaroras known collectively as the Iroquois, emigrated to Canada out of loyalty to the British Crown.

In gratitude for such loyalty George III, in 1784, granted them rights for as long as grass shall grow and water shall flow over 700,000 acres of land.

As may be expected, however, since then things have been 'adjusted' by the palefaces, to such effect that today the Iroquois land has been whittled down to a mere 30,000-acre reservation, the rights and powers over which were severely limited by the Federal Indian Act of 1924.

Last week the Iroquois set out to regain some of their lost dignity by declaring themselves an independent nation. Donning feathers, buckskin and warpaint, 100 braves stormed their local council house (or town hall?) and, with a ceremonial club, nailed a victory proclamation of independence to the wall.

Their Own Government and Police

A crowd of 700 bystanders cheered as they announced the formation of their own Government—and fol-

lowed this by sending cables to the Queen and to President Eisenhower describing what they had done, and requesting official recognition.

Next they ordered the Royal Canadian Mounted Police to leave, and formed their own police force of 70 men and 30 women.

Oddly enough, it was precisely these policemen which brought down upon the Iroquois the wrath of the Government of Canada.

Like every nation, the 6,000 citizens of Grand River Country, as they want now to be called, had traitors in their midst. One, a school-teacher named George Beaver, wrote to the local newspaper saying that the chiefs were not representative of the opinions of their followers, who would really prefer to remain under the Canadian Government jurisdiction.

Immediately the newly formed Iroquois Indian police arrested Mr. Beaver, and charged him with treason.

They tried him in a hurriedly set up court, the policemen who testified against him appearing unshaven and wearing plaid shirts. The tribal chiefs acted as the judges.

Eventually they let Mr. Beaver go with a warning that if he caused any more trouble he would be banished from the Grand River Country.

Further, the new policemen chased and caught a hit-and-run motorist and were about to charge him when they discovered that they had no laws under which to prosecute. They couldn't use *Canadian* laws, could they?

Going Too Far

Now while it is one thing to declare yourself independent and write letters to the Great White Chiefs in London and Washington, it is quite another to start operating law and order yourself.

The Minister in Charge of Indian Affairs, a Mrs. Ellen Fairclough, told the chiefs, led by Mad Bear, that they had interfered with the rights of Canadian citizens (presumably the right to hit-and-run is basic to Canadian freedom, as well as the right to write to the newspapers) and that they had better pack up.

The chiefs of the Iroquois held a tribal pow-wow and solemnly considered Mrs. Fairclough's suggestion. Their reply was brief and to the point. 'Go jump in the lake', they said.

Next morning at dawn the Mounties arrived. In force, in cars, they got their men and women out of the council house with no more violence than was necessary (we think that is the usual phrase), only slightly injur-

ing a few of the Iroquois, and re-established proper law and order by arresting 16 Indians on charges of impersonating policemen.

The press correspondents who have reported these international incidents have clearly found it easy to fall into an attitude of amused superiority. Red Indians have for so long been biting the dust in order for the hero to triumph in the last reel that we all tend to forget that there are some left, and that they too are human beings.

And like Africans in Africa, Arabs in the Middle East and Hungarians in Hungary, they resent being dominated in what they consider to be their own country. Like minorities elsewhere, they read about declarations of human rights, about democracy and about the self-determination and independence of small nations being guaranteed and defended by the big nations.

No Reply

The Iroquois make up the smallest 'nation' seeking independence. Only 6,000 of them—but the principle is the same as for the 400 million Indians of India. It is as much a test of sincerity for the Canadian Government, who would surely not miss 6,000 citizens and 30,000 acres of land?

So far the Queen has not replied to the Iroquois cable, and according to the *Observer*, 'Frankly the Queen's failure to answer is being considered in some way a retraction of solemn obligations. "We stood by you during the American Revolution. Why are you not standing by us now?" said one of their leaders. His name is Hiawatha.'

Perhaps the Redskins should be patient. If they wait a little bit longer on their Reservations the civilized Palefaces may blow themselves and their cities to pieces and the Indians can once again inherit the lands of their ancestors if they can breathe the radio-active air.

Meanwhile we sympathise with their wish to be free from their Government. We want the same thing, and like them, have to face the same question: How?



'Frankly, Newbold, I don't like the look of this at all!'

THE IRISH & OTHERS

THE HOSTAGE, by Brendan Behan. Methuen, 10s. 6d.

AS you were all told in the columns of this paper to go and see this play when it appeared last October, but probably wouldn't, or didn't, there is nothing for you to do now but wait till your friends have passed round the local copy and you get your chance to read it. Me, I'm only telling you my opinion, which is all Mr. Behan says we can do, anyway.

At least two people I gave mine to (an old reviewer's trick) passed it back and asked me rather edgily if I thought there was any point to it. Point is something we must have nowadays, and the vaguer it gets, as in Mr. Beckett and Ionesco and the rest, the more desperate we get.

Kenneth Tynan (who reviewed this play for *The Observer*) called it by the name of *commedia dell'arte*. A name for a Continental style, rather out of date these days, where there is not much plot, only a few blokes come on and horse around, and somebody sings a topical song or two about the latest military escapade, or the need for better drains. Now Behan has a lot of characters playing about, just the same, brothel-keepers, queers, and that sort of select company, all of his own acquaintance, and he also has a great gift for the ballad; and generally he has a good time with it all.

I suppose he won't mind me saying that I don't get on quite so well. Personally, I don't care much for Irish neurotics (I mean, I can stand one or the other, but not both of them together). Of course, Behan lets you see clear enough that the Irish are fairly lunatic, and the English rule is cruel and mad, which are two things that probably need telling, but not much else. He has a nice stanza or two about Macmillan, but when he talks about Notting Hill it is the old, old story: kick the niggers up the spout. Whatever set you belong to, have a good time. Come along to our bridge party, 2 a.m. on the frontier and don't forget to bring your own gelignite.

Any shooting or such always makes me want to know who is responsible for it, and I rather think it is Mr. Behan and his kind. Mind you, he has a bit of shooting, but he makes it happen by accident, in a scramble, which I think is a cowardly dodge, because somebody is always behind the trigger, or else loaded the gun in the first place. If the guns are only a huge joke, then someone losing their life is only a joke too, and I don't think a dramatist really means to tell us that.

I'd like to see a play by Behan about the atomic bomb. I suppose there would be a song about the good old Mutation, or a lot of flying limbs, and it would make us sit back and feel good that we belonged to the Campaign, and had been there on Easter Day of '58. And in outer space, or after the great American-Asian dictatorship had been twenty years in power, this might go down well. But here and now, well, I don't think the comrades would relish it somehow.

If there are any serious Irish revolutionaries left, it might be interesting to know what they think about "The Hostage". I mean, as one minority to another, we can understand each other's motives. Maybe your own commitment to a fight for your freedom makes you think a bit more about human fate in general. This is the problem that is worrying Mr. Behan at the back of his mind, but what with the shouting of his rude friends, he can't hear himself think properly. Maybe he is a serious thinker just at that point, and not only a smooth Sinn Feiner. Anyway, its just possible. A.D.F.

THE CROWD IN THE FRENCH REVOLUTION, by George Rudé. Clarendon Press: Oxford University Press, 35s.

THE revolutionary crowd of Paris, idealised by the radical historians, is usually described by reactionaries as a mob of cut-throats. By a detailed study of the police records of the time, George Rudé shows that the cut-throat element was almost non-existent, the crowds were mainly composed of artisans, small tradesmen and shop-keepers. "The overwhelming majority of its captors

went to the Bastille under arms as enrolled members of their local units of the newly formed *milice bourgeoise*, or Parisian National Guard. This, of course, not only serves further to disprove the legend that the captors were vagrants or social riff-raff—such elements were, of course, rigorously excluded from the ranks of the militia—but it also suggests that the operation may have been a far less spontaneous affair than has usually been claimed."

The main aim of the attack was not to release prisoners, there were only a few in the fortress, but to obtain the powder known to have been recently stored there. All the same, the citadel was, and has remained, a symbol of tyranny, and its fall was, and still is, felt to mark the beginning of a new era for humanity. However, the powers of authoritarianism and superstition were far better organised and more strongly rooted than was the

Theatre

An Enemy of the People

THE idea that Arthur Miller had written an adaptation of a play by Ibsen caused a slight apprehension, and at the same time great hopes. These were both however, based on a misunderstanding of the nature of the adaptation. In fact Miller's version is remarkably little different from the original. Most of the lines would pass as direct translations, a few of the conversations are shortened, and only the fourth act, in which Dr. Stockman, angered by the way in which the liberal majority of his townfolk have turned against him denounces it and the theories behind it, is really recast.

To sum up the plot briefly, Stockman, a doctor who has returned from the north to his home town where his brother is mayor, discovers that the curative spa on which the town's prosperity is based, is, due to an engineering blunder, being supplied with contaminated water. At first the representatives of the radicals and liberals of the town are behind him in his plan to announce his discovery, and are enthusiastic at the prospect of a struggle with the mayor and his conservative faction. When however, the mayor points out that to make the necessary alterations would mean closing the spa, depriving the businessmen of their source of profit, and imposing heavy taxes on the townspeople,

Books & Plays

French monarchy, and they survived the Fall of the Bastille unscathed.

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

A PILGRIM AND HIS PACK, by Barbara Gooden, Heinemann, 15s.

A SCIENTIST gives up his work, which he believes is being used for ends destructive to humanity, and decides to bury himself in the depths of the country on a community farm. Of course his family's world is turned upside down. His wife is vaguely in favour of a "religious revival" (Anglican), but feels there's not much hope of it coming about, and is simply appalled at the roughness of the life in the communal house.

they try to hush the matter up, and turn the doctor out of home and livelihood as an "enemy of the people".

The situation is of an individual who wants and needs to tell a truth to society, and was a rebuttal of the geometric progression type of radical propagandists, who incidentally included some anarchists who regarded the winning of majority support for a rational idea as being simply a question of time and hard work.

It is obvious that Ibsen's idea in this play should appeal to a playwright looking at American society of today; particularly one who has been up himself before the Un-American Activities Committee for refusing to name associates! The air of America is full of democracy. It may be true that much coercive power is wielded by individual capitalists and police chiefs, but the mental food out of which this is fashioned, the theory preached in schools and churches, and the picture painted to immigrants is that the majority is sovereign. Their experience bears out that where this is true, the majority can be more tyrannical than the traditional bosses.

Seventy years later though, there cannot be many freethinking people who are still expecting to convert the majority

The atmosphere of the community very true to life, but the authoress makes her characters so very conventional in their opinions that one wonders how they ever came to believe in the idea of community. This seems to me a weakness in the story.

"Gracious living" seems to have insidious power over some people. It is not the same as a desire for comfort. One can be comfortable in a tent, but one cannot carry on "gracious living" in one. It is this which the wife misses most, the good furniture, the two servants (possibly there is an anachronism here?), the nice car and all the rest of it. For the libertarian there is a problem. If a person gives up his job for his ideals, and his family do not share these ideals, what is to happen? The trouble is that in this story everyone seems to assume that wife and children will follow husband in the good old patriarchal way. It would have made the story more interesting and profound if this assumption had not been made. A.W.U.

to support of their ideas. The people who see Ibsen will undoubtedly agree and find confirmation in "An Enemy of the People" rather than be shocked or challenged. The challenge remains the problem of what one is to do about it.

It is for this that I wish that if I had to adapt this play, Arthur Miller could have made a thorough job of it and set it in modern times in America. As it is, with sets and costumes of New York in the 1880's Ibsen seems admirable but not quite relevant; and then for the sake of dramatic interest it would have been better to have put on a strain translation.

The presentation is by the Cambridge Arts Theatre, and after touring the provinces it arrived at Golders Green last week. The leading parts are excellently played, with George Coulouris putting just the right amount of pride and obstinacy into the doctor's character to avoid making him an idol. The two coats, Hovstad, Billing and Aslaksen make one feel that even if their exact copies don't exist any more, there is still plenty of the same spirit to contend with. It is an interesting production, but of Ibsen and not Miller.

P.H.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

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

New Books . . .

- The Blue-Eyed Boy Ethel Mannin 15/-
- Safe Conduct; an Early Autobiography and Other Works
- Boris Pasternak 15/-
- Trends in English Adult Education (ed.) S. G. Raybould 21/-
- The Footsteps of Anne Frank E. Schnabel 13/6
- The Loom of History H. J. Muller 42/-
- Mythologies W. B. Yeats 21/-
- The Cave Dwellers, a Play William Saroyan 10/6
- From the Other Shore Alexander Herzen 15/-

Second-Hand . . .

- General Marshall Robert Payne 6/-
- The Cloven Hoof Taylor Croft 8/6
- The Poisoned Crown Hugh Kingsmill 3/-
- History of European Morals W. E. H. Lecky 4/6
- A New Way with Crime (1928) Fenner Brockway 5/-
- Personal Identity C. H. Rolph 5/-
- Broad and Alien is the World Ciro Alagria 3/-
- Politics in Pitcairn W. K. Hancock 4/6
- Stalin Reports on the Soviet Union (1934) 2/-
- The Benefits, Moral and Secular, of Assassination 10/-
- The Incomparable Aphra George Woodcock 6/-
- The Adventures of Ralph Rashleigh 4/-
- Report of the Care of Children Committee (1946) 2/-
- The Cosmological Eye Henry Miller 7/6
- The Holy Terror H. G. Wells 3/6
- Nations Can Live at Home O. W. Willcox 3/6

Periodicals . . .

- Dissent, Winter 1959, 4/-
- Chloromonte, Arendt, &c. 4/-
- University Libertarian, No. 8 1/-

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

Discussion

The Muggletonians

"I do believe in God alone, Likewise in Reeve and Muggleton, This is the Muggletonians' faith, This is the God which we believe; None salvation-knowledge hath But those of Muggleton and Reeve; Christ is the Muggletonians' King With whom eternally they'll sing."

FOR over two hundred years, we are told, the Muggletonians sang this hymn. Perhaps they still exist, along with the Swedenborgians, Mormans, Irvingites and Peculiar People. The sects linger on, long after the impetus of enthusiasm which gave them birth has died. And G. in his lecture *The Anarchists: A Non-Conformist Sect* had in mind the comparison with these Protestant splinter groups, just as much as that with the more 'respectable' tradition of radical dissent which I discussed last week. Why is it by no means so comforting a comparison? Partly because of the low intellectual level of most of the evangelistic and revivalistic sects, partly because the emphasis on the next world and on apocalyptic Bible-bashing makes them turn their back on the problems of this world which concern us, and partly, I fear, because tiny exclusive groups, other than our own, appear to us ridiculous, even though we would agree with the Quaker poet who wrote, *They are slaves who dare not be/In the right with two or three.*

But most of all, I think, it is because we associate with sectarianism a dogmatic arrogance and narrowness of vision, and a doctrinal hair-splitting, which we would not like to have compared to our own attitudes. As a matter of fact, a more valid political parallel with religious sectarianism is the Marxist faith with its various churches, denominations and sects. It has its great monolithic Catholic Church, with Moscow as its Rome, it has its Anglican variety of national Marxism with Belgrade as its Lambeth, and it has its dissident protestant sects, each claiming to be the true-begotten child of the Founder. Dwight Macdonald in describing the various divisions of American Marxism in the thirties makes this last analogy very clear. He describes the Lovestonites, the De Leonites,

"they were not intellectuals but real lower-middle-class workers, like the Jehovah's Witnesses, and like the Witnesses they continue to exist, putting out primitive-Marxist tracts whose typography and diction are so antiquated as to raise a suspicion they have been using up an overstock from De Leon's time . . ."

and a whole brigade of even smaller sects, the Fieldites, the Stammites, the Oherlites, the Marlenites and the Weisbordites, whose evolution

"was typical, if a bit extreme, of these splinter groups

(chips off the old Marxist block) as was their leader, brilliant and able but devoured by the worm of sectarianism which dieth not. The 'ites' dropped off one by one until the Revolutionary League of America or whatever it was called—the title generally made up in scope for any restriction of numbers—consisted of the leader and his wife. Then there was a divorce, and the advance-guard of the revolution was concentrated, like a bouillon cube, in the small person of Albert Weisbord . . ."

ANARCHISM, I hope, avoids this kind of absurdity, partly because of the absence of sacred texts with the status of the Bible or the works of Marx, and partly because of the absence of the cult of personalities. Moreover, while the difference between one revivalist Christian sect and another or between one dissident Marxist sect and another are merely marginal, there is a clear difference between the teachings of anarchism and those of other minority political groups, and in the different tendencies within anarchism itself—the mainstream of what used to be called anarchist-communism, with anarcho-syndicalism on one side and individualist anarchism on the other—however reconcilable they are in practice, are, in theory clearly definable in a way in which the minor protestant sects are not.

In Michael Argyle's book *Religious Behaviour* which Ernie Crosswell discussed amusingly last week, an attempt is made to compare the various empirical inquiries which have been made into the sociology and psychology of religion. In his conclusions Argyle distinguishes four main types; firstly *conservative religion* in which he includes Catholics and Anglo-Catholics: "religious conservatives tend to be authoritarian and extrapunitive in personality and accordingly are prejudiced towards minority groups, have a high rate of delinquency and they have a low rate of sexual activity"; secondly *protestantism* typified by Methodists and Presbyterians, who are, Argyle finds, "intropunitive, as shown by their high suicide rate, low delinquency rate and susceptibility to guilt feelings; they are less authoritarian than Catholics, though more so than non-religious people"; thirdly the *sects*, whose members tend to be women rather than men, to belong to the working class and to be relatively uneducated, are "more intropunitive than denomination members, and in addition are unstable with hysterical tendencies"; and finally *liberalism*, characterised by a disbelief in much of traditional theology, and by more concern with the ethical than the spiritual side of religion.

"Religious liberals are not concerned with sin and the need for redemption, nor is their God a watching, for-

bidding, figure. Indeed, there is an optimistic view of life, a belief in the perfectibility of man and in his power to shape his own destiny . . . In personality, liberals are humanitarian, impunitive and above average in intelligence; they have a low rate of crime, suicide and prejudice."

Argyle finds these characteristics in the Unitarians and the Society of Friends, and in one wing of the Church of England. Obviously we can think of individual exceptions to his typology. Where for example do we place the Catholic Worker group in America—surely not in the first category, and where Father Huddleston and the Rev. Michael Scott but in the last, while reader Wardle's tight-lipped Unitarian with his motto "One God, no Devil and 20/- in the £1" should surely go in the second category rather than the last? But if we accept Argyle's findings as statistically valid, G.'s identification of the anarchists with the sect-type is a bit harsh. We have, I hope, more in common with the characteristics attributed by Argyle to his final type.

YET, and here is the sting of G.'s remarks, we have all met a kind of anarchism epitomised by the comparison with the sect-type—a concern with the millenium, with some hypothetical future 'free society' in which all problems will be solved coupled with an impatience with the search for radical solutions to actual present-day problems; a withering intolerance of any departure by a hair's-breadth from the canons of unorthodox orthodoxy; an elevation of personal predilections and prejudices into moral principles and the assumption of a position of moral judgment over all one's fellows; a paranoid suspicion of all existing social institutions, assuming that no-one but ourselves can act in good faith. This is the kind of attitude which the least likeable kind of anarchist has in common with the least attractive of non-conformist sectarians, and for those unlucky enough to encounter it in this guise anarchism must appear to be a restricting and pharasaical creed rather than a liberating and fructifying influence, a bunch of Holy Willies becalmed in a nineteenth-century backwater, rather than a gale of creative destruction blowing over the pillars of the stalemated state.

In an age of conformity, when as John Stuart Mill wrote, "the mere example of non-conformity, the mere refusal to bend the knee to custom, is itself a service", the anarchists, as heirs of the tradition of radical dissent, are too useful a leaven in society, to allow themselves to become a secular equivalent of the Muggletonians.

C.W.

CUBA FROM BATISTA TO CASTRO

(From a correspondent)

SANTIAGO, CUBA, FEB. 17.

THE article in FREEDOM for Jan 17th on the rebel leader Fidel Castro is a very appropriate piece of anarchist honesty. We are not in Castro's political ranks, but we cannot deny him and his revolution a certain amount of admiration and confidence.

It will not bring a society without exploitation and without a State, but today it represents a moment of complete freedom of expression and movement, and there are at least some prospects for the future.

The Batista régime was one of crime, robbery and extortion, founded on military power—a truly dictatorial police state. For seven years Batista ground down the people, killing, robbing and corrupting through the censorship of the press, the Casinos and the most brutal persecution of whoever dared launch a word of criticism. Batista eliminated the old political parties, forming his own with elements from them and from his old cronies, among them more than a few Communists. Since the people knew him and his methods all too well, the great majority were against him, but the political leaders never reached agreement on a united opposition to fight him.

We have known Batista since the time when, in complicity with the United States ambassador Caffery, he pulled down the first government after the dictatorship of Machado, and drowned the 1935 general strike in blood.

During the Second World War, Washington became suspicious of him as a friend of the Nazis to whose submarines the Cuban naval chiefs sold oil on the coast, and when he was under suspicion, looking for help, he found it in the Communists, to whom he gave as a reward two ministries and control over the Cuban Confederation of Labour (C.T.C.).

On March 10th, 1952, sixty days before the general election was due, in which he stood no chance of being elected president, Batista staged his military coup. After the C.T.C. had called off an intended general strike, it was left to the students to begin the struggle, and Fidel Castro was in their forefront. The

politicians who opposed the régime began to talk, from abroad (especially from the United States), of an immediate revolution, but Fidel, didn't put much confidence in politics, began with things more close at hand, and attacked the military barracks at Santiago de Cuba, a big city in the extreme east of the island.

The attack failed and the soldiers massacred their prisoners, while Castro escaped to the mountains until he was handed over to the authorities by the Archbishop of Santiago. He was condemned to five years in jail and was amnestied 18 months later. He then travelled to Mexico, where, among the Cuban exiles, he set to work to organise a new force under the title *Twenty-sixth of July*, the date of the attack on Santiago.

★

WITH a small group of about forty friends, carrying a red and black flag, they landed on the Cuban coast in the province of Oriente two years ago. In the first skirmish with the troops 18 rebels were taken prisoner and killed on the spot. The rest of them took to the mountains, deciding to fight to the last moment, with the slogan *Libertad o Muerte*.

Batista sent some 1000 soldiers to wipe out the small group, but Castro, trained in guerrilla warfare by Colonel Bayo, a Spanish republican living in Mexico, not

only outwitted his enemies, but also caused them heavy losses, merging the revolutionary forces in the daytime with the people living in the district, and mixing especially with the young, the students and workers from Havana and the other provinces. Then Batista gave orders to his army to destroy the Fidei group by any means, offering by leaflets and posters, 20,000 dollars for Castro's head. Actually, more than ten thousand soldiers were in the field and besides the regular army the government recruited ten thousand more, while the air force, and even a few battleships went into action on the coast.

All these measures failed to stop the rebellion from ranging over the entire country, while the police, soldiers and the many different secret service bodies, helped by a legion of stool-pigeons (*chivaos*, or little goats), persecuted, murdered and tortured the rebels who fell into their hands, especially the young people. But the revolutionary tide continued to grow. A year after the arrival of the small initial force, three new fronts were opened, and Batista's soldiers suffered defeat after defeat, losing what is known as their morale. By last December they had ceased to resist, and the end came when we were all expecting at least twenty more days of war. With the dawning of the New Year, Batista and a large bunch of his assassins fled. An old general took over power, trying to ride the wave of public discontent, but a general strike called by Fidel against the will of the Labour leaders, paralysed the island from east to west, pulling down the general and his intentions. The red and black emblem (I cannot say what subconscious elements were in the choice) was triumphant.

★

NO one will mistake Fidel for an anarchist. He is a Catholic and a believer in the necessity for a democratic government, but to what extent do such ideas dominate him?

Among his army he appeared as a brother and is called plainly Fidel. He and the other leaders are not described as generals but as majors. He has no racialist or nationalistic sentiment, and,

a few days ago, when asked about a law against discrimination, he answered:

"I don't trust very much in law, I look to culture and to ideas. Better than the law is public opinion."

You have referred to the money said to have been lent to Fidel by American and Cuban companies. In fact they never gave him a cent. Fidel took the money as a kind of tax under threat that he would otherwise burn the mills and the mines.

Batista was supported by the army and the rich. The revolution was made by the middle class, some of the poorer clergy, the peasants and the workers, but without the acquiescence of organised labour.

Victory came when the whole country was so saturated with the spirit of the revolution that everybody, except in the ruling stratum, was doing something for it: contributing funds, giving secret papers, collecting shoes, clothes or first-aid materials. Batista's army felt ashamed, overrun and isolated by the revolutionary current. Let the rich American press speak of a blood bath. When so many youngsters have been murdered and so many people tortured, it is not for the Americans to react in self-righteous horror at the execution of war criminals.

Of course, time will pass, and people will lose many illusions as to the political nature of the revolution, but some things will change for the better. Even we anarchists can hope so. . . .

M. SALINES.

Death of a Docker

MORE than two thousand dockers and stevedores stopped work in the Royal group of docks yesterday as a mark of respect for Mr. Wally Jones, who was killed in a docks accident on Thursday. The Port of London Authority police allowed the funeral procession into the dock where Mr. Jones's colleagues lined the road by the main gate.

Mr. Jones, chairman of the port liaison committee for many years, had led many strikes at the docks since 1945. Sixteen carloads of dockers, market men and transport drivers followed the funeral through dockland.

Manchester Guardian 10/3/59.

★

We should like to add our tribute to that of the *Manchester Guardian*. We knew Wally Jones from the dock strike of 1951 which he was helping to organise in defence of seven members of the portworkers' liaison committee who had been arrested on charges of inciting to strike.*

The charges were brought under Defence Regulations (still in force then 6 years after the war, which was the excuse for them in the first place!) and the prosecution—which eventually failed—was led by Sir Hartley Shawcross, Attorney General in the Labour Government then in power.

Wally Jones had no illusions about the rôle of a Labour Government. He realised fairly clearly that the workers are liable to get done whoever is in power, but he never came as far as the anarchist position. In theory anyhow. In practice, as he made clear when he spoke to the London Anarchist Group in February, 1951, he acted like an anarchist on the job, realising the necessity of the workers organising their own defence at their place of work and that their strength really lies in their industrial importance.

Wally Jones was always ready to down tools in defence of his interests or those of his fellow-workers, on questions of principle or of pay. He was a courageous fighter and the tributes shown by the dockers on the day of his funeral showed the respect in which he was held.

*See "Freedom Selections", Vol. 1, 1951, p. 7 & subs.

CORRECTION

Dr. Soper is a Methodist of radical opinions. Billy Graham is a revivalist Baptist of the "Get right with God and social problems will solve themselves" kind. When Billy Graham had his crusade in this country, Dr. Soper referred to it as "sentimental capitalistic drive!"

When you survey the history of Protestantism you can see it as a continuing process in which most of the sects stop on the way and harden into orthodoxies, denominations, churches, while others go further along Joseph Priestley's sliding scale into the religious rationalism of, etc.

Don't Point that Beard at me

—it might go off

HAS the time come for revisionism on the question of beards and an agonizing re-appraisal of the function of the beard in modern society? Time was when beards were only associated with anarchism, now the beard has spread from Scottish Nationalists to the Labour Party, even reaching to the League of Empire Loyalists and Fidel Castro's fighters. Professionally, the beard has fanned out from sailors and artists and what are known pejoratively as 'bohemians', to all strata of society. There have been observed bearded postmen, lamplighters, bus drivers and policemen. With the social advance of the working class the beard seems to have been adopted as another prized trophy of the middle class to be taken over like other habits.

At one time the 'Bolshie' was depicted as wildly bewhiskered, even Popski the dog-villain of Pip, Squeak and Wilfred had a beard but as communism became more respectable beards tended to disappear. True, Lenin and Trotsky had beards, but of the later revolutionaries only Kadek had a beard (of the rather distressing 'Farmer Giles' type) and he was shot. Amongst present-day leaders, only Bulganin and Walter Ulbricht have beards. Bulganin has now slipped from favour and 'lieber Walter' had better be careful. On the whole beards are 'out' in the Soviet Union.

The primeval forests of Karl Marx, Michael Bakunin and Peter Kropotkin still stand in pictorial glory as testimony to what can be done in this matter. But the art of political denigration has even reached out to pluck at the beard of Kropotkin. A critical sketch some years ago alleged that Kropotkin only had a scrubby little beard. This is palpably false.

Beards as a symbol of revolt are only a comparatively recent innovation. The angry young man of the past was clean-shaven as a social protest, linked with ideas of hygiene. Marx, Bakunin and Kropotkin were only as bearded as their time allowed. The bearded Bolshie is a

symbol of xenophobia rather than (pong-) beardophilia*. After all, Edward VII and George V had beards and to cry 'Beaver' would be *lèse majesté*.

The beard as a masculine protest seemed a social necessity with the usurping of men's functions by women. (Although a case is recorded in hagiology of a female saint who was divinely visited with a beard in order to preserve her chastity). However there is no correlation between the resurgence of femininity in women and the incidence of the beard in males. The phenomena of long hair and beards (e.g. Cavaliers, Nazarenes, Elizabethans) occurring together frequently disposes of the 'masculine protest' myth. It may be that the gentlemen protest too much.

The beard as a sign of decadence or virility (strike out the word not applicable) has little scientific or historical evidence to support it. To adapt Oscar Wilde it may be that 'kissing a man without a beard is like eating an egg without salt', but the added *frisson* to the labial interchange does not precipitate a rush for bearded ladies as pin-ups.

Let's face it, or beard the lion in his den, or singe the King of Spain's beard or whatever metaphor suits us, the main function of the beard is utilitarian. There is the beard which covers up a facial shortcoming (e.g. chintlessness). The beard which covers up the lack of years in one of a nature outlook. There is also the double bluff beard which causes an older man to look younger because everybody thinks that only young men grow beards. There is the disguise beard which is useful to have for the purpose of getting rid of at opportune moments. The existentialist expendable beard is also a useful philosophical outlook: if all else fails one can get rid of the beard and start a new personality, a humanitarian substitute for suicide? There is the hobby beard which comes in

*On the other hand outbreaks of pongophilia can be observed frequently on posters.

JACK SPRATT.

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 20, No. 12. March 21, 1959

The Moral Immoralists

Continued from p. 1

sexual attraction can be. The whole Nature depends on it. Without it every creature from the house-fly to the elephant would soon be extinct. So the mistake may be one of just not know-

Talk about "mixed-up" young people! One of the "experts" complains that if the sex-act is performed "instinctively" then we are no better than animals. So we must first learn to kill those natural feelings. By that time we are ripe (economically speaking!) for marriage and we should start reading books about the "technique" of love-making which we impart to our now rigid wives who may, in the course of a few months or years patient application of the "techniques" learn to appreciate it all!

Dr. Chesser who recognises that his "Man who interferes with Nature and not Nature with Man" nevertheless declares "immoral" the enjoyment of sexual relations which is based on sexual attraction only, and is virtually condemning all young people to sexual chastity and denying that a relationship of love and love-making cannot result from one which originates in sexual attraction only.

★

TO our minds so many of the sexual problems which beset our society are less due to ignorance than to the result of having learned how to suppress natural feelings when they manifest themselves. As Dr. Chesser admits

Nature has created a unity of our bodies and minds and society attempts to destroy this by working in exactly the opposite direction. Small wonder that the young, and indeed, the not so young, find it unnatural and difficult to accept and so to conform.

Unfortunately too many have been house-trained to conform to the patterns of adult behaviour and wishes from earliest childhood in all things; and the suppression of their sex feelings is simply one more discipline they learn to accept.

Getting married, for them, is the passport to freedom from the heavy hand of parental control (incidentally the answer to the question as to why most young married people cannot bear their "in-laws" is surely that one set of parents is more than enough without having to be saddled with another!) and the open sesame to sexual relations. But as Dr. Chesser puts it. "All too often events prove this to be too little and too late".

However the only heartening statistic in this sordid business of "getting married" is that to-day one woman out of every three who bothers to get married couldn't wait for the parson or the registrar to bless the bed!

Money

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 11

Deficit on Freedom	£220
Contributions received	£255
SURPLUS	£35

March 6 to March 12

Oxford: Anon. 5/-; Milan: V.G. 10/-; San Francisco: A.G. £1/5/6; London: M.H.S. 2/6; London: J.S. 3/-; Wolverhampton: J.G.L. 2/6.

Total	2 8 6
Previously acknowledged	253 3 2
1958 TOTAL TO DATE	£255 11 8

GIFT OF BOOKS: Glasgow: L.B.
*Indicates regular contributor.

An Open Letter to Harold Macmillan

SIR,

In one of the speeches you made in Russia you are reported as saying that "every individual should have freedom to develop his personality". As one who believes in the uniqueness, the unrepeat-ability, of each human person, this state-ment of yours struck a responsive chord in me. Upon reflection, however, I came to the conclusion that such an assertion came strangely from the lips of a man of your position and ideas. Just how can anyone who lauds, as you do, the present system of things in this country, have the cool cheek to argue that this way of life gives freedom to the individual to develop his personality? Either this statement of yours was intended as a sort of garnish to hide the stench of western capitalism, or you really believe that freedom of personality is compatible with such a system and are thereby a victim of doublethink. Assuming that the latter is the case, I would like to point out to you certain aspects of our life today and the denial of personality that inevitably accompanies them.

Most of us are workers of one kind or another. That is to say we have to sell our physical and mental energies to an employer in order to obtain the necessities of life. As a result we have no economic independence—one of the foundations of the freedom needed to develop our personalities. Not only that, but the work we are compelled to do is, with few exceptions, monotonous and repetitive, a negation of creativity and craftsmanship. Millions of us are daily herded into factories, offices and ware-houses to labour for the profit of the owners. We spend a large part of our working hours obeying the whims of our bosses and following that routine of irresponsibility known as "earning a living". Everywhere, and to an increas-ing extent, we find the soulless beat of the machine overwhelming the natural working rhythms of our individual personalities. To the god of Production is sacrificed not only our hands but also our minds. What freedom to develop personality is allowed in Ford's of Dagenham, or Austin's of Birmingham? What unique skills and perceptions are called forth in the massive steel and concrete offices which dominate the sky-line of central London? Perhaps you can tell us, Mr. Macmillan, and tell us in specific examples, not vague generalities.

But it is not only as workers that we are denied freedom for the development of our personalities. As consumers we are more and more preyed upon by the advertisers. Once advertising was confined to the billboards, the cinema, the newspapers and the occasional hand-bill. Now it is shrilly and insistently penetra-ting into our family lives and even when we have no television sets we can hear its voice bursting from the houses of our neighbours. On all sides we are cajoled and bullied into buying this or that deter-gent which will wash our clothes (and our sins?) whitest of all. How can we develop our personalities, our apprecia-

Was he an Anarchist?

THE ideas of Gerrard Winstanley were undoubtedly communistic as C.W. states (*The Dissenter's Burying Ground*, 14/3/59), but it is questionable if he can be claimed as a precursor of anarchism. Whatever he may have written in his earlier work, "The Law of Righteous-ness", his utopia, "The Law of Freedom", was certainly not conceived along liber-tarian lines. The late Marie Louise Berneri wrote that it "reveals an authori-tarian spirit". This is a mild description of an 'ideal' society which included prisons, police and punishment (both corporal and capital), an army and a law-making and law-enforcing parlia-ment. However well Winstanley may have indicted the oppressions of his time, his positive proposals for the reconstruc-tion of society would, had they been carried out, have resulted in new oppres-sions—equally onerous and even more dangerous since they were advocated in a sincerely revolutionary spirit.

Yours fraternally,
London, Mar. 15. S. E. PARKER.
[C.W. writes: I agree.]

tion of the beautiful, the good and the true in the face of the clamour of the admiss world?

Yet again we are all affected by the blight of militarism. Of what use is your profession of belief in the freedom of personality when you are leader of a government which holds up the soldier, the sailor and the airman as objects for admiration? Can you honestly assert that the personality of a man or a woman can develop in all its potential richness and differentiation when the vessel which holds it is shrouded in blue or khaki and the spirit which should animate it is bent to the will of the sergeant-major and the Queen's Regulations? You and the other rulers of this planet threaten us with a world-wide massacre as the result of your power struggle. Of what use are your words when the fact of your nuclear weapons could obliterate the personalities of millions of human beings?

Then there is the state—that monstrous machine of coercion which maintains the systems which produce these things. You say that the state exists for the benefit of the individual. But if something exists for my benefit I can make use of it. In reality, however, and in spite of the theories of liberal democrats, it is the state that makes use of me. In time of war or of crisis I am used to protect it—it does not protect me. The state, by its very nature as an apparatus of repression, cannot treat individuals as *ends in themselves*. It must regard them as *means to its end*—that is to say, the ends of the class who manipulate it and for whose continued pre-eminence it exists. To that state man is not a person, he is a thing, a category, an obedient citizen. How can our personalities be free when the contours of our existence are shaped, not by ourselves, but by an external authority? The freedom of personality is in inverse proportion to the power of the state.

There are many other aspects of our present condition I could mention—the "educational" institutions whose purpose is the efficient production of boss-men and mass-men; the authoritarian family with its attendant miseries; the prevailing ideology of conformity and status which permeates our thinking—but I feel I have written enough for you to ponder on. Of course, I do not really expect that you will reply to me, since you, as a statesman, and I, as an anarchist, have no spiritual affinity. If what I have written, however, raises a doubt in the minds of one or two of your admirers I shall not feel that my efforts have been wasted.

S. E. PARKER.

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

Bouquet from Cuba

After long years receiving your paper (I dare to say your paper), only now I am sending you a letter. I love FREEDOM and admire your labour as it deserves and if I don't add my grain of sand it is because Cuba has no money order ser-vice with England and I am an old writer never handling so much silver to make a bank note.

Hoping you will catch my English.
I remain truly for the ideal,
Santiago de las Vegas,
Cuba, 17th Feb. MARCELO SALINAS.

[Our correspondent's article appears on another page.]

Homogenized Peanuts

The 17th January, 1959 issue had an especially interesting article, "Well Done, Schoolboys". To me it appears that if 12- and 11-year-old schoolboys can reason so well, there might be some hope of sanity in the next generation. In England at least.

In this land of homogenized peanut butter, hydrogen bombs and Coca-Cola one could never expect such clear think-ing from University students, much less 12-year-olds. In this lunocracy that's known as the "leader" of the West, these boys would promptly be dubbed "double-domes", "spoil-sports", cranks or even potential subversives who are maladjust-ed, as the head-shrinkers call anyone who can think for himself.

Here in the U.S.A., where they go to University to learn fly-casting, safe driving, playing football, these boys would be out of place. The girls in the U.S.A. have to go to college to learn something called "Home-Economics", which means learning how to cook a stew or pork chops. It's wasted effort because when the old man gets home he has to open a can of beans for his supper, our college-bred "home-economist" is out playing bridge or watching a moronic T.V. play.

Yours for a better world,
U.S.A., Feb. 5. R.J.C.

Swedish Thoughts about South Africa

SWEDEN has always been the Labour Party's idea of a "socialist Welfare State". A dream come true. And with-in a Welfare State educating the majority is regarded as the first duty of "good government".

In such a paradise we can cut our-selves a slice of the larger loaf, dream of a win on the Pools, draw up a chair before Television and "suffer" at the thought of how awful it would be to suffer like the "uneducated" Africans of Nyasaland.

With the rise of Income Tax forms, cross-word puzzles in pictures, Football Pools, washing machines, Americaniza-tion of industrial methods, a rigid domes-tic conservatism, respect for the protocol, middle-way urbanization—we are all happy and enjoying ourselves under Social Democracy.

Of course it's necessary for a "social-ist" boss to obtain reasonably healthy and educated workers to run his compli-cated machines.

But alas, a Swedish doctor and psycho-logist has recently stated the following; "Owing to the gradual losing of small individual freedoms 900,000 Swedes will have had, have or will have stomach ulcers within a population of seven mil-lions".

A glance into the evening paper *Expressen*, biggest in Scandinavia—with a circulation of approx. 325,000 as well as being the deadly Liberal enemy of "socialism"—prompts us into viewing their comments on "black African self-government", and the education of the black populations. "200 million blacks", scream their headlines, "against six mil-lion whites". A beautiful disguise for the superior strength of European colon-ists.

The truth is, of course, that soon the argument won't be about blacks and whites. It will be a battle between two armies for the control of particular pieces of territory—a struggle for politi-cal power.

The championing of the African cause is to be found between the pages of sport, strip-cartoons, and more often the advocacy of the atom-bomb for "peace".

Their correspondent writes the follow-ing: "Jomo Kenyatta for a time went to a Swedish school to learn democracy. There are those who think that when one has taught an African to read the direc-tions of how to run a tractor, one has also taught him to read the Communist manifesto.

"Meanwhile most of the whites feel that the education of the Africans is the only road to a peaceful solution of the black races problems. At the moment only 85 per cent. of Africa's coloured population can read and write."

Both the expression of tacit limita-tion... "There are those who think... It's also noticed that the Russian boss has been haunting political circles here since the 18th century. But now the Swedish Liberals push Mr. Christy forward to haunt the "illiterate" masses of Africa. Western capitalism or "dem-ocracy" is worried for Africa's peace all being liberated by coloured capitalists. "They will be free—but how?" they ask will it be civil war?

But what really worries the politicians behind the *Expressen*? Isn't it that they hope these new emerging states will fall into power politics without leaving the "free west" in a hopelessly disadvan-tageous position when challenged by spheres of influence in Africa. The fanatical boys of the Kremlin have their eyes on Africa also!

"Africa must be free," as advocated by the Labour Party and Liberals, is a slogan taken up by the Liberals of the Kremlin. They also present their man-ifesto for "self-government" to the struggling nationalist movements.

Premier Nkrumah could just as well become a communist Fuhrer, as accept a knighthood and remain within the com-monwealth. Which would probably be the sophisticated *New Statesman* (a talk of educated Africans still have "western ideals") a secret pleasure.

There's exploitation, and exploitat-ion imply the *Expressen*, "It's different for black gold-miner in South Africa, than for an African who owns a little land in Uganda under British administration.

"Alan Lennox-Boyd seeks to med-dle and put the situation right in Nyasaland, they continue 11/3/59 "It's not the British government's fault that this situa-tion has come to pass in Africa".

These apologists for colonialism "good" and "bad" colonialists. They are always preaching the iniquities of col-onialism until circumstances alter attitude. They are secretly charmed by Brit-diplomatic courtesy which seeks to "tear down" a situation where millions of Africans are deprived of human rights. They hope the British government will be "influenced in the right direction."

"Africa struggles to be free," roar the double-thinkers, "We can only wait for more blood."

It's fortunate for the "democratic" writer of this panegyric that he's never brought before a "tribunal" of "liber-ators" such as Nkrumah, Verwoerd, Welensky, Nasser—to decide what "jus-tice" to administer.

If he was, the verdict might be like that of the Queen in "Alice in Wonder-land". Off with his head.
Sweden, March 14. H.

Slough's Youth at Work

CHRISTIAN moralists make the enor-mous mistake of not insisting upon the right means of livelihood. The Church allows people to believe that they can be good Christians and yet draw dividends from armaments factories... imperil the well-being of their fellows by speculating in stocks and shares... yet be imperialists, yet participate in war. All that is required of the good Christian is chastity and a modicum of charity in immediate personal relations. An intel-ligent understanding and appraisal of the long-range consequences of acts is not insisted upon by Christian moral-ists." Thus spake Aldous Huxley in 1937.

This, surely, is the basis upon which Dr. Herford should have tackled the problems of our young people in his book "Youth at Work" instead of indulging in a fruitless attempt to take the sharp edge off profiteering rather in the manner of a Monopolies Commission charged with the duty of keeping power in the desired hands.

Dr. Herford is the Factory Doctor for the Slough area and has gone to the trouble of collecting together information connected with youth employment, backed up by the results of question-naires.

The author's big plea seems to be for employers to recognise that it is in their own interests to provide *bona fide* apprenticeships and trainee schemes, and he deplores both the dearth of such schemes and the fact that a proportion are mere excuses for cheap labour: "Sometimes the term 'trainee' was only a tag to attract lads". Dr. Herford

doesn't admit to being in a dilemma but he must surely have some teeny weeny doubts about the altruistic motives of employers—unless he is a "narrow specialist who understands, but under-stands only his own speciality", one of the common types noted by Huxley. He makes the statement "Employers want value for their money", perhaps as one would speak of a housewife choosing the Sunday joint to suit her limited purse. One might wonder how he avoids use of the term 'profits'. He writes of apprentices diverted to mass production "to earn their keep", again seeming to exhibit ignorance of the principle on which industry functions.

Amusing, in a way, is his acknow-ledge-ment to "A number of firms (who) have taken great pains to encourage their young members to save". It is just pos-sible that the Factory Doctor's director and manager acquaintances live in three-bedroom blocks of houses on large estates and cycle to the office to get their trainees an example in austerity—but there is reason to doubt this. He may be sufficiently imaginative to think that the Ranks, Kemsleys and Rootes of our society go to great lengths to discourage youth from spending their money on film shows, parties and fast cars. Not all of us take mescaline.

On the effects of Home Background we are entertained with the usual remarks about broken homes, homes that might be better for a break and lack of religion (ethics is another term that is not to be found in the Herford Diction-ary). Young people from religious homes, he writes, showed a "noticeable sense of responsibility"—a phrase which could well be altered to "noticeable wil-

lingness to submit to authority" in many cases. (One can drop H-bombs for fun or by order from above, the latter method being of a more 'responsible' nature. One can, I believe, refuse to drop them and be locked up for such irresponsibility).

Factory Canteen conditions are con-sidered with the verdict that some are good; some bad. Workers' destructiveness is blamed for the conditions in some of the worst canteens, the remedy being improvement of conditions and the "con-tinuous influence of senior members of the staff". If this is a plea for abolition of separate canteens for workers and managers it is a very disguised one.

The author begs many questions. On the Church he notes "too much dogma, repetition of formula, dull sermons". Question: too much church?

One hundred boys and one hundred girls were questioned on sex with the result that school instruction is found to be inadequate. Some boys thought sex experienced before marriage was permis-sible but not for their sisters—Slough has its young Victorians as well as Teddy Boys!

But wait! What is this commendable insight on delinquency? "Perhaps if many who are now respectable citizens had been caught in some moment of youthful delinquency they might have had the whole course of their lives changed". A welcome relief from so much shallow analysis in a very ordinary book by a Doctor who doesn't seem to know what happens to profits and might never believe that Justices of the Peace take their places with other moralists on the Directors' Boards of Brewery concerns.
ERNIE CROSSWELL.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

Regular Sunday meetings now held at "Marquis of Granby" Public House, Rathbone Street (corner of Percy Street, Rathbone Place and Charlotte Street), 7.30 p.m.

MAR. 22.—Philip Holgate on SOME COMMUNITIES OF THE PAST

MAR. 29.—No meeting

APRIL 5.—Speaker to be announced

APRIL 12.—H. B. Gibson on THE PSYCHOLOGY OF COMMUNAL LIVING

FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

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

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies
12 months 29/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)
6 months 14/6 (U.S.A. \$2.25)

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

FREEDOM PRESS
London, W.C.1. England
27 Red Lion Street
Tel.: Chancery 8364