FREEDOM

MARCH 9 1963 Vol 24 No 8

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY - 4d.

'It's criminal to steal a purse, daring to steal a fortune, a mark of greatness to steal a crown. The blame diminishes as the guilt increases.'

FRIEDRICH VON SCHILLER

In this Issue:

EXPORT THE Ph. Ds !

FOR years the government has exhorted us to EXPORT. Now we are exporting our top-scientists (our Ph.Ds) as well as our cars, and the government's spokesmen far from rejoicing at the fact, lament that the United States' gain is Britain's loss. Let us at least be thankful that our Ph.Ds don't do a Pontecorvo, and give the £20,000 it costs us to pave their way, to Mr. K (Moscow). As the feature writers of our press are at pains to point out, our top scientists are not interested in money. They would love to stay with us, and win the Nobel prizes for Queen and Country—and discover the last word in human annihilation for the benefit of mankind; and they are only too anxious to keep us informed and interested in what they are about, on Radio and T.V. (for a fee, of course).

We cannot understand Lord Hailsham's indignation. He complains that the demands of American Universities are not catered for by American High Schools. An American could equally argue that British appetites are not catered for by British agriculture. America and Canada may well be gasping for British Ph.Ds.; but we in this country would be *literally starving* but for the farmers of Canada and the United States. As a matter of fact the situation is more favourable than we make it appear. Britain only exports 140 Ph.Ds a year, that is, on Lord Hailsham's figure of £20,000 per brain, the equivalent of 2,800 Jaguars per annum (motor fans, please correct us if we underestimate the Jags!). *Par contre* (a Jag expression for "on the other hand") a *Guardian* editorial indignantly informs us (liberal fair-play and all that) that after the Hailsham *cris-de-coeur* (trans: mock indignation) it was learned that the American investment in British Universities, Ph.Ds *et alia* amounted to no less than £1,350,000. For a non-profit journal (it's losing money since it aspired to be a National) which always considers pelf as important as principle, it is not surprising that the *Guardian* should have engaged in a quick bit of mental arithmetic and found that the old country had lost on the deal. To console the *Guardian*'s editor and others who might be spending sleepless nights over the brain-drain we suggest that the more scientists this country exports the-better-we-shall be. It's not what the Ph.D. costs to train that matters; it's what he costs in expensive brain storms once he is let loose!

The United States spends no less than £5,000m a year on research, of which more than a half goes on so-called "defence", while a mere £400m goes on medical research. There is no end to pure scientific research just as there can be no end to technological development, and obviously in this technological and capitalist age one can be sure that the scientists will be the last to suggest that our know-how has reached a point where it can stop, or at least suggest transferring the know-hows to those countries struggling to get on their feet. A case in point is the development of the airplane. There seems to be no limit to the speeds that can be attained. Is that a rational argument for seeking to develop faster machines?

The alarm expressed in this country over the "brain-drain" is based on considerations of Industrial development and competition for markets. There are those too who are concerned with the question from the military point of view (hence the comparisons with the numbers of scientists turned out by the Russian colleges). We are much more concerned at the prospect of our universities becoming swamped by scientists and technocrats. And this of course any government would be in a position to do without much opposition.

One of the drained brains interviewed by the *Daily Herald*'s reporter declared that "In England nobody was interested in reaching for the moon—I am", and on reading this our first reaction is to suggest that we should encourage the export business in Ph.Ds, so that we can be left to reach for something more modest, and in human terms, more real!

A Banker's view

Dangers of World Recession

[The following article was referred to in our last issue, but was unfortunately omitted.—EDS.]

Two signals which gave warning of the onset of the great world slump 30 years ago—falling stock market prices and falling prices of primary products —have reappeared. The question whether these trends might once again herald a serious recession in world trade is examined in some detail by Mr. A. R. Conan, the economist, in an article in the "Westminster Bank Review."

Mr. Conan attributes the fall in international stock market prices to pressure on profit margins and doubts as to the future outlook. He points to excess capacity in basic industries such as steel, oil and chemicals and leading manufactures like cars and paper. Unemployment is causing concern, at least in the US and the UK. All this suggests that for the first time since the war the productive capacity of industrial countries may now exceed current and prospective demand. Should this prove generally true, it would involve a check to the pace of expansion and perhaps lead to depression.

As for the second signal, the evidence of maladjustment in the markets for primary products, Mr. Conan argues that the demand for commodities is governed by the state of the industrial economies. Commodity prices as a whole have been falling since 1952 and though there are some notable exceptions, the general weakness continues. Countries depending on exports of primary products have already seen their export earnings restricted and any sudden deterioration would seriously affect the import capacity of these countries.

The marked contrast between industrial countries and under-developed countries has been noted for some years.

If the UK had entered the Common Market, Mr. Conan argues, this would probably have restricted the exports of the primary producing countries still further. The fact that free entry for Commonwealth produce now seems likely to be maintained here will at least be helpful. But there are other ominous trends to be watched. The massive expansion of world trade we have seen since the end of the last war has been associated with an immense outflow of capital from the advanced countries, particularly the US and the UK, to the less developed parts of the world. There are signs that the flow of capital may not be maintained at the high level reached in recent years.

Next, the International Bank is finding it increasingly difficult to maintain the scale of its annual lending because more and more borrowing countries are reaching the limit of the debt they can safely undertake to service. The flow of private capital may also level out and possibly decline.

All this does not amount to a prediction that we are about to encounter a world slump but Mr. Conan thinks that the dangers are sufficiently serious to be studied and faced.

"The essential policy objectives", he concludes, "must comprise at least a high level of imports into the US, the UK and the 'Six', as well as the maintenance of large-scale capital exports from creditor countries." Unfortunately, these conditions cannot be guaranteed. We are travelling close to a precipice with little margin to spare for bursts of temper or violent disputes among the travellers.

(*Guardian*).

Behind the Government Crisis ?

BIG-VERSUS BIGGER-BUSINESS

THERE'S no doubt about it, whatever the government says or does these days is not only seized upon by the Opposition but is unfavourably publicised by the capitalist press. One suspects that while not going so far as wanting the Labour Party returned to office, Big Business, Finance and influential Tories are tired of Macmillan, and hope that a government shake-up will result in a change in their present fortunes. Clearly, no Tory in his senses wants a general election at this time; on the other hand they must believe that even if postponed until next year, as seems likely, their chances of winning, will be even more remote unless, in the intervening period, the government can record apparent successes, and introduce measures which have a popular appeal. Only a new-look Cabinet could create the impression of tackling the ever-growing economic and power-political problems with zest and fresh "ideas", whatever it does in reality!

The fact that the government is at present being shot at from the Unions as well as from those who would rather be dead (or emigrate to the Bahamas) than vote-in a Labour government, is to our minds, a pointer as to the nature of the government "crisis". In other words, the "crisis" is not being provoked by the Unions, but by dissatisfied sections of the privileged class who can see themselves being sacrificed in the interests of the Corporations with their international ramifications, and their ability to command the "best brains", and the markets, as well as control government policies and the money markets. We consider it highly significant that at a time when *Big* Business is drawing on its reserves in order to maintain its dividends, *Bigger* Business is reporting a record year. Four examples we have noted in the past fortnight will illustrate our point: Unilever profits in 1962 amounted to £106.5 million, an increase of £3m on 1961; I.C.I. profits rose from £61.8m to £70.4m; the Royal Dutch Shell Group's 1962 profits at £204.5m was 14½ per cent higher than in 1961, exceeding by more than £4.5m forecasts made last October And Woolworth's increased their profit by £2.4m to £35m in 1962. And 1962 was-the-year-that (-was) marked a meteoric rise in unemployment as well as a growing profit-crisis in Big-Business. We are therefore entitled to assume that the present disenchantment with the government stems from those capitalists who see their interests threatened not by the Unions but by their capitalist Big Brothers. The disunity among the capitalists over the Common Market negotiations is, we suggest, confirmation of our thesis. It follows therefore that, apart from personal ambitions, Macmillan's desperate attempts to fit Britain into the framework of the Common Market, must identify him as a spokesman for Bigger- rather than Big- Business. If our conjectures are correct, and Mr. Mac. retires on the grounds of ill-health, or because of a need to give more attention to the family business, or perhaps to offer to posterity his intimate memoirs, before the next general election, it would be reasonable to assume that his successor would be the mouthpiece of the anti-Common Market, anti-Bigger Business, anti-Take-Over section of the Capitalist class. From the workers' point of view, merely a palace revolution; the parasites would still be on their backs, and the need to shake them off would remain unaffected, unchanged!

★

THE foregoing considerations, rather than the pacific well-meaning aspirations of advocates of world government, such as Bertrand Russell, influence us in opposing, or being suspicious of, *all schemes aiming at establishing supranational "authorities within the context of the capitalist system.* For though we are delighted that among the capitalists, the law of the Jungle, and not co-operation and solidarity, reigns supreme, we are also filled with apprehension by the growth of the vast, international, industrial monopolies that are the result of this struggle between capitalists. That such a monopolistic system could, if universal, dispense with war as a basic feature of the society we live in, as a feasible argument since, after all, war in our time is the result of rival capitalist interests being unable to soilve their differences (when it is not a way of solving their problems!). But it is not difficult to visualise at what price such "peace" would be bought by the world's underprivileged majority.

If one accepts capitalism—that is production and distribution for profit—as not only a practical but as an equitable (*i.e. fair*) system, then to our minds, the chances are that *monopoly* capitalism would ensure that the greatest number of our fellow beings would *be allowed* to secure by their efforts, the means of life, as compared with the *laissez faire* capitalism dreamed of by Beaverbrook *et alia*. It is our opinion that within the next decade there will be either conventional war (and not *against* Russia) or the wholesale financial colonialisation of the "underdeveloped" territories (not *by* Russia). We cannot, on the evidence, put forward the third possibility, of revolution, because the have-not half of the world will clutch at every capitalist straw for survival, and the "affluent" other half is now so conditioned that it will not let go of what it *has* to fight for its *secret wants*.

But these, to our minds are distractions and just as yo-yos yesteryear and hula-hoops in the recent past could not fill the boredom and emptiness of life as-it-is-today, so we assume full bellies, refrigerators,

Continued on page 3

Inside the Labour Party

"OUTSIDE THE RIGHT", by Fenner Brockway, George Allen & Unwin, 25s.

FENNER BROCKWAY is a prolific and interesting writer, and has written biographies of several of the old socialists of the I.L.P. as well as his autobiographical works.

Inside the Left took the story up to the outbreak of war in 1939, and the present book carries on from there, although there is very little about the war years themselves.

I read *Inside the Left* while still at school, under the influence of the first flush of excitement at having 'discovered' revolutionary socialism, and it was from the account given in that book that I made the aquaintance of the problems of pre-war politics; the anti-war movement and conscientious objection, the disputes between Communist and non-Communist left, the Spanish revolution, the tactical questions of socialism and anarchism, violence and non-violence, and whether to join the Labour Party or not.

Without looking up my copy, I can remember how it played a part in stimulating and developing my ideas. The author's war-time resistance and his descriptions of the personalities of the European revolutionary socialists compared with the Social Democratic leaders led me to admire a rational commitment to socialist ideas, a feeling which has resisted years of exposure to Stirnerism. His description of the Spanish anarchists, who lived and breathed an atmosphere of freedom and equality, yet who were armed to the teeth and prepared, if need be, to fight and kill to defend their freedom led me away from pure pacifism. His remark that after spending three years in prison and three in parliament, he had seen more characters degenerate in the latter place, and his discussion of the relationship of the revolutionary left to the Labour Party, concluding that the structure of the Party made it impossible for a left wing socialist to work in it, reinforced my support for the I.L.P. at the time, and probably contributed to my eventual turn to anarchism, despite the fact that by that time Brockway himself had gone over to the Labour Party.

In this later book, Fenner Brockway speaks of Parliament after a general election as resembling a school at the beginning of a new year. Some boys have left and a lot of new boys are just starting. He gives an astonishingly frank account of the way in which most of the "left wing" M.P.s have found it difficult even to vote for socialism agains their party, one of the supposed reasons for putting them there. After specialising most of his life in the anti-colonialist movement, he has to admit to concern over the dictatorships established by the African nationalist leaders.

I doubt whether anyone will be inspired by *Outside the Right* as I was by the earlier book. It is far too "chatty", and few of the people chatted about have got anything to do with socialism. The author starts off by saying that his place is inside the mass workers' movement, and speaks of fifteen years in the political wilderness, but he does not show convincingly that the Labour Party is a mass workers' movement, or that the compromises, manoeuvres and puzzling about which of half a dozen bad decisions is least bad, is not wilderness enough for anyone.

Nor unfortunately, do the concluding chapters on "The Dilemma of the Left" and "What's it all about" get to grips with the problems of socialism in modern society, although the author comes nearest to an anarchist view in pin-pointing the socialist challenge on the question of power and control in industry, rather than simply total production and wage rates; while the summing up of *Inside the Left* with its emphasis on the contributions of individual socialists, and the maintenance of internationalism and hope for the future against the darkness of the warring capitalist states did have something important to say, although anarchists will disagree with many of its political conclusions.

The chapter on "The M.P.'s double life" describes the individual problems of some of the writer's constituents, and one cannot fail to admire his efforts in helping them. It is valuable work, but again, not specifically socialist, and it would not be difficult to find examples of right wing Labour, or Tory M.P.s who have shown sterling qualities in helping their constituents in personal difficulties.

Obviously, I found this a disappointing book. With the encouraging growth of libertarian and anti-governmental attitudes within the last few years, one would have expected the left wing Labour faction to have rendered a rather more spirited account of themselves, and argued their case more persuasively than Brockway does here. In the *New Statesman* 8/2/63, Stuart Hampshire makes a "Plea for Materialism", and criticises the libertarian school of thought round Paul Goodman, challenging them to be more precise about what they think is wrong with society and what they propose to do about it. The point may well be valid, carrying as it does the implication that libertarians would be hard put to crystallise themselves to such precision, but it could be addressed to the political socialists with even more destructive effect.

Fenner Brockway has obviously done a lot of good works, and has been inside something, but it has not been socialism.

P.H.

Against High Productivity

DEAR SIRS,

Brian Leslie (FREEDOM 16/2/63) says I argue "that productivity would not have developed as it has in an anarchist society . . . ; that it is capitalism which has developed productivity; capitalism is evil; therefore productivity is evil." This, he rightly says, is a *non sequitur*. It is also a travesty of my argument.

What I argue is: that a technological revolution, plus the impulse of a capitalist class to raise productivity, led to modern industrial capitalism; modern capitalism is far worse, on the whole, than the older varieties; therefore the fruits of technology and the drive to raise productivity seem to be evil, at least in a capitalist world. But in an anarchist world, technological progress and the drive to raise productivity would be frustrated by the very nature of anarchist society (with its small economic units and lack of capital for investment). *so that no distinction between the uses of high productivity under capitalism and its uses under anarchism is possible.* Under anarchism it would not be there to be used.

I am well aware of the other distinction Brian mentions—that between productivity and production, and I entirely agree that "there is no reason on earth to object on principle to productivity in itself." Productivity *in itself* is merely a ratio (between input and output), and anybody who produces anything is productive! What I object to is *high* productivity (by modern standards), which necessitates a mass-society and is thus anti-libertarian. Brian, of course, thinks that high productivity would be attainable under anarchism, but he has not explained how. If, as he says, a good case can be made for this thesis, I do wish he would make it, and deal with my counter-arguments, instead of just referring me to the works of Lewis Mumford (I thought he was against referring to authorities as a substitute for argument).

As for the workers' resistance to the industrial revolution, I agree that *one* reason for this was probably that they were working for capitalist bosses. But surely there were other reasons? Mere dislike of change was probably one, but more important, perhaps, was revulsion against the regimentation, the death of individual craftsmanship, and the general alienation of the worker which are all inevitable under *any* system (capitalist, "socialist" or whatever) aiming at the high degree of productive efficiency regarded as normal today.

Geoffrey Boardman (same issue) is convinced of "the impossibility of large-scale production in an anarchist world.' Yet he asks: given automation and "spiritual maturity", could not man "control the machine" instead of being enslaved by it? If by "machine" he means the machinery of large-scale production, he already knows the answer: because you cannot *have* large-scale production in an anarchist, or free world.

If, however, his idea is that automation could make small-scale production as efficient in the future as large-scale production is at present (so that even a small anarchist community could achieve high productivity), then I just cannot agree. Could he, or Brian Leslie, describe an automated anarchist community, sufficiently small and independent to be genuinely self-governing, and explain plausibly how it builds and maintains its expensive machinery, how its scientists and technicians get their expensive training and expensive research-facilities, and how the other members of this *small* community manage to meet all this expense *and* enjoy living-standards as high as present-day workers? Hardly! *Automation pays only in a mass-society.*

Man is not *irrevocably* doomed by his own inventions: he is always capable of enlightenment, and this is where the mystical philosophies can help. (Incidentally, these have not "obviously failed", as F.B. wrote in FREEDOM, 19/1/63. It is the human species that seems about to fail through neglecting them. But the current widespread interest in Zen Buddhism is a hopeful sign, and I would urge F.B. to read some of the extensive modern literature on that subject). However, should man become enlightened enough to value freedom more than high productivity, he will still have to choose between them. He cannot have both.

Yours faithfully,

Bristol, Feb. 25. FRANCIS ELLINGHAM.

This Sporting Life

THE film *This Sporting Life* is in itself neither better nor worse than the average film that weekly passes through the film theatre mill and as an evening's entertainment it would justify itself, but the massive support it received from the art establishment demands that one examiness the claims made for it by its fervent supporters.

Dilys Powell publicly wept tears of gratitude at being allowed to review it, *Film & Filming* published a solemn interview with the director and followed it up with a rave notice, while six months ago *Sight & Sound* gave a poe-faced account of the director's method of shooting his first feature film. Of the rest only Isabel Quigly of the *Spectator* gave it a cold hard look and her bleak review will be the odd man out in Anderson's press-cutting book, for Isabel Quigley made her point coldly and clearly when she wrote that *"for the eye of the director, although earnest and talented, is basically banal and sentimental, drawn with magnetic inevitability to visual clichés and predictable images."...*

Lindsay Tnderson has been around the Town for many a long year and this one-time associate of the top echelon of the New Left, Bleeding Heart Section, has always been within a bus ride of any group willing to discuss the cinema as an art form. The director of two or three minor documentaries, he has, nevertheless, had to wait five years for the chance to show his worth in the commercial field and despite the hosannas of his loyal associates the result as a contribution to the art of the cinema is, to use an understatement, disappointing.

This stocky, grey-haired man now going through his von Stroheim phase in his public image has spent half a lifetime with the theory of the cinema and his first film is an essay on all that he has learned but been unable to adapt, for scene after scene rises befor us as the regurgitated *clichés* that now form part of the history of the cinema. From almost the very opening scenes when we view a close-up of massive fingers cramming into a mouth, we are back to the 1930's and Bunuel's toe-sucking sequence in *"L'age d'or"*, street scenes shout of Carol Reed's *Odd Man Out* night exteriors and moorland shots recall the camera work under the direction of David Lean plus a half hundred corny Caucasion documentaries, for how many times have we sat in the art cinemas to watch our hairy non-hero posing on the crest of the grassy horizon to gaze into the new dawn left of camera while the black blood dribbilng out of the mouth of the dead woman's white mask face is pure Cocteau, and even if the master did not use it, belongs to his *La Belle et la Béte* and not in a National Health hospital.

Anderson has taken David Storey's violent novel of north country life and, though remaining true to each letter of the book has succeeded in producing a film that appears, unintentionally, to parody the whole school of kitchen-sink social realism. The outline of the film is that of a young Yorkshire miner who becomes a professional rugby-league footballer, his relationship with his landlady, who, since the death of her husband has retreated into her own bitter world, their unsatisfactory bedding together, their break-up and their separate tragedies. Anderson's personal tragedy as a director is that he never knows what to do outside the letter of the book, for in its visual interpretation he casts each character not as a unified creation but according to the mood of the moment.

Rachel Roberts plays her roles with an air of dead-pan bitterness last seen when Zasu Pitts found fame half a century ago in Stroheim's *Greed*, while the unfortunate Richard Harris is forced to change his style and appearance time and time again within this odd film. At one moment he is quietly and soberly dressed and minutes later, dressed like a juvenile take-off of Olivier's interpretation of Max Miller in the *Entertainer*, he is giving a Mack Sennet version of the prole raised by sudden wealth into a higher and more dignified social strata even to the feet planted firmly on the restaurant chairs and the gutter abuse of the other customers. At one moment he is the intelligent card-player and again minutes later a throw-back to the 30's and O'Neill's barely articulate apeman, finding his first glimmerings of that old new dawn. In the restaurant scene he wears clothes that one would assume it would be literally impossible to buy in a Yorkshire town yet towards the end of the film, in a time sequence of months, dressed with quiet dignity, he leaves the woman and drives up in his car to take lodgings in a doss-house straight out of *Lower Depths*

One can only remark in passing, the debt that Anderson owes to Resains's *Last Year at Marienbad*, with his light and dark images and his *collage* of time sequences, but Anderson's major failure is that while the maker of a documentary simply records he has been called upon to interpret and in that he has failed for he has become the London-bound intellectual visiting the sour comic world of Andy Capp and he has taken his camera and his text books to an alien land only a train ride away and despite the brilliant camera operation of Denys Coop he has brought back his own preconceived and superficial judgment of a people who have for too long been the mainstay of the comic postcard industry and the saloon-bar anthropologist, for it is the mark of the creative artist that the character he turns loose upon the world's stage shall transcend time, class and national barriers and this Anderson's creation never does, for he is the stereotype of every north country workman to tread the stage of a Whitehall farce, animal in his lust, moronic in his attempt to communicate and lovable, if handled with care and understanding. But the cheers, with the exception of Isabel Quigly are still faintly echoing for the Town's intelligentsia are applauding one of their own who, after a long haul, has finally arrived.

ARTHUR MOYSE.

Strike at Something!

DEAR EDITORS,

As regards the January 19 issue of FREEDOM ("Strike at the Roots of War!") —your contention of pacifism striking at symptoms rather than causes, may I point this out: Even if war is but symptomatic, and I wouldn't argue it isn't, it's still better to strike at symptoms than at nothing at all.

Because the idea of striking at either basic causes or not at all usually ends in not at all.

Let me illustrate. In the U.S.A. is an organization called the Socialist Labour Party. Their *Weekly People* is an almost uninterrupted theme on the idea of war being but a symptom, on the need for recognizing same—and doing something about the basic cause, a capitalist *system*.

So far, so good. This system plays no mean role in causing war.

As an individual, however, the SLP person will go right along with things, won't, for instance, advise his son to refuse the draft. Because, since war is only a symptom, it would obviously be a waste of time and energy to oppose it *per se*! The idea is to oppose the system as such.

But since—so continues the logic—the system can't be effectively opposed unless and until workers get together, this leaves nothing for the individual person to do—other than propagandize for class unity.

Now to propagandize is OK, but I should say not enough, since this alone leaves out of the picture the idea of individual witness and responsibility. On this personal level does the SLP, given its war-is-but-a-symptom concentration, set up its own roadblocks at taking steps again war, against even the system they say is responsible for war.

Continued on page 4

FREEDOM

March 9 1963 Vol 24 No 8

BIG-VERSUS BIGGER-BUSINESS

Continued from page 1

two-cars-per-family, are not *in themselves* the passport to happiness, or the elixir of love. The assumption of anarchists is that sooner or later intelligent human beings will come to realise that there is something more vital to life than the rewards and the gadgetry offered by the capitalists and their stooges. And that "that something" eludes the businessmen and their politicians; is something the mass-communicators and other entertainers cannot supply; and which can only grow and flourish in an environment of freedom. We are revolutionaries because we believe that such an environment of freedom can neither be legislated for, nor drop miraculously from the clouds.

In an unfree society (which is the characteristic of *all* privileged societies, by whatever fancy name their rulers describe them) you achieve nothing unless you are prepared to fight to overthrow the power that oppresses you; not with reason but with power. Pacifists, no less than authoritarians misunderstand the problem as well as the anarchist position. There can be no *dialogue* between reason and prejudice. By definition they are diametrically opposed (*who would assume that a* reasonable man would be won over by prejudice or a man blinded by prejudice won over by reason?).

The force of the anarchist argument, as we interpret it, is that in rejecting one authority we do not seek to put another in its place. In other words we make it clear that what we are opposed to is authority not individuals *per se*. By the same token we would be opposed to the Labour- and the Communist- Parties however revolutionary their programmes, however radical their candidates, *so long as the means by which they sought to implement their programme was authoritarian.*

No anarchist, without ceasing to subscribe to the tenets of anarchism, would, or has, suggested that an anarchist society can be brought about by force. On the other hand very few anarchists have, to our knowledge, suggested that existing society based on profit, privilege and authority, could be persuaded by love and sweet reason to allow others to experiment on an equal footing with methods based on freedom and co-operation, between producers and consumers. We cannot see why the privileged minority should! And they don't! It's surely only a small minority of politically woolly-headed, *soi-disant*, "catholic-anarchists" and "pacifist-anarchists" who could cherish such illusions?

It is a fundamental mistake, those who believe in love and reason too commonly make, to believe, that by the same propaganda you can make the workers more revolutionary and the bosses more amenable. It just doesn't work that way, and the bankruptcy of the Trades Unions and the perennial stubbornness of the boss classes to the persuasive oratory of a Keir Hardy and Nye Bevan or a Donald Soper or a Michael Scott over the past half century, just goes to show that reformism neither converts the bosses to "love their neighbours" nor subverts the worker to accept the *status quo* however much he may, in the short term, crawl before the boss. And we would add that neither a Labour nor a Tory government in spite of overwhelming majorities, legislated (or attempted?) to break down the class barriers which divide the nation as well as the world.

★

THE fact that we observe with pleasure the way the Tory government is being rough-handled, and hope the public will take the point, does not, for one moment, land us in the Wilson-Brown camp, or the Grimond suburbs. The Big Count almost certainly won't be this year; and we won't have Anarchy next year, or the year after. An an exercise in propaganda and a challenge we suggest to our comrades of the London Federation of Anarchists that they select a London Constituency, such as Fulham, which votes Labour, and seek to persuade half the electorate to refuse to vote. We have probably 12 months in which to campaign for anarchism; FREEDOM is published in the area and its columns are at the disposal of the campaign. A number of us live in the area, many others would assist us if we showed initiative. Here is an experiment, at *street level*! Abstention in Fulham not through apathy but political awareness. Make Fulham conscious of the anarchist arguments and philosophy; aware of the existence of FREEDOM and ANARCHY and the ideas they espouse. Let us attempt something we have never attempted: concentrate our limited forces to persuade a section of the community to refuse to choose between two, three or four political evils offered at the next elections, and make their silence more significant than the crosses of the gullible. Any offers?

TITMUSS AND

Social & Economic Inequality

"INCOME DISTRIBUTION AND SOCIAL CHANGE" by Richard M. Titmuss. (George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 25s.).

THE statistical foundation for much social and economic comment on the supposed egalitarian moves in Britain since the beginning of World War II are reports issued by the Board of Inland Revenue. These are two in number, one being issued, concerns itself with the distribution of income from 1938-9 and the other with the years 1948-9. In the second report the Board concluded that in the years between these two reports there had been "a very considerable redistribution in incomes".

On these official statistics rested policies and academic treatises; in fact they were accepted by all serious commentators on society. As Professor Titmuss mentions: "Taxation in its many varieties is now coming to be seen as one of the dominant political issues of the 1960's. Insofar as they prefer facts to political institutions, Chancellors are going to depend more rather than less in future years on the statistics of income and wealth." In short these statistics play a critical role.

Studies carried out by Mr. Lydall in 1955 and by Professor Paish in 1957 considered the distribution of incomes before tax. Both authors were agreed about the trend since 1938. Mr. Lydall concluded that "the trend in income distribution over the past two decades has been much more strongly egalitarian than in any previous period in history", and Professor Paish talks of "this very remarkable redistribution of personal incomes before tax" between 1938 and 1955. They both worked on the same basic material, the Board of Inland Revenue statistics.

As Titmuss remarks, "No serious criticisms have since been made of these and other studies nor of the Board's own analysis, the conclusions of which have been accepted by the broad mass of opinion, specialist and lay, as confirming practically all post-war writings on the subject of equality in Britain."

In February, 1961, the Financial Secretary to the Treasury expressed the view that "we have a better and fairer distribution of incomes today than we had ten or eleven years ago." These views are fairly described as representative of conventional wisdom, are based on the statistics in question, statistics which have "provided the rationale for academic and political criticism of post-war social policies", which have "furnished material for numerous public figures to plead for a more unequal society", and which formed "the justification for the budget of 1961 which raised the surtax limit to £5,000."

In his study Prof. Titmuss sets out to "Examine these statistical foundations on which law and opinion in the 1950's were based."

If we may place his examination on one side for the moment and confine ourselves immediately to Prof. Titmuss's conclusions we find slight but vitally important, indeed shattering and devastating views.

It hardly seems that the following conclusion is devastating: that "we should be much more hesitant in suggesting that any equalizing force at work in Britain since 1938 can be promoted to the status of a 'natural law'," until we see that this is what has been done, without hesitation, by most commentators on post-war Britain. Mr. Lydall spoke of a permanent bias towards greater equality of incomes. The 1950's saw the Board of Inland Revenue, Mr. Lydall and Professor Paish propound the theory of a natural law of equalization.

Other conclusions are even more provocative. "There is more than a hint", writes Titmuss, "that income inequality has been increasing since 1949 whilst ownership of wealth . . . has probably become still more unequal and, in terms of family ownership, possibly strikingly more unequal, in recent years."

He also writes: "We have simply attempted to show that fact and economic theory are at variance." One is tempted to exclaim with scarcasm, "Is that all!"

Now, it is necessary to consider the various factors that lead Prof. Titmuss to these conclusions. The main factor in the criticism of the Board of Inland Revenue statistics concerns the definition of income. The Board's definition is as follows: "Income before tax is all the income brought under review of this department, after certain deductions. It is after deducting losses and capital allowances in the case of profits and professional earnings and the allowance for repairs in the case of income from property; it is also after deducting National Insurance and superannuation contributions and other allowable expenses, mortgage interest and similar annual payments. It is before deducting the personal allowances of life assurance relief. It excludes income not subject to tax, such as interest of National Savings Certificates, National Assistance grants and certain National Insurance benefits and grants (unemployment, maternity, sickness, industrial injury, etc.)."

Peter Townshend has referred to this as "a narrow definition of income" and Titmuss points out that changes in the demographic structure of the population are not taken into account. There are also certain benefits to employers that are largely excluded from official statistics, these are termed fringe benefits: meal, entertainment, car and travel allowances. Taxable income, furthermore, is sometimes deliberately reduced to spread income into retirement, to spread it to other members of the family or friends—*via* irrevocable settlements, discretionary trusts and gifts intervivos in favour of children, and to secure bonus shares or other tax-free capital gains. The object of these procedures is to avoid taxation and in the view of Peter Townshend, "These activities are now sufficiently common and on a large enough scale to make hay of recent statistics of income distribution."

Titmuss cites the dissent made by a few members of the Royal Commission on Taxation who argued that "in fact no concept of income can be really equitable that stops short of the comprehensive definition which embraces all receipts which increase an individual's command over the use of society's scarce resources—in other words, his "net accretion of economic power between two points of time". The fact is that untaxed realized capital gains and capital receipts do not fall within the present definition of taxable income.

There are also some taxpayers who have translated taxable income into forms of capital appreciation—thus avoiding tax. It is significant that since the mid nineteen-fifties there has been a boom in capital appreciation.

It is hardly surprising that Titmuss claims the Board of Inland Revenue statistics—the basis for law and opinion in the 1950's—increasingly present a "delusive picture of the economic and social structure of society." Many writers took as their baseline these statistics, whose validity Titmuss sharply questions. He even speaks of "concealed multipliers of inequality" which are not measured at present by the statistics of income and only marginally by the statistics of wealth; these include settlements and trusts. The Board of Inland Revenue statistics have omitted various important factors and are thus not to be relied upon.

If, then, these statistics present a delusive picture and are not reliable we have a mountain of re-thinking in front of us. Titmuss asked in his introduction to this book: "To what extent and in what respect do these statistics represent reality?" His conclusion is that "Ancient inequalities have assumed new and more subtle forms; conventional categories are no longer sufficient for the task of measuring them." As so often with Titmuss in this book, words which sound insignificant are dynamite, for "the conventional categories no longer sufficient" are the Board of Inland Revenue statistics which claimed there had been "a very considerable redistribution of incomes". In fact, Titmuss is saying that conventional wisdom about egalitarianism is quite wrong. He never directly says that the Board of Inland Revenue statistics are based on invalid, inadequate definitions of income that do not take account of tax evasion on a wide-scale and other factors; nor does he say that anyone who relies on them is in a world of unreality. He never claims that a wholesale illusion has been fostered, sometimes deliberately, sometimes unknowingly by a host of serious and respected commentators. He never directly points a finger, he simply implies these things which makes his criticism all the more damaging and overwhelming.

J.W

Resistance to Civil Government

"ON THE DUTY OF CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE", by Henry David Thoreau. Introduction by Gene Sharp. Peace News, 1s).

"PEACE NEWS" have performed a useful service in making Thoreau's famous essay available as a separate publication, No longer hidden in the pages of anthologies its merits and its weaknesses can be seen all the more clearly.

"On The Duty Of Civil Disobedience" (originally, and more fittingly, called "Resistance To Civil Government") is, as Joseph Wood Krutch has pointed out, a proclamation of individualist rebellion rather than a plea for social reform. But its implications are far wider than its ostensible theme of Negro slavery. It speaks to all those who are aware of a contradiction between their individual aspirations and the demands of Society. With caustic wit and sincere anger Thoreau asserts his right to contract out of support for any institution or practice with which he disagrees: "Know all men by these present, that I, Henry Thoreau, no not wish to be regarded as a member of any incorporated society which I have not joined." Shortly afterwards, Herbert Spencer wrote his irrefutable "The Right To Ignore The State", which was a chapter of the 1851 edition of "Social Statics". Shortly before, Max Stirner published his "The Ego and His Own"—a more powerful, profounder, radical work than either Thoreau's ar Spencer's, but having affinities with both.

Was Thoreau an anarchist? Some have argued he was; others that he was not. Gene Sharp, in his Introduction to this edition, claims that Thoreau "was neither an 'anarchist' nor a statist'." The argument that Thoreau was an anarchist usually rests on statements like "That government is best which governs not all" and "I think that we should be men first, and subjects afterwards. It is not desirable to cultivate a respect for the law, so much as for the right . . . Law never made men a whit more just; and, by means of their respect for it, even the well-disposed are daily made the agents of injustice." The argument that he was not on statements like " . . . I ask for, not at once no government, but *at once* a better government", and, from his "Journal", "That centainty is the best government where the inhabitants are at least often reminded of the government.

I think that, while Thoreau was not an anarchist in the modern sense of the term, the whole trend of his thinking in "Civil Disobedience" is anarchistic. Anyone who places individual will or 'conscience' before the law by asserting that he is justified in breaking the law when he believes it to be wrong, is, at bottom, denying the basic premise of government which is that laws *must* be obeyed until changed, if they need to be, by *constitutional*—*i.e.* governmentally-approved — means. Governments, always except themselves from this principle when it suits them, but they all demand that their subjects accept it. Consciously or not, Thoreau was putting an anarchist case, for the logical conclusion of his thinking was the affirmation of the sovereignty of the individual and the negation of the sovereignty of the State.

One must remember that, in Thoreau's time, the power of both state and federal governments in the U.S.A. was much weaker than it is today. As he says, he usually only met the State once a year in the person of the tax-collector. Community experiments of the most various kinds flourished virtually unhindered by the authorities—the prejudice of local populations rather than legal acts forcing the closure or modification of some of them (*e.g.* Oneida).

Thoreau's seemingly compromising attitude can, therefore, be understood, if not approved, although his awareness of the fundamental conflict between his aspirations and those of the archist is shown by his remarks that "For my own part, I should not like to think that I ever rely on the protection of the State", and "I simply wish to refuse allegiance to the State, to withdraw and stand aloof from it effectually . . . I quietly declare war with the State, after my fashion, though I will still make what use and get what advantage of her I can, as is usual in such cases."

Whatever liberals may say about it, however much whitewash they may use, "Civil Disabedience" belongs to the literature of anarchism. It may, at times, suffer the lack of clarity that pioneer works often suffer, but it is on the right track.

S. E. PARKER.

3,000 ASSORTED water birds at St. James's Park, London, found an unfrozen patch of their lake and by concerted paddling kept the stretch ice-free for the whole community. Man, using intelligence and not mere crude instincts, kept the cold-war frozen solid. The US conducted two nuclear tests in Nevada, one of a weapons device, the other relating to developments for peaceful purposes. Marshal Malinovsky, Soviet Minister of Defence threatened Mr. McNamara, the American Defence Secretary, "I maintain emphatically that in retaliation, we shall deal a simultaneous blow of several times more missiles and such a tremendous nuclear yield that it will wipe off the earth all targets, industrial and administrative political centres of the United States, and will destroy completely the countries which have made available their territories for American war bases." The procedure for firing Polaris from the Ethan Allen, one of nine submarines based in Holy Loch is (*a*) the message to fire comes abroad direct from Washington; (*b*) The captain and another officer, together with a third as witness, then unlock a safety box which contains further directions for fire procedure; (*c*) The captain has one key but the box cannot be opened without the second key held by another officer. (*d*) The captain alone has the combination to the lock of the firing button. There is also a button marked 'Stay' which may be pressed if Washington countermands its original order. Mr. Macmillan denied in the House of Commons that the orders to alert V-bomber crews and Thor rocket bases at the time of the Cuba crisis were 'abnormal'. "This is the normal procedure of a force which is kept at a much higher state of normal readiness than perhaps any other force." Ration books which are being printed in case of an emergency will cost £240,000. The Ministry of Agriculture will hold them "for issue if, and when it is considered necessary to introduce rationing". A wealthy American in Memphis has built a £50,000 shelter in which 56 people would be able to live in a "civilised" manner for about a month. Elvis Presley has been invited as a guest. Chicago Police Supt. O. W. Wilson said all prisoners would be

released from city lock-ups in case of a nuclear attack. "After the all-clear, if feasible" the order states, the prisoners are to be rounded up and returned to their cells. US civil defence surveys have located fall-out shelters for 103 million people. US population is about 190 millions. . . .

A GROUP of members of the Society of Friends (Quakers) said that the fact that a husband or wife had a love affair should not mean the end of a marriage. It said "that morals were made for man, not man for morals and that as society changes and modes of conduct with it, we must always be searching below the surface of human nature to discover what is in fact happening to people, what they are seeking to express, what motives and intentions they are satisfying, what fruits, good or bad, they are harvesting' . . . Homosexual affection, says the group, is not morally worse than hetrosexual affection, and should be judged by the same standards. A Moslem who three times declared "I divorce my wife was validly divorced under Moslem law, and an English judge recognised this as valid in England. Adam Faith, the pop-singer discussed teenage sex problems with a committee at the British Medical Association. He distinguished between love and lust. He answered questions on his love-life and said the teenager "seeks love as a dying man clutches an anchor." At the moment he was lonely but he could cope with it much better. He believed in sex and moral instruction at school but thought that the church was out of touch. He didn't think that pop-music had anything to do with the growth of teenage promiscuity. He said he thought that if he ever had kids he wouldn't want his daughter not to be a virgin when she gets married. The annual statistical review for England and Wales reveals that most unmarried mothers are in the 20-24 age group but probably about a quarter of these are between 13 and 18. Holborn (London) Council refused to give a £50 grant to the Islington Family Planning Centre. Councillor Mrs. Louise Coleman opposed the motion "Single girls go along there. I am all for family planning within the family, but this goes too far." Mr. Wilfred Schuele introduced a bill in the Wisconsin State Legislature to imprison women for having more than two illegitimate children. He said, "I'm not against women. I'm for them having husbands". Children could be taken from their mother upon the birth of a third illegitimate child, under a bill proposed in the North Carolina senate. A letter in the *Nursing Times* says that "every organisation dealing with the problem of the unmarried mother says that nurses are among the most numerous of those seeking help . . ." Ignorance of the facts of life is the reason". A jury at the Old Bailey spent two days reading 'obscene' books and brought in a verdict of guilty against two bookseller brothers who were each sentenced to nine months' imprisonment for conspiring to contravene the Obscene Publications Act. The Archbishop of York told undergraduates at Oxford "It would be an enormous tragedy if the Church, which took the initiative in teaching people to read, lost the initiative in the matter of what people shall read". He continued, "Anyone who keeps his eyes open knows that in any big city in England a boy can go into many shops and buy literature which is a disgrace in any Christian country." A highly-placed civil servant was fined £25 for persistently importuning male persons. He said he felt sick after a dinner at the Guildhall and went to a public lavatory. The prosecution stated that he was seen to enter the lavatory on three occasions. On each he followed another man in and was followed in turn by a policeman, who saw him smiling and nodding at the man, from whom he got no response. The civil servant is appealing. *Osservatore Romano* the Vatican newspaper, said that if intelligent beings lived on other planets they would be outside man's path to salvation. "If there were other men on other heavenly bodies, since they would not be sons of Adam and would not bear original sin, they would be outside this way of salvation and would not be subject to the fate of men". . . .

COLCHESTER CND hopes to contest borough council elections on the issue of civil defence. The leading aircraftsman, who wrote an anti-bomb letter to *Peace News* was confined to barracks for being late on parade and his posting to Malta was cancelled. Two university lecturers stood bail for a 22-year-old student charged with unlawfully and maliciously causing by certain explosive substance an explosion of a nature likely to cause serious injury to property at Liverpool's £20 million reservoir site in Merionethshire. The two airmen who wanted to start a services CND group were sentenced to eight months' imprisonment and discharged from the service with ignominy. The sentence is subject to confirmation. A national conference of the Committee of 100 agreed that the Welsh Committee of 100 should be re-integrated into the movement. A 21-year-old marine refused to wear his uniform on conscientious grounds. He was sentenced to 140 days imprisonment, subject to confirmation. This year, writes Peggy Duff in *Peace News*, political slogans and party identification banner will be discouraged on the Aldermaston march. According to the *Guardian* the Committee of 100 is undergoing a thorough shape-up and the tendency towards decentralization has been emphasised; some think too much so, and a tendency for the committee to become an all-purpose protest supporter 'veering towards anarchism'. Four Oxford undergraduates were fined for obstructing the pavement whilst selling *Peace News* a nearby newseller of the orthodox kind was left alone. Oxford Labour councillors had volunteered to challenge this ruling by selling on the same spot but Mr. Hugh Brock, the editor of *Peace News* came to an arrangement with the police whereby *P.N.* sales would be allowed on another site. . . .

A SCULPTURE of President Kennedy posing as a watchful angel will be used over the main altar of a seminary in a Memphis seminary. President Kennedy posed for it in 1939. Walt Disney has been awarded the highest honour of the Americans Freedom Foundation, the George Washington award of £1,800 in recognition of Disney's "educational wisdom, patrotic dedication and creative leadership" . . . .

"PSYCHIC NEWS" claims that Mr. Hugh Gaitskell returned in a seance to speak to a London medium, who waits at table in the members' restaurant at the House of Commons. He said he was not displeased that his friend, Harold Wilson, had been chosen to succeed him as Leader of the Labour Party, even though Wilson had pin-pricked him, which hurt at the time. .

JON QUIXOTE.

IN THE RED!

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AT FEBRUARY 28th
Weeks 8 & 9

EXPENSES: 9 weeks at £70			£630
INCOME:			
Sales & Sub. Renewals	£	£	
Weeks 1—7 ...	220		
Weeks 8 & 9 ...	29		
		249	
New Subscriptions:			
Weeks 1—7 (65) *	70		
Weeks 8—9 (13)	11		
		81	
			330
DEFICIT			£300

DEFICIT FUND

New York: S.K. £1/15/-; Llandysul: H.D. 8/-; Lincoln: A.B. 7/6; Cleveland: T. & D.H. £1/15/-; London: W.S.N. 14/6; Shoreham: M. & D.* 2/6; Hounslow: L.* 2/6; Oxford: Anon.* 5/-; Chorleywood: S.E.E. 3/-; London: B.S. 1/6; Newry: J.O'H. £1/8/-; Wolverhampton: J.L.* 2/6; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/-; E. Rutherford: A.S.* 7/-; Leeds: G.L. 1/9; Hounslow: L.* 2/6; Watford: J.R. 15/-; Wolverhampton: J.L.* 2/6; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/-; Belfast: H.C. £3/8/-; Hednesford: K.T.K. 4/-; Surrey: F.B.* 15/-.

TOTAL	13	4	9
Previously acknowledged	218	8	2

1963 TOTAL TO DATE £221 12 11

*Denotes regular contributors

STRIKE AT SOMETHING!

Continued from page 2

So in the very midst of propagandizing against a military-industrial complex, they go through the physical—and financial—motions of supporting it.

They say, write, feel, believe one way —and act another way.

Thus you and the SLP, while of course not the same, have, it appears, a similar psychology when it comes to the war problem—this idea of seeking to educate people toward an understanding of war's basic causes, which as I said is OK in itself, the problem being that it provides a logical excuse for personal inertia—no, more than inertia—for actually going along with the injustices —a willy-nilly support of the very thing one speaks out against.

The pacifist, on the other hand, even conceding he deals on with symptoms, is not really on the wrong track—not existentially. However narrow his horizon (we'll even assume his total ignorance of war's causes), his words are tested on the personal, down-to-earth level. Implicit in violence-refusal are things like draft, tax refusal. Implicit in the word is the deed. It's a matter of ends and means as inseparable.

There, then, is the rub—ethical individual witness, or not waiting for mass witness which (euphemistically speaking) seems to take a long time in coming about.

Pacifism gets to the personal side of things. Other movements don't, not even anarchism (unless it be anarcho-pacifism). However logical their analysis about war and its root causes, it remains but an analysis, at best an educative and propagandistic device, at worst an opportunity for one to comfort oneself in the thought that, pending collectivist activity, and outside of propagandizing for some, there's really nothing much else to do but drift along with what is.

Sincerely,

Detroit, U.S.A., Feb 15. SAM COHEN.

Conservative Anarchists

DEAR EDITORS,

I found Kenneth Maddock's article on "Anarchy" and "Conservatism" a little disturbing. Apart from the huge overtones of the word Conservatism, surely Conservationism would have been more apt. I had the impression that he feels other 'anarchists' are mere bomb-throwers, picture-slashers, etc., completely ignorant of the positive, constructive, growth strain in 'anarchism', which to myself is at least as attractive as the other side.

As for labelling those who wish to preserve the (unhappily few) facets of our existing society(ies), compatible with the free society for which we all strive, as 'Tory-Anarchists', here I must object. In my opinion this term should be reserved for two types: first Messrs. Clore, Niarchos, *et al;* secondly those mixed-up individualists such as T. H. White, Oskar Kokoschka and William Rushton to whom the word nihilist is more applicable, whether as activists or quietists.

And while I am tackling the problem of word-definition, I may as well add my belief that the word 'anarchism' quite accurately does us all a lot of harm, meaning as it does, without government, certainly and quickly, but all the 'anarchists' that I know, believe in self-government. How many times have you been told, "Oh, you're the people who don't believe in law and order", and how many times have you replied "Law no, Order, yes."? The word is inaccurate and should be thrown out of our vocabulary. Wouldn't Autonomy (or Libertarian) be more to the point, and less misleading. If we make no effort to keep our own house in order, it is hypocritical of us to expect others to do the same.

Yours,
PAUL ROBERTSHAW.

East Peckham, Nr. Tonbridge.

Printed by Express Printers, London, E.1. Published by Freedom Press, 17a, Maxwell Road, London, S.W.6.

LONDON FEDERATION OF ANARCHISTS

CENTRAL MEETINGS

meetings to be held at
The Two Brewers,
40 Monmouth Street, WC2
(Leicester Square Tube)
Sundays at 7.30 p.m.

MAR 10 Arthur Uloth:
Pacifism, Militarism and Violence

MAR 17 S.F.:
The Great American Myth

MAR 24 Brian Hart:
Nestor Makhno

MAR 31 Dennis Gould:
Pierre-Ceresole: International Revolutionary

OFF-CENTRE DISCUSSION MEETINGS

1st Thursday of each month at 8 p.m. at Jack and Mary Stevenson's, 6 Stainton Road, Enfield, Middx.

1st Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. at Colin Ward's, 33 Ellerby Street, Fulham, S.W.6.

3rd Tuesday at Brian and Doris Lelie's, 242 Amesbury Avenue, S.W.2 (Streatham Hill, Nr. Station).

Third Wednesday of the month, at 8 p.m. at Albert Portch's, 11 Courcy Road (off Wood Green High Road), N.8.

Last Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. Tom Barnes', Albion Cottage, Fortis Green, N.2. (3rd door past Tudor Hotel).

3rd Friday of each month at 8 p.m. at Donald & Irene Rooum's, 148a Fellows Road, Swiss Cottage, N.W.3.
Please note that the meetings at Fellows Road, N.W.3 are now on the third Friday, not the third Wednesday as hitherto.

Last Thursday of each month at 8 p.m. at George Hayes', 174 Mcleod Road, Abbey Wood, S.E.2.

Notting Hill Anarchist Group (Discussion Group)

Last Friday of the month, at Brian and Margaret Hart's, 57 Ladbroke Road, (near Notting Hill Station), W.11.

OXFORD ANARCHIST DISCUSSION GROUP (gown, town and district)

Meets Wednesdays, 5.30 usually.
Christ Church, Packwater Quad: 2, 6: Special meetings at 8 p.m.

MAR 13 Jack Robinson:
Philosophy of Anarchism