

Freedom

APRIL 25 1970 Vol 31 No 13

'We've Got a Problem Here'

LAST WEEK, as a result of an Act of Man, hundreds of bodies, many of them with their hands tied behind their backs, floated down the Mekong River. The next day, by an Act of God, 72 people, including 46 children under 14 years old, and suffering from tuberculosis, died when an avalanche destroyed their sanatorium in the French Alps. Elsewhere the usual number of children died from starvation and the effects of long-term poverty, hundreds of parents committed suicide, thousands coughed their last with lung cancer or were massacred on the roads, rebels around the world were being tortured in jails, bombed, burned or shot in jungle or street, tenants were being evicted, simple people were being swindled at their work and in their homes and all in all for the poor and ordinary folk it was very much business as usual.

Of all the millions in trouble, however, the world was looking at only three. Three fit, well-fed and wealthy men, backed up by thousands more of the world's most advanced technicians, with billions of pounds' worth of the most sophisticated equipment at their disposal, faced an uncomfortable death—and the world goggled at them, torn between its rival titillations: hope for their safety and acquiver for disaster.

The world, according to the *Evening Standard*, was 'holding its breath', which seemed to be disobeying the command of its stablemate, the *Daily Express*, which had told the world to 'Pray'. But what actually brought the three astronauts splashing safely down in the Pacific was not prayer, it was the technical resources of their friends on earth.

SO WHAT?

These technical resources have progressed—if that is the right word—at such a fantastic rate that success is the accepted norm for space travel. Apollo 13's flight was expected to be just another TV bore, with those metallic voices chattering away their weird perversion of English across the skies. Because something went wrong, what was just another trip to the moon became an *Odyssey*, a *Saga*, a dangerous voyage of discovery with three hero-victims trapped in a circumstance of their own choosing which could lead them to a unique death, sordid on the inside, spectacular on the outside—the first Earthmen lost in space.

But what bloody check it is that we are supposed to be so concerned for these particular darlings of the Warfare State! So they are engaged, and are voluntarily risking their lives, in pioneering flights to outer space, demonstrating the ingenuity of Man—so what?

We know Man is ingenious. Too damn clever for his own good, in fact. There can be no doubt that Man will go on solving problems and producing more and more techniques for controlling his environment. The recent development of the computer, still obviously only in its infancy, has put power in the hands of 'Man' that he has never had before.

But when we talk of 'Man' who do we mean? Do we mean the Vietnamese floating down the Mekong River—murdered by Cambodians on suspicion of being Vietcong sympathisers? Or do we mean the Cambodians shot up by the actual Vietcong inside Cambodia? Do we

mean the tuberculous French kids buried in the Alpine landslide? Do we mean any of the world's millions of ordinary people who provide the wealth for the moon-men's missions?

The world is plundered by the military/industrial complexes of the rich nations, who exploit men and materials for their own power or profit. In the nineteenth century, Britain waxed rich while India, Africa, the West Indies and East Indies provided the raw materials and the cheap labour—and today are still the 'undeveloped' countries. In the twentieth century it is America's turn to play the Imperialist, with Russia running a good second and Britain pushed well down into third place. The industrial revolution that Britain led a hundred years ago is now seen as no more than a curtain raiser for the technological explosion of today.

INCIDENTAL ADVANTAGES

The techniques have improved—but the profit and power motives are the same. Social progress has not kept pace with the speed-up in production and communications, and what is really happening now is that more and more power is being put into the hands of the controllers of

mankind—those who can finance the building of the computers and the making of the bombs. Communist Russia is a vastly more efficient dictatorship than the Tsar ever dreamt of, thanks to technocracy—and in America, the enormous resources for population control (and I don't mean birth control!) are only now being called upon because of the mounting revolutionary activity among the young people.

Part of every technological advancement may end up with some advantage or improvement for the 'man in the street'. But this is purely incidental. For some it is enough for them to go along with 'progress'. The late Bernard Levin, who died some years ago whilst working for the *Daily Express* and now works for the *Daily Mail*, and sounds like it, said on the radio last week that the fact that his coffee pot was made from some new metal that was developed as part of space research meant that 'we had to go along with progress'.

On such a superficial level, alas, do so many 'go along with progress'. And 'progress' is simply and superficially equated with technology when in fact the more techniques that are developed under the present social, political or military systems,

the more reactionary can they be, since they can be more efficiently and ruthlessly counter-revolutionary. Can anyone doubt that the computer's most important function is to give the State immediate information on each and every one of us?

REVOLUTION MORE URGENT

Science can serve man only within the framework of man's social structure. If man's social structure is repressive—science will help the oppressors. If we have a free society, science can extend our control of our environment—but freedom is a matter of human relationships.

In a world where human relationships are low down on the social scale, science is perverted to serve inhuman forces and institutions and to maintain them. At the very best, it can only offer the physical possibility of abundance given a social structure that will use it for that purpose.

At the moment technology is in the hands of power maniacs and greedy money-grubbers. Inasmuch as it gives them more power with every development, it makes revolution even more urgent!

JUSTIN.

THE BANDIT

ONCE UPON A TIME there was a bandit who preyed on a whole village. He made a regular appointment to exact tribute. Every penny that the villagers earned had a sum automatically deducted on pay day which found its way to him without them seeing it. He also insisted from time to time that they should tell him how much money they earned, or indeed had in the house so that he could decide how much they should give him. Of course they cheated but he knew that they cheated, it was only to be expected under the circumstances. Some would sulk and wouldn't answer his letters asking how much money they had. So he would send them a letter giving an exaggerated guess, of course they would deny it and give him the proper figures which was all he wanted to know.

Once a year he would make a great haul by taking their cigarettes, their wine, and say that they had to pay him money every time they went to the cinema, or gambled or went to the lavatory. He would take money off them for employing servants, for employing workmen, for using coffins, for having windows in their houses (some cheated by bricking up the windows), for sending goods out of the country, for bringing them in. He said this was only once a year but every now and again he came up with some excuse for taking more. He had friends too who performed some small services for the village, of which they made sure they had a monopoly, and every now and again they would put up their charges.

The bandit too had control of the scrip which circulated round the village in exchange for various goods and services; quite capriciously from time to time he would decide how much the scrip was worth and of course, it was worth less and less each time. He would forbid them to take the scrip out of the village or he would say how much they could take.

He said he robbed the rich to feed the poor but the poor were not fed much and the rich were the only people left to rob. It was said the rich kept him supplied with weapons because he would keep the poor in order.

In his yearly raids he would now and again decide that he was really going to take less from everybody, or from some people. Every time he decided to take less from some people, these people were very happy; sometimes it was the rich who were left alone, occasionally the poor; sometimes meat-eaters, sometimes vegetarians, it all seemed rather arbitrary.

Every five years the village was given a chance to choose a new bandit. Just before this happened the old bandit tried to curry favour by not taking quite so much. This made everybody happy for a while so they forgot what he was and spoke of him 'giving' them money and described him as 'generous' and a 'benefactor'. This didn't do him much good for the candidate-bandits usually promised to take even less than he did. They usually chose a different bandit every time but it didn't make much difference.

One day somebody in the village got the idea of getting rid of the bandit and keeping the products of their labour for themselves. They then chased the bandit out of the village and he was never seen again.

JACK SPRATT.

PISTOL TO HEAD TACTICS

SINCE THE GOVERNMENT'S incomes policy collapsed last autumn, workers have seized the opportunity to lodge pay claims to try to catch up with increased prices. They realised that this was their chance to have a go and that, with the General Election coming along, the Wilson Government was no longer able to keep such increases tied to productivity. It obviously does not like the situation that has arisen, but this is a 'democracy' and although people have short memories, it could not expect to gain working class support if wage increases were being restricted.

Employers, for all their traditional opposition to State intervention, have complained that their employees are using 'pistol to head' tactics in order to gain increases. These same employers, the Engineering Employers' Federation, recently called for legislation to combat unofficial strikes since the Government has 'chosen to bury its head in the sand'. The Federation is now saying that workers in the industry are deliberately

violating the three-year wage agreement made in October of last year. This excluded plant level wage increases for three million engineering workers unless they were tied to increased productivity. Now claims are being demanded 'without strings' and strikes threatened if they are not met.

YORK AGREEMENT

These complaints from the employers were put forward at a meeting with the unions for the industry who are trying to negotiate a new disputes procedure. The present fifty-year-old York Agreement is a long-drawn-out affair, which most trade unionists hold in contempt. The employers are after speedier handling, but still want negotiations to pass through all the channels until they reach national level. The disagreement between the unions and the employers concerns the number of stages or the amount of the delay.

The difference between the two parties concerns the amount of procedure and the length of time it takes a grievance to

be passed through the various channels. There is also the question of 'status quo' provisions in agreements. Unions are demanding that any disputed changes should not be effected during procedure. These include wages, working conditions, practices, manning, dismissals, while so-called industrial misconduct and redundancies are not affected.

Before any chickens are counted, it is worth remembering that the darling of the left, Hugh Scanlon, who is involved in these present negotiations with the engineering employers, was a signatory to a 1967 agreement with Fords which allowed the management to arbitrarily introduce new machinery and transfer men. Scanlon's union was similarly a partner to another agreement of this nature at Vauxhalls.

CONDITIONS UP FOR SALE

While both these companies are outside the employers' federation, these types of agreement hardly inspire confidence in the leadership of the trade unions, who think of trade unionism as a question of bargaining. To them, hard fought for conditions are just items for sale which are tucked away as part of an agreement.

Continued on page 2

DOUBLE WIN FOR FASCISM

THE ELECTION of Paisley and Beattie has shaken the Unionist Party to the core. Chichester-Clark is quaking in his shoes and already they're trying to pick his successor. The Unionists have got what they deserve. They created a monster and put words in its mouth. Now it's begun to talk back to them and threatens to devour them. There is no doubt it is good to see the chickens coming home to roost—to hear Clark asked why he doesn't resign now the B-men are being disbanded.

But delight at the trouncing of the official Unionists shouldn't disguise the real significance of the by-elections. Paisley is no longer a joke or a useful embarrassment to the Unionist Party. 15,000 people voted for Paisley and his mouthpiece in S. Antrim and put them both in Stormont. Even more significant than the Bannside result was the election of the nonentity Beattie on Paisley's coat-tails in South Antrim. Paisleyism

is now a serious political force in N. Ireland.

THUGGERY

The alarming thing is that Paisley is a Fascist. Hitler and Mussolini were not just maniacs who hated Jews, loved flag-waving and ceremony, and specialised in political thuggery—nor is Paisley. Mussolini and Hitler used Jew-baiting and extreme nationalism to divide the working class, they smashed the trade unions and workers' organisations, and forced down wages. Paisley has divided the working class with great success, and he has several times attacked trade unions and strikes. He is against unemployment benefit, family allowances and almost every other benefit won by the long struggles of the working class over the last 70 years.

Paisley should be recognised for what he is—an enemy of the working class and small farmers, Protestant as well as Catholic, and upholder of a system

which will perpetuate the slums, misery and unemployment in the North. It is nonsense, and dangerous nonsense too, for people like Gerry Fitt to claim that Paisley belongs on the left because he has talked about bad housing conditions. Paisley used the Unionists' neglect of Bannside to win votes just as Hitler used the terrible poverty and unemployment in Germany in the 1930's to win the support of confused and frightened workers for his reign of terror.

Paisley and his storm-troopers are not in power yet and may never be, but it is important to realise the threat they pose. Already the Unionist Party are falling over themselves to outbid the Paisleyites in bigotry. Nat Minford, a member of the Cabinet, has been talking about 'a Protestant Parliament for a Protestant people' and the decrepit arch-bigot himself, Brookeborough, was resurrected in a last minute bid to stave off defeat. So much for the new reforming administration. The danger is that fear of Paisleyites will drive the spineless jellyfish of the Unionist government to adopt more and more of their policies.

Abridged from *Free Citizen*.

The Myth of Intelligence

ALL FORMS OF INEQUALITY, such as feudalism and capitalism, have been supported by myths. Nowadays the myth is that only a minority are suited to doing creative, responsible work, while everyone else is only capable of boring work carried out under someone else's instructions. The system is that of division of labour, and the myth is that of intelligence. While the former was retained, in modified form, from old-style capitalism, the latter resulted from the efforts of bourgeois theorists to discredit capitalism without actually thinking themselves out of a job.

What's depressing is that so many anarchists and other radicals seem to subscribe to this myth the same as other people. I've heard anarchists, who were themselves in very lowly jobs, say that 'on the whole', or some such phrase to indicate that the speaker is a shining exception, middle-class people are more intelligent than working-class people. Or the same belief will be revealed in other statements. The last time I saw our spokesman for the libertarian right, he was toiling his guts out, working as some kind of miserable government clerk by day, and as a bartender by night, and he was still going on about intelligence rising to the top, and Ayn Rand.

Too weak in the ego to be able to bear identifying with their fellow victims in the factory or office, these anarchists prefer to regard the class struggle as an out-of-date idea, and themselves as individualists and classless people who are leading their own lives—which suits the boss just fine! All his employees should be such good anarchists.

Sometimes they'll say they don't think intelligence runs along class lines, but that it's still distributed unequally—which only argues for a rearrangement of the unequal society, not its abolition. Often they'll come up with glowing descriptions of their particular Utopia, but nowhere will the abolition of division of labour be mentioned, unless they're the sort who expect to do away with work altogether and live on manna from Heaven, or to return to some never-never-land of primitive culture. At best there will be vague proposals for the sort of workers' control which changes the administration and conditions of work but not its nature, or for the humanization of work—if you can make the whole pair of shoes yourself, it's all right. But most work is more complex than that, and requires, not division, but co-operation of labour.

TWO CLASSES

Politicians of every shade will say, 'You can't get away from differences in ability, but at least our party

wants to provide equal opportunity, greater prosperity,' etc. It's their acceptance of that first clause that defeats even the most militant industrial rebels before they begin. As long as they believe it, they'll never have anything but crumbs from the table. Their children will go to school and be taught, in their turn, 'Your parents are inherently inferior'—even though they may never be lucky enough, from the standpoint of political education, to encounter someone who will put it into so many words. When I expressed shock at the wages a young fellow I know was earning, he said, 'But why should I earn any more? All I do is move things on and off the shelf. Without the supervisor I wouldn't know what to do.'

The two classes, divided according to 'intelligence', are called middle-class and working-class, but both are misnomers. I prefer 'upper' and 'lower' class, referring not to worth but to circumstances.

'Middle-class' implies that there is a significant landowning class above it, and that the professionals, administrators, etc., who are, numerically, the chief beneficiaries of the system, are really just plain folks. Perhaps they have a bit more money than the rest of us, but basically they're in the same boat. In fact, they're exploiters. The direct exploiters, the businessmen, are of course traditional villains to the left-wing, so it's easier to recognize them as such; but faced with the greater current prestige of the professionals and technicians, the radical becomes confused, and either ignores them, mildly satirizes them, or imagines that he has common cause with them, as witness the widespread fantasy of the political importance of students. But brainworkers not only exploit by taking more than their share of the material standard of living made possible by everyone's work; they also monopolize the satisfying work itself, which is just as important.

ALL IN THE SAME BOAT

The charwoman for the landlady at a place where I lived was once complaining about the price of oranges, and said, 'It's a crime that decent working-class people and decent middle-class people should have to pay such prices!' All in the same boat, you see, all doing their little bit together as best they could, and worrying about the price of oranges. The charwoman was unmistakably old, and the landlady (a teacher) was unmistakably middle-aged, but they were both the same age; the charwoman lived in an unheated terraced house without a blade of grass in sight, and with an outdoor loo and no bathroom—the family bathed in the kitchen, heat-

ing up the water on the stove—and she could still talk about 'decent middle-class people'!

'Working-class', on the other hand, is an example of the 'moral glorification of the oppressed'; the term seeks to appease society's victims with the flattering notion that no one else does any real work. (Even Orwell was guilty of this kind of sentimentality, although he recognized his own role as indirect exploiter. Another example of it is the Richard Hoggart-type crap about Working-Class Culture and how vital and honest it is.) Of course, many upper-class jobs are very useful, while many lower-class jobs are a complete waste of time. I sometimes do temporary office work; a friend said that my current job reminded him of the Red-Headed League—the Sherlock Holmes story where a man is got out of the way, to facilitate the commission of a crime, by being employed to copy out the city directory in longhand. As I told him, the sad truth is that all my jobs remind me of the Red-Headed League.

Along with all this goes the notion, commonly held by the liberal upper-class, its lower-class sycophants, and nice people, that it's 'just as good' to be lower as upper, and people 'should' be more democratic. (This is a bit oblique with the idea that the worker is in some way actually better because of the greater usefulness and concreteness of his job, but a prejudice syndrome can't be expected to be consistent. Both ideas are part of the disguise for the real belief that the lower-class person is stupid.) These democratic-minded egalitarians don't believe in equal incomes, of course; intermarriage is out because of 'disparity of interests'; in real life a worker is unlikely to find himself at the dinner table, or even the factory canteen table, with a brainworker, but it's still 'just as good'. Oh, yes. Separate but equal, as they used to say in the South. And while even the nicest people can't quite deny that it's those obviously necessary lower incomes which cause lower-class people to live in slums, have a higher infant mortality rate, and grow prematurely old, at the same time there's a faint suggestion in much that you read and hear, that these things also are part of 'working-class culture', matters of taste and preference.

SHARED THE DRUDGERY

But it's not just as good to spend most of your waking hours, all your life, doing work you dislike, which offers neither interest, a sense of accomplishment, creativeness, independence or responsibility—it's

degrading and dishonourable. Put the dishonour where it belongs, but don't pretend that it doesn't exist. You hurt, not help, the lower-class that way, by obscuring its interests. There is work which is just drudgery, which is lower than other work. When one class of people have to do it all the time, they become associated with it and are thought of as lower people, and their lives are lower in that they are restricted, boring, frustrating. If everyone shared in the drudgery, and also did some of the higher work, then there would be nothing dishonourable about 'honest toil'.

Nor is it the authoritarian conditions of work which make such work low. It's the other way round: at present, division of labour perpetuates industrial authoritarianism, whatever its origins. As long as division of labour (in the up-and-down sense, from low to high, not of course the lateral kind, from one type of brainwork to another; there's nothing wrong with that, as it's voluntary) exists, not only will workers' control be meaningless, but social equality and even the obvious minimal reform of equal incomes will be psychologically impossible.

'Intelligence', inherent differences in which are supposed to explain and justify inequality today, is just as foggy and ill-defined a notion as 'the soul', and likewise implies a division between body and mind, but while no one any longer believes in the soul, intelligence is considered a concrete thing, with millions of pseudo-scientific tests, experiments, theories and institutions reflecting the belief. People will differ, according to their prejudices and interests, as to how to measure and develop intelligence and what it is, but this doesn't stop them believing that it exists and that the questions they raise have objective answers. Nowadays educationists will proclaim with great self-righteousness and pride in their liberality that environment and physical health influence intelligence, but they stop short of seeing that this makes nonsense of the whole idea. All that is needed, according to them, is more nursery schools and whatnot, to provide equal opportunity, and all will be well with the world. Slum child Pedro, who would otherwise have become a ditchdigger,

will now become a doctor, while suburban child Richard, who would otherwise have become a doctor, will cheerfully become a ditchdigger because the new, revised, equal-opportunity intelligence tests have shown him that this is what he is really suited for. Of course, the educationists don't actually paint such a ridiculous picture, but without abolition of the division-of-labour system, it's naturally implied.

Suppose everyone had equal opportunity, and everyone passed all the tests needed for entry into the upper-class. Do you think that the egalitarians would abandon their position? Of course not. This 'indiscriminate' result would be considered evidence that the tests were inadequate, and new barriers would be set up. The people at the bottom would still be considered stupid, and would accept the label themselves. Already this has started to happen; the man in the street is much better educated than two-hundred years ago but he is still doing shit work. In America, it's a cliché that you can't get anywhere without a higher degree.

A recent article says: 'The "11-plus rat race" in Surrey, where there are grammar school places for proportionately fewer children each year, is creating a boom for private schools in the county. . . . There are grammar school places for only 15 per cent of Surrey's 11-year-olds. As the percentage drops annually more parents complain that their bright children are not passing the exam.'

EXTEND THEIR INSIGHT

It's good that these parents have the self-confidence to see that their children's failure is artificial and statistical. One hopes that they might extend their insight to society as a whole.

When the economic set-up requires that a minority succeed while the majority fail, of course this is going to happen, one way or the other! How could it be otherwise? The only improvement that people can see when they accept such a system is the one described already, of greater 'justice' in separating the sheep from the goats. But even with perfect 'justice', the odds will still be against any given person. When automation does away with all phy-

Continued on page 4

SCREWED-UP KIDS AND WOMEN'S LIBERATION

MANY TEENAGERS don't use contraceptives. They are not always easily available to young people and are expensive. Consequently they sometimes develop pregnancy fears which help manipulate them into premature marriages. It is obviously irresponsible to enter into such a legalised association without a trial period to determine sexual and social compatibility. Likewise it is extremely wicked to force children into situations where they are confronted with perverse and irrational morality, social taboo, corruptive parental disapproval and repressive adult neurosis. An entire inhibiting complex of guilt and frustration. The normal human sexual syndrome. Cruelly faced with a choice between the suppression of natural instincts and the very real risk of conception. To substitute an expedient indulgence in self-masturbation and homosexual promiscuity or suffer impotent making ten-

sions in heterosexual affairs with the probability of an undesired and uncherished creation. This is a central problem for a significant number of kids, incarcerated in authoritarian social structures.

Such self-perpetuating unnatural conditioning is, however, but one spore of a cancerous growth which festers upon the psycho-physical reproductive system and destroys its orgasmic potential. It is symbolised by the prevailing selfishness of people used and abused as sexual objects. The masturbatory gratification or mutual rape which generally passes for love-making is a sad by-product of the competitive and acquisitive society. Can a quickly growing female liberation impetus make the anti-sex Bond Playboy Hollywood mystique redundant? Rediscover pubic-hair and genitals. The real people behind them?

Sexual discrimination saturates us all

for it is the index finger of the System's restraining and destructive hand. It is only the victimised and repressed who can liberate their jails and throw away the shackles for good. Yet we, as anarchists and human beings, can help by transcending our conditioned prejudices and transforming a normal resentment into a natural encouragement, support and solidarity. Sister against brother or sister and brother together?

Creep up closer children and old Mother Freedom will tell you things you have never heard before. How she is no longer willing to function as a sexual object for you to masturbate into. How she does not cherish the drudgery and slavery of cleaning up your garbage and shit; sucking your kids. No longer willing to do all the dirty work and act stupid to bolster up your ego. She demands to be related to on the basis of what she actually is as a person. If your relationships (communication and intercourse) with women are fashioned by an assumed superiority, tinged with a benevolent or crudely patronising paternalism, shaped by a supposed innate inequality; up yours brother. What chance the revolution whilst women remain incarcerated within the traditional abnormal authority of men?

DAVE CUNLIFFE.

SOCIAL SECURITY FOR GIPSIES

LAST YEAR I WENT to see the rehearsal of a lunch-time half-hour play in Stockholm putting the case for 47 gypsies who, having fled from Poland in the beginning, sought asylum in France. They had then fled from there to Sweden (because of brutal discrimination) and were asking for political asylum for the second time. As France happens to be within the 'free west' there was certain doubt as to whether asylum should be given.

A Social Democratic trade union leader, commenting on the question, said the following. 'The fate of these gypsies to stay here should be decided by the law of the country and not by public opinion.' Adding to this the Syndicalist movement here sent a telegram to the Government worded as follows, 'The gypsies need among other things the education and social security which Sweden can and must give them. SAC demands the Government's participation in fulfilling the gypsies' desire to build a new future in Sweden.' We might ask what 'security' SAC are referring to? How can the Government solve the gypsies' problems within a society made insecure by politicians? How does SAC account for the social insecurity that is the lot of many workers here including the homeless? Even those who have this (completely illusory) social

security have to pay a high price, i.e. obedience and stress.

The tragedy of this affair is that these 47 gypsies have had to make a choice between the harsh and less harsh discrimination, for most of them probably had no illusions concerning what would await them here. For our information (whilst Mr. Nyerere, surrounded by police, was wined and dined by politicians and interviewed by Stockholm's comic opera journalists), the *Dagens Nyheter* told us, 'It's not desirable to have large numbers of Europe's discriminated poor southern peoples wandering around the country.'

On one hand the liberals support them coming into the country. On the other hand once they are in and refuse to conform and integrate into a complex industrial society, the liberal and trade union evening papers put on their hypocritical crown of barbed wire and slobber over the gypsies' misfortunes. Psychologically this has a complete reverse effect of making workers, who are often in full support of harsh immigration laws, more tolerant.

What the public, authorities and literary prostitutes of the press here will not accept are those gypsies who refuse to adjust themselves to a modern society whose ideologies emphasize status, stability and class distinction.

The gypsies more than most of us have a greater chance of psychological survival from the rat-race of modern society and those of them that refuse to

Continued on page 4

