

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"It is immoral to use private property in order to alleviate the horrible evils that result from the institution of private property."
—OSCAR WILDE

Vol. 21, No. 45

November 5th, 1960

Threepence

Anarchist Commentary

SEX AND YOUTH

It is not surprising that a plea that children should receive their first sex instruction before puberty failed to get support when the National Council of Women discussed "immorality among children" at its conference in Scarborough last week.

A Salvation Army officer, Mrs. M. Westergaard, while putting a fairly reasonable case for "a sane, healthy understanding of the right place of sex in life" nevertheless showed the usual common confusion of thought on the subject when discussing practical ways of "dealing" with adolescent sexuality.

The same speaker who made a plea for understanding also called for control over the sale of contraceptives so that school children could not get hold of them; this motion was "wholeheartedly" supported.

If it is true that promiscuity is on the increase among children of eleven and twelve and that very young girls are increasingly becoming unmarried mothers, it is not going to help the situation if they are denied access to the means of preventing unwanted pregnancies. Quite apart from the difficulties which would arise in trying to control the sale of contraceptives, there is little value in merely understanding the emotional problems of the young if their sexual needs are not recognised as part of that problem.

Not everyone is agreed on the age at which girls have sexual desires—it seems to vary tremendously—but whatever the age we can be certain that no system of control will entirely prevent children from gratifying their sexual curiosity.

This being so it would surely be wiser to remove the taboos from the sex act and the sense of sin from the desire by social recognition of youthful sexuality.

Whether it is desirable to provide alternative outlets for the very young by canalising their energies into social activities is debatable, but it is certain that a "healthy understanding" of their emotional needs cannot be achieved without first removing the stigma from sex.

Children and Young Persons are also the subject of the Ingleby Committee report just published.

RELEASE OF FOULNESS PRISONERS

SIX women and seven men protesting against British possession and manufacture of nuclear weapons, imprisoned on May 2 this year were released on Tuesday.

The demonstrators were sentenced to six months imprisonment after refusing to sign recognisances to keep the peace for twelve months, for their part in a non-violent civil disobedience demonstration at the entrance to the Atomic Weapons Research Establishment at Foulness, Essex.

The prosecuting counsel at their trial in Southend County Court said that in the two weekend demonstration they had cost the police over £200. This was "absolutely intolerable".

"At the rate of six months for £200," commented the Foulness Prisoners' Committee is week, "the Government which has wasted £100 million on Blue Streak missiles should be jailed for 250,000 years."

FREEDOM sends warm greetings to the released prisoners.

One of the recommendations of the Committee if adopted would raise the minimum age of criminal responsibility to 12.

The committee feels that in dealing with young children who commit offences and with children whose primary need is for care and protection it (the juvenile court) should move away from the conception of criminal jurisdiction. The committee emphasises that its recommendations have no element of letting off.

We hope to discuss this report at a later date, but in passing we think it curious that society deems the adolescent unable to make responsible decisions on matters of sex, but holds a child under 12 to be "criminally responsible"!

PUNISHMENT and sex occupied the minds of more than one group of "moral guardians" last week, not always so forthright on the big problem of war—its cause and cure.

At the annual meeting of the Public Morality Council the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Westminster, Cardinal William Godfrey, recommended:

More emphasis on punishment rather than so-called 'treatment' of criminals.

We would agree with him that it "is disastrous for any nation when sex and sensuality become big busi-



ness", but the reason why sex is "big business" is because the Church and the moral codes of our society make sex a dirty business only permissible within the bonds of marriage which forces many young people to have their sex in secret with consequent feelings of guilt.

The cheap thrill which the cinema and the striptease joint provide (deplored by the Archbishop) fulfil a need which would not be there if our society encouraged men and women to regard sex as a normal pleasurable function, unrestricted by the taboos with which Christian morality surround it.

The Archbishop is on dangerous ground when he complains about the "unceasing portrayal of killings and crime for the entertainment of old and young . . . which breeds a distorted idea of the value of human life". Entertainment of this kind is certainly foolish and dangerous, but so is the idea that war is "just" and that it is "good" to kill the enemy. No amount of jesuitical reasoning can deplore one without condemning the other.

In appealing to Government to protect the freedom "of the citizens who wish to dwell peacefully in their homes, holding their property secure

from theft", Cardinal Godfrey says that "there should be no false ideas about interfering with freedom".

We agree that the man who tries to deprive another of his freedom should not be surprised if in the process his own is taken away, but why is it moral to disturb the peace of the citizen and break up his home when he is called to war?

When Cardinal Godfrey condemns the use of legal force and not only "deplores" war but openly fights against it, and the causes which give rise to it, then he will be in a stronger position to condemn the individual "criminal".

Comment on a 'Guardian' Editorial

DISOBEDIENCE

THE *Guardian* editorial (Oct. 25) on "Lord Russell and disobedience" was as unexpected as it was provocative. So much so that we read it a second time and then we found it less provocative! For whilst arguing that Bertrand Russell had "every right to ignore [those] criticisms" which sought to remind him that in a democracy the "proper way to change government policy is by persuasion" or the warning of the "threat to our way of life implied" in his proposed disobedience campaign, the *Guardian* concludes that he will be helping his cause much more "by a form of direct action which is legal". Again the *Guardian* points out that "a democracy can be wrong as well as a dictatorship" and after giving examples to substantiate this healthy observation adds that

If Lord Russell and his friends sincerely believe that unilateral nuclear disarmament by this country offers the only hope of world peace, they are entitled to take whatever action they think necessary to get it.

But "though no one yet knows what sort of direct action Lord Russell and his friends propose to take" it is the *Guardian's* opinion that "whatever they do . . . they will almost certainly bring the rest of the CND into disrepute".

Until now, the general public has been remarkably sympathetic to the CND. Lord Russell risks turning that sympathy into hostility and derision.

All that the *Guardian* can in fact suggest to Bertrand Russell "if he wants to help his cause by a form of direct action which is legal" is that he should "initiate a one-man filibuster in the House of Lords" The *Guardian* even foresees what

would be its effect: "No-one could object—and it would take their lordships' aback".

All very exciting and possibly good "copy" for the gutter Press, assuming it is hard up for a child-murder thrill or juicy scandal for its front page headlines on that day, but most unlikely to shake the government or those engaged in the manufacture or the handling of the weapons capable of destroying mankind.

However experienced the *Guardian* may be in being as slippery as an eel when it comes to committing itself, it has willy-nilly committed itself to the admission that 'a demo-

cracy can be wrong as well as a dictatorship".

The significance of such an admission is much greater than the editorial writer imagined when he penned it. Presumably what he was saying was that a democracy can make an error of judgment.

The United States was wrong to allow slavery before the Civil War; Britain was wrong to deny Home Rule to Ireland. The extreme abolitionists who went to gaol for their beliefs, as the Fenians who went to gaol for theirs, took to direct action because they saw no other way of persuading public opinion—and history has not condemned them.

★
TO our minds a democracy cannot make a mistake. Governments yes, a democracy never! What we are saying of course is that no such thing as a democracy exists anywhere in the world today. Government of the people, by and for the people presupposes a people informed on the various questions of the day, who discuss them at length and who reach unanimity on the steps to be taken. Unanimity is not possible so long as the principle of equality is neither accepted nor implemented. For so long as there is inequality it is nonsense to talk of a "common interest". But without a common interest it is impossible to expect people to think objectively and in the interests of the community.

To think and act in the interests of the community every individual needs to feel that he is an integral part of it and that whatever decision is made will not penalise him but that, on the contrary, it will enrich

Thank Goodness, Someone is not in a Hurry!

A Canadian schoolmistress, Miss Meryl Anderson, aged 24, is cycling round the world. Since leaving her home in Vancouver she has pedalled more than eight thousand miles, and intends to cover another twenty-two thousand miles before she goes home in 1965. When she passed through Dover yesterday she said: "I'm not in any hurry. I want to see things and meet people. There's no point in dashing everywhere; I'm not after any records."

She has spent almost a year cycling round Britain, earning her "keep" by working as a typist at various towns. Her next stop is Copenhagen—then she goes across Europe and the Middle East into India and eventually to Russia. Miss Anderson is riding an Italian racing bicycle and carries her belongings—a few clothes, camping equipment, and puncture outfit—in a pack on the rear mudguard.

Programme for a FREE PRESS?

The new radical morning paper which, it is hoped, will take the place of the *News Chronicle* will be "genuinely independent" and "open-minded but critical."

This was stated in a declaration issued by the action committee of the *News Chronicle* staff yesterday. The paper's aims will be:

To provide a bold platform for all shades of radical, and in particular left-of-centre, opinion;

To respect the readers' intelligence, and to cater for the discerning young person as well as for the mature mind;

By literate reporting to acquaint the British people of all significant developments affecting the life of this and other nations;

To improve the communication of facts and ideas;

To pursue the truth relentlessly; and Above all, to inform.

"We shall be for facts, justice progress, candour, vigilance, humanity, understanding, and the arts (the declaration continued). We shall be against racialism, humbug, complacency, trivia, sentimentality, stunts, hysteria, conformity, totalitarianism, and monopoly. We shall be a journal of combat, open-minded but critical."

Offers of help and donations towards the new paper have been received from all over the country, and negotiations were begun last week aimed at guaranteeing large sums from private sources. Expert advice has shown, the committee stated, that the costs involved, "although substantial, are considerably less than the sum which would have been required to put the *News Chronicle* back on its feet."

Guardian

A FREE PRESS NEEDS YOUR SUPPORT—MORE READERS!

Continued on p. 3

Warlords, Troglodytes and Crackpot Realism

WHEN Nikita Khrushchev makes his forays into the West and alternates ebullient joviality with blustering threats, the strategic journalists and sovietologists explain that Nikita would like to be cosy but has to put on a show of bellicosity to placate the "war party" among his colleagues back home in the Kremlin. Certainly the granite-faced, Goering-medalled, field-marshal who stood unsmiling at his elbow in Paris last summer gave us that impression. But the shadow of the military establishment as ultimate policy-maker stretches a good deal farther than Moscow.

We are in the habit of thinking of government by generals as a Latin-American phenomenon, with a few instances in the outside world like Spain, Egypt and Pakistan, (not forgetting of course that the present French régime was installed by a coterie of parachute colonels). The lone voice of Professor C. Wright Mills, in *The Power Elite* and *The Causes of World War Three*, has been warning us that American policy and its "permanent war economy" is dominated by a coalition of military men and industrial executives which could not only prevent any easing of international tension, but could unseat any American administration which sought to do so.

Powerful support for this point of view comes from a report issued last month in America which has not been discussed in the British press at all, except in a long dispatch from the *Guardian's* Washington correspondent, Max Freedman, published in that paper's issue of October 18th. Mr. Freedman writes that:

"Cries of astonishment and rage have greeted a report by the Centre for the Study of Democratic Institutions alleg-

ing that a military élite in the United States is primary responsible for resisting an agreement on disarmament. The report also alleges that the military establishment of the United States, supported by powerful scientists working with the Defence Department and the Atomic Energy Commission, might one day subvert and destroy the civilian foundations of the American Government.

"These charges would be astonishing if they came from any reputable source: they become doubly alarming when they are issued by a centre established by the Fund for the Republic. Entitled *The Community of Fear* the report is written by Mr. Harrison Brown, a geo-chemist and professor at the California Institute of Technology, and Mr. James Real, one of the consultants at the centre."

The report suggests that the likelihood of "desperate, erratic, unauthorised action by the United States and Allied forces is much greater than the chances of similar breaches of discipline by the Soviet", and it declares that

"if things continue to go the way they are going, the possibility of a coup by the United States military is real. The general assumption that the American soldier is automatically responsive to his civilian master might be rudely shaken were there a serious and clearly visible retreat on the world front by the American policy makers. The same might be true in the event of a disarmament agreement which the military does not consider foolproof."

THERE are, it says, "domestic forces, largely unspoken, that commit us more absolutely each day to the path away from effective arms control, not to speak of actual disarmament," and it complains that responsibility for research and development of nuclear test detection is in the hands of the Air Force and the Atomic Energy Commission, two groups which it identifies as being "most opposed to test cessation." (If you saw the transatlantic television conversation, on the BBC three months ago, between Bertrand Russell and Dr. Edward Teller on this subject, you will see what they

mean). And it goes on to say that the Air Force and the AEC are reinforced in this opposition by the tens of thousands of scientists and technicians who have "devoted all their professional lives to the invention and construction of weapons." The military leaders "quite naturally" oppose disarmament or the curtailment of their power, but this other sector too, the "paramilitary-civilian soldiers" in a showdown "could be relied upon to staunchly back the handlers of the weapons they have so devotedly evolved."

(On the tie-up between the generals and the corporations providing military ironmongery readers of *FREEDOM* may remember the account of Stewart Meacham's *Labor and the Cold War* published by the American Friends Service Committee which describes how the corporations "educate" the Pentagon on what weapons the government will need. A General Dynamics spokesman said of their B.58 supersonic bomber "First we had to dream it up, then sell it, then operate a poor man's State Department to get the co-operation of other contractors". The staff of this "poor man's State Department" included the Corporation's President Frank Pace, former Secretary of the Army, and 54 retired military officers including 17 former admirals and seven former generals.)

The report by Mr. Brown and Mr. Real says that a small, but not negligible fraction of America's 40,000,000,000 dollar defence budget is

"invested judiciously each year in a well-conceived programme of public and congressional relations. As a result, the military lobby is now the strongest lobby in Washington."

and it concludes that "There is little doubt that the armed services exert more control over Congress than that body exerts over the Defence Department. Indeed, the military élite is clearly in a position to assume actual political command over the United States striking forces if there are serious signs of weakness in the United States foreign relations." Their report goes on to discuss in

general terms the "deadly myth" behind the American dependence on a war economy, declaring that

"If any one nation which possessed nuclear potential believed that the war system was not obsolete it would be retained. The arms race, already almost incomprehensible in its capacity for mass annihilation, would be elaborated with new elements—chemical, biological, psychological—until the arsenals were packed with devices to destroy all the peoples of the world many times over. Yet in the long run the armaments race could produce no winner, for in any future war the consolation prizes could only be surrender, stalemate, or death."

REVIEW

'The New University'

It will be remembered that the proprietors of the Oxford weekly *Isis* recently "rescued" the magazine from the left-wing control that had prevailed for several years, involving personalities like Dennis Potter and Ken Todd and also getting Paul Thompson and William Miller two months' jail back in 1958 (incidentally, the article that got them into trouble was reprinted verbatim in *Clarion*, the NALSO and Oxford Labour Club magazine, last summer with impunity). While *Isis* is edited by the son of Richard Dimbleby, the left-wing group who were ousted earlier this year have now brought out a sort of "*Isis in Exile*" called *The New University* (a rather pointless title), which is edited by the son of Hugh Carleton Greene. (It would be interesting to know what these two pillars of the BBC think of their respective sons' activities). The Oxford "New Left" is striking back.

The first issue of *The New Univ-*

describes the effect of a "minimal" nuclear attack on the United States, and the effect on world politics of nuclear weapons becoming cheaper, less complicated and easier to make, so that every government can own some, with the result that the chances of war by blunder, by accident, or as a result of the expansion of a "limited" war, are astronomically boosted.

The authors think that within the next few years the United States will start a shelter programme for civilians and industry, which, they say, will constitute a significant "retreat from the ideas of the obsolescence of war." Once people become convinced that they can survive nuclear hazards, a new habit will be accepted, one "grotesquely different from

Continued on p. 4

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

[Open 10 a.m.—5.30 p.m. and till 5 p.m. every Saturday.]

New Books . . .

- Agrarian Policy of the Chinese Communist Party
Chao Kuo-Chun 55/-
- Jazz: New Perspectives in the History of Jazz
Nat Hentoff & Albert J. McCarthy 25/-
- Four Plays
William Inge 21/-
- Season of Adventure
George Lamming 21/-
- Harvest on the Don
Mikhail Sholokov 21/-
- The De Gaulle Revolution
Alexander Werth 30/-
- Permanent Red: Essays in Seeing
John Berger 16/-
- Selected Writings: an Introduction to Oronomy
Wilhelm Reich 52/6
- Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx
K. J. Kenefick 10/6

Reprints and Cheap Editions . . .

- Pride and Prejudice Jane Austen 3/6
- Autobiography of a Super Tramp
W. H. Davies 3/6
- Let Me Feel Your Pulse O. Henry 3/6
- The Satyricon Petronius 3/6
- So Be It, or the Chips are Down
André Gide 16/-
- God and the State
Michael Bakunin 3/-
- Does God Exist? Sebastian Faure 1/-
- Anarchism and Other Essays
Emma Goldman 3/9

Second-Hand . . .

- Voluntary Listener-Sponsorship (KPFA)
Lewis Hill 7/6
- The Rationalist Annual, 1948 Ayrer,
Woodcock (on Godwin) &c. 4/-
- Ludwig Feuerbach
Frederick Engels 5/-
- Broad and Alien is the World
Ciro Alegria 3/6
- By Grand Central Station I Set
Down and Wept Elizabeth Smart 3/6
- Freedom of Expression (F.E.N.)
Forster, Read, &c. 4/6
- Bullfinch's Mythology: The Age
of Fable (Binding damaged) 4/6
- Destiny of a Revolution
Victor Serge 7/6
- The Totalitarian Enemy (1940)
Frens Barkenau 12/6
- Lectures and Essays
R. G. Ingersoll 3/6
- War Memoirs
David Lloyd George (2 vols.), set 12/6

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

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

17a MAXWELL ROAD
FULHAM LONDON SW6

Tel: Renown 3736

CINEMA

The Morning After

A few months ago I criticised Alan Sillitoe's second novel, among other reasons, because it was so much inferior to his first one. The film of *Saturday Night & Sunday Morning* is now on in the West End, and no doubt it will soon be generally released. I urge every reader of *FREEDOM* to see it at the first opportunity, and to see it again at the second.

It is an outstanding film, both in relation to English films in general and in its own right. This is not really surprising, since the production is by the John Osborne/Tony Richardson company, the direction is by Karel Reisz, and the script is by Alan Sillitoe himself (incidentally, did I see him in the first pub scene?) It belongs to what can be called the English "New Wave", so its treatment of working-class life is neither melodramatic nor farcical nor patronising nor sentimental—that this has to be made clear is a measure of the shocking inadequacy of the commercial film industry in this country.

Everyone who has read the book will remember its story of a young Nottingham factory worker who takes everything he can get—including two married women—until he is punished by being beaten up and tamed (to some extent) by getting engaged to a more suitable girl. There are obvious similarities to *Room at the Top*, but despite his appetite for cigarettes, alcohol and women, Arthur Seaton is nothing like Joe Lampton; far from being on the make, he is a thorough-going anarchist without any ambitions at all and without any illusions about the affluent but unjust society we live in. He is a welcome new kind of working-class hero—neither villain nor buffoon, neither on his way up into prosperity nor on his way down into prison.

This part is perfectly played in the film by Albert Finney (who may also be seen in the current play of

Billy Liar at the Cambridge Theatre). I very much hope he will have several more parts like this before he is the great actor he looks like becoming, or before he is hauled off to Hollywood to play fashionable morons opposite fashionable harlots. As he is here, relatively inexperienced and clearly directed with unobtrusive skill, he gives a straight performance you will relish and remember for years.

But he is given no star position. Shirley Ann Field, as the girl-friend, reveals a bit more of the promise already shown in *The Entertainer*—though I think she is too glamorous for the part; I'm afraid she is due for the fatal star treatment now, but she may be a good enough actress to resist it. As for Rachel Roberts, as the first married woman, she lacks the majesty of Simone Signoret, no doubt, but her performance here is quite comparable to the analogous one in *Room at the Top*, and I find it more convincing at the point when she begins to cry it is as if you had just driven someone you love to tears—that awful shock of embarrassment and surprise and irritation.

The rest of the actors and the sets and soundtrack are so good that you don't notice them. This meticulous but unobtrusive attention to detail is of course characteristic of the good documentary film director, and Karel Reisz has made the transition from Free Cinema work like *We are the Lambeth Boys* to his first feature with conspicuous success. I think *Room at the Top* was a good film, but this one is better. Without straining for effect or relapsing for a moment into rhetoric or sensationalism, it makes its impact just because it doesn't seem to be trying to do so. I hope other film-makers will learn from it, and in the meantime I hope Karel Reisz will work on film versions of things like the Wesker *Trilogy*, *Billy Liar*, *Hurry on Down*,

Under the Net, *The Ginger Man*, *Absolute Beginners*—or at least on Alan Sillitoe's story *The Loneliness of the Long-Distance Runner*.

Despite my admiration, I should like to make three connected complaints. First, I am sorry the story has been expurgated—so that Arthur spills beer instead of spewing it, and Brenda fails to get rid of their baby. Apparently the Censor intervened here on the ground that girls in trouble might get ideas, but the hot-bath-and-gin technique described in the book is mentioned in the film too and is hardly an esoteric one; anyway the film is an "X", so what's the Censor doing? (But since "bloody" still brings roars of laughter, 46 years after *Pygmalion*, and "bastard" nearly induces apoplexy, I suppose some expurgation is inevitable).

Second, I am sorry the story has been altered in several other ways—so that Mrs. Bull is shot in the arse instead of the face, and the ending is quite different. It is true that this is the normal practice and that the author of the original novel wrote the alterations himself, but I still think it is a pity. Third, in anticipation of one obvious answer to the last complaint, I wish the film had been much longer—say 2½ hours instead of 1½—so that far more of the richly cinematic material in the book (including the other married woman) could have been included and the whole picture filled out in greater detail. I am sure most people would willingly sit through at least another hour of this sort of film; heaven knows most of us have sat through centuries of rubbish and gained nothing but eye-strain.

But enough complaining. This is an excellent film, and all praise to the people who went to a lot of trouble to make it against the opposition of the cinema Establishment. More power to their elbows—and more films from their studios!

N.W.

The influence of the American sociologists and the New Left may also be traced. I think the editorial comes pretty high on the list of competitors for the worst piece of writing this year. It breaks the most important rule of all—readability. No-one, even at Oxford, can possibly be so "advantageously situated" that they can afford to waste time wading through this sort of rubbish. There are also some unfortunate misprints: It is rather unkind to refer to the new *Isis* group as a "politically illiterate caucus distinguished by neither experience, intelligence or promise"—nasty syntactical howler at the end, too. But to proceed.

The rest of the magazine consists of two rather good poems, eight articles, and four pages of advertisements (14% of the total space, students of the "free press" may care to know); there is no list of contents. Of the four political articles, three are now out of date, though still interesting—Claude Bourdet's article on Bevan (published last July in *France Observateur*), an interview with Ronald Segal (last June), and Keith Botsford's account of McCarthyite goings on in Puerto Rico (last November)—and the fourth is an excellent analysis of Adenauer Germany by Thomas Metscher. There is a rather good article on jazz by Kingsley Shorter, and a rather good review of Simone de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex* (half of which has recently appeared in a paperback edition) by Sheila MacLeod. The two almost obligatory articles on Oxford are both first-rate.

The New University 1 is not an outstanding undergraduate magazine, but nothing in it descends to the level of its editorial—so don't be put off by that. It's a very good 6d. worth, and may be obtained from Dick Booth at Jesus College, Oxford, or from 129 Walton Street, Oxford. There is no indication how often the magazine will appear, so I suppose it depends on sales. Anyone who likes *New Left Review* or *Clarion* will enjoy it. If only there were enough money and readers for anarchist magazines of the same kind . . .

N.W.

DISOBEDIENCE

Continued from p. 1

his life as well as that of all the members of the community. (Such a community, in our humble opinion, would never dream of enriching itself at the expense of the misery of other communities. Real democracy is anarchism, is the abolition of national frontiers). And a community which has the possibility of thinking objectively cannot make mistakes of judgment. Or even if we express ourselves more modestly—that it cannot make as many or the same mistakes as a Government harried on all sides by pressure groups representing conflicting interests.

When, therefore, the *Guardian* admits that "democracy can be wrong as well as a dictatorship" it is admitting that what it calls a "democracy" is in fact no such thing. All this saying is that all governments can be wrong, and implicit in this judgment is that governments do not, however democratically elected, necessarily represent the best interests of the people, however admirably they may serve the interests of some sections of the community.

★

It will be objected by some, either that it is ridiculous to expect that everybody should be equally intelligent and able to express themselves on "complex issues", or that, after all, in the democracies people have the vote and that certain issues are then decided by a referendum.

On the first point we would first of all say that we wholeheartedly agree, and it is why in general we believe that most people could run their lives better than a handful of "elected" politicians succeed in doing for them. And that in particular if workers were allowed to assume responsibility for the jobs they do the results would be much more satisfactory both for consumer and producer. But we must add that we do not think that such a change can be effected overnight.

The idea that modern society has become so complex that only super-intellects can understand, unravel its problems and organise our daily lives, is a myth invented by those in managerial, technical, executive or political posts to maintain their economic and social privileges.

The so-called "tension" between nations are to a large degree the inventions of the professional politicians to justify their existence, their "indispensability" as well as a host of well-paid tax-free jobs with the para-governmental agencies which were started after the war (which fortunately for them created more "problems" than it solved!) While recognising the technical complexity of modern industrial production we should not be blind to the fact that the profit motive, the struggle for markets are determining and complicating factors. In a word, the "super-intellects" are geared to the interests of production for profit, irrespective of real needs, or the interests of the workers, as human beings. It is obvious to us that in a true democracy the organisation of industry would be based on (a) real needs, which would be expressed through some kind of consumers' organisations and (b) human considerations so far as the workers engaged in those industries are concerned. Thus, mechanical and technical efficiency would be invariably subordinated to human factors such as needs, and, what another generation used to call, "the dignity of Labour".

And here we come to the heart of the problem. What is intelligence? Is specialised knowledge more im-

A FORTNIGHT ago a Mr. John Docherty was arrested on a charge of being drunk and disorderly, brought before a Court, and fined five shillings. As he was leaving the Court he was recognised by a policewoman as a man who, some short time previously had been fined five pounds for insulting behaviour to the police, and had not paid the fine. He was accordingly brought back into the dock, and as he did not have five pounds on him at the time, was sentenced to prison for non-payment of the fine. During the course of this second procedure he denied ever having been accused and sentenced for insulting behaviour. However, his identity was later substantiated by other policemen involved in the first case.

It was proved later that the man in prison was not the one who had defaulted with his fine, but someone else of the same name. Mr. Docherty had asked to have his fingerprints taken, and these proved to the satisfaction of police, court officials and all, that he was in fact not their man. Independently of this, the police who had identified him had second thoughts and admitted to having made a mistake.

On the whole, the press considered the case to be a very humorous affair, which showed how existing life in England could be for Irish labourers. Even the imprisoned man, although he remarked that it was not so funny when you were on the inside of the story, said that he had no hard feelings.

The importance of the case is not so much that the police made a mistake, but that the magistrates believed their assertions, and that people can be put in prison as a result. Besides denying the charge on which he was imprisoned, Mr. Docherty gave a quite different date of birth to the man who had not paid the fine. Nevertheless, the officials who have been appointed to dispense justice clearly took the point of view that he

important than human understanding? Is the scientist or the technocrat whose world is the laboratory or the factory invariably a more intelligent human being than the fisherman whose world is his village, his larder the sea?

On the second point there can, surely, be no doubt. A vote, a referendum, are a farce where mass communications are in the hands of those who stand for inequality, privilege or the State—quite apart from the fact that a free man will never vote for another man to legislate on his behalf!

★

THE chances of changing government policies by persuasion on major issues are virtually nil, and some members of the CND have at last realised this. Hence the Committee of a Hundred. In a statement issued by Bertrand Russell and Michael Scott last week, justifying their plans for a civil disobedience campaign against nuclear weapons they accuse governments of deliberate deception and "politicians and the vast majority of newspapers" of "deliberately or mendaciously" underestimating the imminence of nuclear war.

In these circumstances, they continue, "the threatening disaster is so enormous that we feel compelled to take every action that is possible to awaken our compatriots, and ultimately all mankind, to the need of urgent and drastic changes of policy." The prevention of nuclear war is "a profound and imperative duty which must remain paramount while the danger persists."

"We are told to wait for the beneficent activities of congresses, committees, and Summit meetings. Bitter experience has persuaded us that to follow such advice would be utterly futile while the great Powers remain stubbornly determined to prevent agreement. Against the major forces that normally determine opinion, it is difficult to achieve more than a limited success by ordinary constitutional methods. We are told that in a democracy only lawful methods of persuasion should be used.

"Unfortunately, the opposition to sanity and mercy on the part of those who have power is such as to make persuasion by ordinary methods difficult and slow, with the result that, if

The Docherty Case

Our Not-So-Wonderful Police

was lying and had given a wrong age on one occasion, and that the policewoman was right in her identification. This was on a minor case in which no deep feelings or principles were involved in the original offences.

There have been two cases recently in which policemen have been accused of assault. In one of them four policemen were tried together on a charge of assaulting a young man. The case depended on the truth of their statements versus the truth of the assaulted man's. They were acquitted. Last week the *Daily Express* reporter brought a case against an Inspector alleging that he had been wrongfully arrested and beaten up at the police station on Guy Fawkes' night two years ago. Again the crux of the case lay in deciding who was telling the truth, the reporter or the policeman. He was acquitted. It is of course impossible to decide by merely reading reports of cases like these who was right. One can only accept the view of the jury that in these cases no assaults had been committed by the police. However, in the first of these cases the Judge himself declared that the policemen concerned had concocted a pack of lies to avoid any suspicion falling on them, and in the second the Judge mentioned the *esprit de corps* which undoubtedly exists among the force.

The principle put forward as that on which the British legal system is based calls for an objective assessment of the facts by the magistrates or jury, and to the best of their ability they carry this out. Many cases arise, however, like the ones above, in which the sole issue for the magistrates or jury to decide is: Which of the parties is telling the truth and which is lying? A recent example is the trial of John Lawrence, the St. Pancras communist, for inciting people to break through a police cordon during the evictions of tenants from their flats. Lawrence described the evidence against

such methods alone are employed, we shall probably all be dead before our purpose can be achieved.

"Respect for law is important and only a very profound conviction can justify actions which flout the law. It is generally admitted that, in the past, many such actions have been justified. Christian martyrs broke the law and there can be no doubt that majority opinion at the time condemned them. We in our day are asked to acquiesce passively, if not actively, in policies clearly leading to tyrannical brutalities, compared with which all former horrors sink into insignificance. We cannot do this, any more than Christian martyrs could acquiesce in worship of the Emperor."

A movement of civil disobedience will probably not succeed in removing the threat of nuclear weapons. But it may well do something to shake enough people in this country and the world into new ways of thinking. For what is above all needed is to break down the universal and unquestioning acceptance that the social structure of Western society is based on some kind of absolutes which have been forged through the centuries and are therefore immutable. And the first of these immutable we need to question is that "Respect for law is important". All governments justify their actions with the "law". And where laws do not exist they invent them so as to make their actions legal!

To resort to civil disobedience is a big step to take, and we think that those who take part in such a movement must clearly realise that in so doing they will be doing much more than protesting against nuclear weapons. They will in effect be challenging the authority of the State, of government and "law and order". It is time intelligent people did, but it would be foolish and their action doomed to failure if they were not deeply conscious of the real social implications of their actions. And for this reason they must expect that the authorities will take off their kid gloves to deal with them. Remember the energy with which they dealt with the Rent strikers of St. Pancras!

him as untrue, and suggested that the officer had been watching a television play and had taken on himself the mantle of the heroic Sheriff. The magistrate believed the police and put Lawrence in gaol for three months.

Behind all the procedure of the courts lies the assumption that policemen are likely to be telling the truth, and their opponents are much more readily suspected of lying, even though the opposite has been proved to be true quite often. While the victim can substantiate his side of the story, with fingerprints, or as in the case of a man accused some years ago at Golders Green of breaking into a house using one of his

arms that he proved was paralysed, he can get away. When there are only eye-witness accounts, what can the defendant do but stick to his story? He can always follow the friendly advice to plead guilty and get away with a lighter sentence, as many people arrested at demonstrations do.

The people who sit in courts and judge their fellow men come from the influential and conservative section of society. However independent of the police they may be, they are on the same side. The fault of the legal system is not that its members are dishonest; that could easily be put right. It is that they are so honest, in the light of their own attitudes and assumptions about society. Anyone likely to fall into the clutches of the law should be concerned about this, and as the above cases show, this does not only mean criminals and anarchists.

P.H.

From the United States

First Libertarian League Conference

A CONFERENCE of the Libertarian League was held on July 2nd and 3rd. The scene of this gathering, our first general get-together since the first group of the League was founded in New York in July, 1954, was the important steel centre of Youngstown, Ohio.

Over two dozen League members from Detroit, Cleveland, New York, Milwaukee and Youngstown participated. Unfortunately there was no representation from the West Coast. Distance, and the problems of time, employment, etc., had made this impossible.

The Conference had been called primarily to discuss organisational matters and the greater part of the discussions dealt with means of improving our educational and recruiting efforts. Shortcomings as well as advances were noted, differences were aired, and "linen" was "laundered".

Some steps were taken for decentralisation of tasks which have heretofore (and still are largely) handled by the New York Group. It was decided that Corresponding Secretaries in Youngstown and in San Francisco should henceforth take charge of contact work in Ohio and Western Pennsylvania and California respectively. Carlos Cortez of Milwaukee, whose poems are familiar to readers of the *Industrial Worker*, agreed to assume responsibility for the artwork in *Views and Comments*. Russell Blackwell will continue as Corresponding Secretary for international contact and for general League correspondence apart from that in the above mentioned areas.

The general feeling prevailed that the League would not yet be prepared to hold its First Congress in the summer of 1961 as had been planned. This Congress when held should formally establish and integrate the Libertarian League as a federation of U.S. and Canadian groups. A longer preparatory period is needed. It was, however, decided that a Second Conference be held on Labor Day weekend next year. The summer of

1962 is now the "target date" for the League's First Congress.

Our movement is still in an amorphous, embryonic stage which must be recognised if we are not to deceive ourselves. We do not aspire to erect a big house of cards, but rather to lay firm foundations for a serious responsible organisation. The establishment of a federation will only have meaning if it is based on a number of functioning local groups. The Youngstown Conference, bringing together as it did a number of people from various cities, was a milestone in this direction. The Anarchist Movement in U.S.A.

MAKING THE LAW FIT THE CRIME

PRETORIA, OCTOBER 21.

Mr. Erasmus, South African Minister of Justice, announced here tonight that legislation will be introduced at the forthcoming parliamentary Session to indemnify the State and its officials against claims resulting from action taken during the Sharpeville and Langa riots last March and the subsequent state of emergency.

The legislation would cover the shooting at Sharpeville on March 21, in which 67 Africans were killed and 176 wounded, and the anti-pass book demonstrations at Langa, which occurred in the same month. The state of emergency was declared on March 31.

Mr. Erasmus said it had come to the Government's attention that a large number of people intended to institute claims against the State or its officials. The Government was convinced that the action taken in March was imperative for the prevention and suppression of disorder, and "it has been the practice in the past to pass indemnifying legislation to prevent successful institution of claims against the State or its officials as the result of action taken in good faith with the viewpoints mentioned in mind."

Reuter.

FREEDOM PRESS

SELECTIONS FROM 'FREEDOM'

- Vol. 1, 1951, *Mankind is One*
 Vol. 2, 1952, *Postscript to Posterity*
 Vol. 3, 1953, *Colonialism on Trial*
 Vol. 4, 1954, *Living on a Volcano*
 Vol. 5, 1955, *The Immoral Moralists*
 Vol. 6, 1956, *Oil and Troubled Waters*
 Vol. 7, 1957, *Year One—Sputnik Era*
 Vol. 8, 1958, *Socialism in a Wheelchair*
 Vol. 9, 1959, *Print, Press & Public*

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

PAUL ELTZBACHER:
Anarchism (Seven Exponents of the Anarchist Philosophy) cloth 21s.

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

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

E. A. GUTKIND:
The Expanding Environment 8s. 6d.
 HERBERT READ:
Poetry and Anarchism cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d.
The Philosophy of Anarchism boards 2s. 6d.
The Education of Free Men 1s.

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

RUDOLF ROCKER:
Nationalism and Culture cloth 21s.

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

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

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

17a Maxwell Road, Fulham,
 London, S.W.6

The Effluent Society

Following upon a resolution on the Mass-Media passed by the N.U.T. at their last annual conference, representatives from the Press, Television, Advertising, Education, the political parties, the Ministries, etc., have had a three-day meeting to discover where the smell comes from in this effluent society. Unable to show conclusively that it is an intrinsic fault of television tubes, printing presses and film projectors that they won't run efficiently unless lubricated generously with plenty of violence and greed subject matter, the delegates passed the buck to one another or simply played it down.

Popular Culture and Personal Responsibility was the theme of the conference and the opening address was given by the Home Secretary, Mr. R. A. Butler. According to the Daily Herald he attacked parents who failed to bring up their children properly (this is the safest and most usual gambit)—but he did suggest that teachers had their part to play. Then, concerning horror, violence and sex on T.V., he said "I hope that rising educational standards will help to drive out the shoddy and second-rate". Now, for a start, what did he mean by that? Are we to believe that Mr. Butler wants the

controllers of T.V. to attend classes at our Colleges of Further Education? Obviously not. Does he, under the illusion that teenagers and tiny tots control T.V., believe that when they are better educated they will replace *Double Your Money* and *Whiplash with Tender Stories of Gentle Jesus*? We have our doubts. He was probably taking avoiding action.

Every Saturday afternoon T.V. viewers can watch wrestlers taking turns at throwing each other about and groaning in simulated agony in a show that is presented as a programme of serious wrestling fights. Even the two commentators give no hint, apart from their rather composed voices (their faces don't appear on the screen—so you can't see if they have their tongues in their cheeks), that the wrestlers are acting. Now in this case the T.V. authorities cannot say they are giving the public what it wants unless they can prove that the public want to be deceived! The only explanation that seems to make sense here is that the box office stands to lose if the women and children and the more gullible of the menfolk are informed as to the real nature of these bouts. Perhaps Mr. Butler

would find some other explanation for it?

Arnold Wesker, the playwright, called for Juke Box Jury type lessons in culture in the schools. He reckoned that the ability to divide four by two might be used to share out the proceeds of a bank robbery if not backed up with moral guidance. So he apparently kicked the ball into the schoolyard. But then he's a playwright.

Sociologist Dr. Mark Abrams dismissed the role played by T.V. in delinquency as insignificant and claimed that real-life anger and violence by adults familiar to them affected children much more than a hundred killings on the screen. How right he is! Yet, if reports are adequate, he wasn't going any further than that thank you. Many of us, had the Anarchists been invited to the conference, would have mentioned words like *Polaris* and *Suez* and *Hola* in that context.

Both the director of BBC television and the deputy chairman of ATV concurred in the evasive view that children should be in bed early so that we adults can corrupt ourselves in secrecy. That's two bucks passed to the parents so far. In similar vein the secretary of the

British Film Institute plumped for raising the X cert. age from 16 to 18. Now the government has got it.

Finally, the general secretary of the N.U.T. in his summing up, would not have the buck passed to the schools—so he kicked it around till he lost it. But that is not all really because a film director, Karel Reisz, had said earlier, on the subject of artistic freedom, that "The money people certainly affect what goes on the screen".

The power of money was actually noted by one of the delegates! But, it seems, it was only within the narrow context of a hamstrung film director who wanted the Baddies to beat the Goodies just for once on the screen—like they do in real life most of the time. It slipped out just like that. Did any of the delegates notice it? Of course "the money people" affect screen programmes. So do they affect T.V. and Newspapers and Magazines and Books and clothing styles and that most fundamental thing in our lives the *Your Money*, pictures of half-naked, breastful young women bleeding from stab wounds, fantastic double-pointed and stiletto-heeled shoes, prostitute set-ups that pass as life partnerships, all are largely the result of people allowing money to rule their lives.

This is not to say that the profit motive can explain every malaise of our society. It would be difficult to explain why Bill Bloggs watches *Double Your Money* every Thursday night on those grounds entirely. Bill Bloggs doesn't get paid to watch it. Indeed the controllers of T.V. would take it off pretty quick if Bill and his friends stopped watching it. Perhaps it is that he has nothing better to do and wants something quite different from his monotonous job. And if he has nothing better to do it is because ever since he was a kid—ever since they made him a Christian at the age of 3 months—his life has been ordered for him. So Bill actually *wants* his life directed for him. He even thinks the T.V. authorities are giving him a choice of programme. What a choice! As the Editor of the *Times Ed. Supp.* has it "They (people who claim that

the viewer has a choice) also omit to mention the steps which are taken through the advertisers to ensure that when people do choose, their choice is convenient to them."

Bill Bloggs was a schoolboy once. Notwithstanding all that worshipping in Assembly and the Sermon on the Mount, the things he really learnt at school were that you do what you are told and if you are lucky enough and clever enough to pass the tests they set, you will get your reward not in a future existence but in this society—in hard cash. *Double Your Money* isn't half so ruthless as the ordinary school. Now was he told that it was a bad thing to gamble on the Stock Exchange—unless you lost. After all, Jesus said nothing about the Stock Exchange or Telly.

So everybody watches *Double Your Money*. And all the brains in the country don't know why.

Do they imagine that the television promoters would put on shows they don't really like putting on if they were paid only £10 per week for doing it?

The conference was a flop. They could explain its poor coverage in the press. It was a game of hide the thimble—where the thimble was purposely disposed of before the game started.

E.F.C.

Their Little Baby's Got a Bomb Too

PERHAPS the most common argument against the dissolution of the state, among people who bother to think about such things at all, is this: the mass of people are incapable of ruling themselves—maybe thee and me are sensible, reasonable, capable of controlling our aggressive impulses, working long enough to maintain our end of the social contract, but THEY? No, alas, for they are too stupid, too short-sighted, too nasty, too irresponsible, too selfish, and so forth, to manage their own affairs and those of their social relations, without guidance by those who - know - more - about - what - is - going - on - than - them (us).

Any child is too nasty, too short-sighted, too stupid (ignorant), too irresponsible, too selfish, and so forth, to manage its own personal affairs, and it does not learn how to manage them by having Papa and Mama take care of them for him. It does learn from experience—sometimes it steps on a rotten ladder and breaks its leg or spills milk, or hits Johnny on the nose—and also some (but not as much as by experience) by education by others—Mama tells him how to tie his shoe, helps him do it a while, explains that hitting Johnny is an inferior form of social relationship, etc.

If, however, like the modern state, Papa and Mama don't allow the child to gain experience—at some risk inevitably—then the child must either go through a painful adolescence and rebellion where he forcibly overthrows Mama and, at great expense to himself and those around him, learn the art of taking care of himself—avoiding rotten ladders and temper tantrums—all at once when nearly adult (which is harder and much more likely to be a failure than if he learned it in his chronological childhood), or, if he doesn't learn it, remain a perpetual child. This is quite horrible, as anyone who knows a man of 50 living with his mother in a dark little house can testify or who has observed schizoid personalities in action or who know people who've never passed the oral stage. The personality which did not go through the process of exploration and experience and education as a child, the victim of repressive parents and guardians, remain babies of the mind, becoming repressed childish adults, who are passive—dependent or boistrous—dependent depending upon certain other circumstances, without the modicum amount of the acquired arts of self-direction, without the ability to act when circumstances make it necessary to—he waits, as his world falters

(and sometimes falls) about him, for someone else to tell him what to do.

On the social level one cannot expect too much different a response. The State has for centuries served as a bad parent rather than a good one. It has repressed the individual rather than allowing him to grow into self-reliance, doing his social relationships for him rather than letting him do them himself (if we'd had a proper childhood, we'd have had the opportunity to learn these relationships piece by piece rather than all at once or not at all), and not even educating him for self rule in the future, but like a possessive Mama, tries to brainwash society into a condition where it finds the state necessary for its continued functioning. The state tells people how necessary it is, how society would fall apart without it: it creates circumstances and habits of doing things where the state is a necessary and controlling factor. The State has failed in its part in social evolution, by refusing to reduce and finally withdraw from the life of society. Unfortunately society is put in the position of a repressed adolescent, who though it has all of the mental and mechanical equipment for adulthood, must learn how to act, to think, and to do, from scratch on its own or not at all—such adolescences are usually stormy, and have their unpleasant moments.

If one can extend this analogy further, the adolescent finally free of parental control "kicks up his heels," he tries cigarettes, drinking, sex, high living, and laziness, but then, when and if he passes the adolescent phases, he throws away the oral fetishes and the irresponsibility, and keeps what is good in his growing up behaviour, for an adult life which is more satisfying for himself and others—he can give as well as take—something a child has a very hard time doing.

We are at this time in history still social children, though we are physically, scientifically, and in terms of communications adults, or near adults, and since the "parent" will not do its job and relinquish its power, society, the object of its power must tear itself from it, and go through its maturing process itself. An adolescence, a period of learning, sometimes painful, sometimes inefficient and deadend paths are taken, sometimes beneficial and creative experiences made and participated in, is necessary for the individual and society to reach its adulthood. Adolescence, no matter how trying, on its way to adulthood is better than perpetual childhood,

no matter how easy it is to stay in that childhood condition, especially when that childhood has reached a pathological stage of development in our society, which has the mechanical complexity of the "adult" without the social maturity of a 14-year-old. This condition is at best frustrating—note the dearth of great art, poetry, prose and philosophy in our age, note the increase in social neuroses—beatniks, mental illness, boredom, etc.—and at worst (like now), in addition to taking the "heart" out of society, giving it a schizoid dull brave-new-world-quality, leads to destructive misuse of energy. Wars and purges, suicidal drives to self-annihilation and annihilation of other societies. Temper tantrums in an age of bombs and gas are on the social level on the "razor's edge" just as a child waving a loaded gun in a temper tantrum is on the "razor's edge". World war one, two, the purges, fascism, McCarthyism, totalitarianism, all involve social temper tantrums. Considering the weapons at our disposal the next one (tantrum) may be fatal.

Modern societies have their own weapons, their frustrations, their inability to control irrational drives, the suppressions and repressions. They are always told what to do by a force (the state) superimposed upon them. At this time, who will do the telling?

BETTY BLANCK.

The Deficit!

WEEK 44

Deficit on Freedom	£880
Contributions received	£804
DEFICIT	£76

October 21 to October 27

Surrey: F.B.* 5/-; London: P. & G.T.* 3/9;
Stockwell: Anon.* 2/6; Baltimore: M.E.M.
7/-; London: R.W. 1/3; Morden: S.M. 2/-;
Wolverhampton: J.G.L.* 5/-; Isleworth:
L.K.W. 2/6; London: A.M.B. 5/-; Glasgow:
J.S.A. 10/6; Hull: R.J.W. 10/-; Germiston:
V.D. 3/-.

Total	2 17 6
Previously acknowledged	801 19 8
1960 TOTAL TO DATE	£804 17 2

*Indicates regular contributor.

People and Ideas

Continued from p. 2

any we have known for thousands of years—that of adjusting ourselves to the idea of living in holes." The final result might be that factories, apartment houses and stores would be built in caves, and eventually most human life would be underground, confronted by arsenals capable of destroying all life on land.

"Deep under the ground people would be relatively safe—at least until such time as scientists learned how to make explosions capable of pulverising the earth to greater depths."

★

It is interesting that only one British newspaper found this report newsworthy. Yet we too are deeply involved in the policy which Wright Mills calls crackpot realism. Not only as junior partner in the American alliance, and Airstrip One in American strategy. For while in this country (presumably) the military lobby is by no means so influential and less directly connected with the industrialists, the point is that they don't need to be, because a deep community of interests exists anyway.

For the fact is that not merely is there

a military-industrial-political power elite with a vested interest in crackpot realism, but there is also a community of interest that spreads all the way down the line to the humblest employee of the most modest sub-contractor in the electronics and aircraft industries. It is said that in the new town of Stevenage the suggestion was used in last year's general election campaign that the jobs of local employees of De Havilland's and English Electric would be jeopardised by a Labour victory, which, it was said, would make the ending of defence contracts likely, and consequently would bring unemployment in the boom town of the guided missile industry. Similarly, as Dave Dillinger noted in *FREEDOM* a fortnight ago, the question that is regularly hurled at those who have been demonstrating at the Polaris submarine base in New London, Connecticut is *Where else can I earn three dollars an hour?*

The rise of the warlords is accompanied by the rise of the troglodytes, the cave-dwellers of the future who know on which side their bread is buttered.

C.W.

Meetings and Announcements

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP and MALATESTA DEBATING SOCIETY

IMPORTANT

MEETINGS WILL BE HELD in basement, 5, Caledonian Road, N.1 (near King's Cross Station) Sundays at 7.30 p.m. All Welcome.

NOV. 6.—A. Rajk on THE VOCABULARY OF POLITICS
NOV. 13.—Tony Gibson on THE PRESS AS A SOURCE OF MISINFORMATION
NOV. 20.—Ian Leslie on Subject to be announced.
NOV. 27.—Ian Celnick on THE KRONSTADT REVOLT.

London Anarchist Group AN EXPERIMENT IN OFF-CENTRE DISCUSSION MEETINGS

1st Thursday of each month at 8 p.m. At Jack and Mary Stevenson's, 6 Stainton Road, Enfield, Middx.
Last Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. At Dorothy Barasi's, 45 Twyford Avenue, Fortis Green, N.2.
1st Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. At Colin Ward's, 33 Ellerby Street, Fulham, S.W.6.

Study Group on Non-Violent Defence

(Organised by CND) Every Thursday at 8 p.m. at 18 Campden Grove, W.8. Admission 1/-.

NOV. 10.—James Henderson on RESISTANCE TO TOTALITARIANISM: A GERMAN CASE HISTORY

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
17a Maxwell Road
London, S.W.6. England
Tel.: Renown 3736