

Commercial T.V.

THE shape of commercial television is becoming clearer even though the discussion of details as to how the Controlling Corporation is to exercise its function produces the usual legalistic and administrative fog. The function of the Controlling Corporation is to see that commercial television does not descend to the level at which it operates in America. But apart from this consorship the commercial companies are to organize their programmes and sell advertising time to whoever cares to buy it.

Like so many schemes under democracy this all sounds fine but in practice there will be serious problems. Thus the sole revenue for this commercial television will come from the advertisers. It is pointed out that television programmes cost somewhere about £2,000 per hour to put on. The government has laid it down that not more than five or six minutes in every hour's broadcast should be given to advertising. If this stricture is implemented, these few minutes will have to provide the cost and the profits of the whole programme. The revenue of the Controlling Corporation is expected to be derived from a percentage—the figure fifteen has been mentioned—of the commercial companies takings, so the total amount of financing which those few minutes of advertising in each hour will be expected to bring in will be relatively enormous. On the other hand the advertising possibilities of television are obviously enormous also.

Control by the Largest Firms

It seems almost certain that the only organizations who will be able to make use of television advertising will be the largest and wealthiest (Socialist critics instance the largest firms, Conservative ones such wealthy one as the Co-operative movement. Both agree that smaller organizations could only benefit if they combined to buy broadcasting time). If, as seems likely, television proves to be the advertising godsend it appears, such customers will become larger and wealthier still.

The whole aim of the governments scheme is that it claims to avoid the vulgarization of television programmes by the advertisers. Yet it is almost certain that organisations wealthy enough to finance these programmes—for that is what they will be doing—will very soon find ways of influencing them. The editorial writer in the *Observer* declares that "The pressure on the programme companies by their backers will inevitably be to deliver up a mass audience, happily relaxed and prepared to accept the suggestions of the advertiser. This means that the commercial stations are likely to provide the B.B.C. with competition only in the most popular fields of sport and variety. It also means that to get the largest possible audience commercial programmes will have to aim, just as sponsored television has, at the lowest common denominator of public taste".

Here one sees the limitations of the Controlling Corporation. For a

successful commercial company will be able to justify its programmes by the revenue they bring in from the advertisers (and as we have seen will be concerned to meet the requirements of the providers of this revenue), and it is from this profit that the Controlling Corporation's own revenue will be derived. It seems therefore to use a sound-broadcasting metaphor, that whoever pays the piper will also call the tune—just the same as in all commercial fields.

VOTERS in two London constituencies have the privilege of exercising their democratic rights in by-elections as we write.

By the time FREEDOM is on sale, the results of the struggle for power in Holborn & St. Pancras will be known. From all reports in the national Press, however, the voters in that area could hardly care less which of the candidates speaks in their name for the next electoral period.

Which goes to show that maybe the people of Holborn & St. Pancras are wiser than the canvassers realise.

The candidates, Tory Tim Donovan and Labour Mrs. Jeger, find themselves lucky to amass an audience of ten with their loudspeaker cars, while their indoor meetings attract audiences only

when party leaders are on the platform—and they probably come from all over London, with very few unconverted from the actual constituency itself.

The area is not a normal residential one at all. It has a large floating population of workers and students, being a boarding-house area around university colleges and about twenty hospitals.

It also has a sizeable Catholic vote among large Italian and Cypriot communities, and both candidates are plugging hard at the faithful, hoping that their well-known habit of making the sign of the cross will guide their steps towards that other confessional box on polling days—the one where you confess your inability to think and act for yourself.

The Labour Party, on Sunday, sent its principal speakers into Mass first and then attempted to hold meetings outside the churches as the congregations trooped out. They turned out to be anything but Mass Meetings however, for Leo XIII had got in first with his declaration, in *Rerum Novarum* that Socialism means undue interference from the State and rests on a foundation of injustice.

It may or may not be the fault of the electors themselves if they don't know the difference between the Labour Party and Socialism, but in the other by-election, the forthcoming one in North Paddington, there should be no confusion whatsoever, for the one and only true Socialist Party of Great Britain is entering the lists there.

This by-election has been caused by the resignation of Mr. W. J. Field (Labour) who was recently convicted on a charge of importuning, and it was an edifying spectacle to see how the job-seekers started to form a queue from the first day Field was charged. Like hyenas smelling blood, numerous disappointed ex-candidates from the Labour ranks moved in as soon as trouble hit one of their comrades—not to offer a word of solidarity (that would have been bad for the vote) but to try and get his job.

The lucky Labourite has been Mr. Ben Parkin, and he is opposed by a Mr. John Eden, a relation of our present Foreign Secretary.

But these two are the representatives of Capitalism. Lifting aloft the banner of Socialism is Mr. W. Waters of the S.P.G.B., the party pledged to pass a law abolishing capitalism immediately after it has won a majority of seats in the House of Commons.

This party actually got as far as contesting two seats in the 1950 General Election, and had the pleasure of handing over £300 to the Treasury in two lost deposits. Anxious to donate another £150 to the capitalist State (it will buy a few rifles, or pay the expenses of keeping a prisoner in jail a few months) the only true Socialists are setting out to

Continued on p. 4

Police Sentenced for Brutality Against Mau Mau Suspects

THAT objectionable police methods and the police mentality are products of the arbitrary power possessed by them is shown in the recent trial of a Kenya screening team in Tanganyika. Eleven members of this team were sent to Tanganyika in search of Mau Mau suspects among Kikuyu settlers in the northern province of the territory. They proceeded to carry out their investigations with considerable cruelty and were finally brought to trial for it. It then transpired that the leader of this team was a youth of 19 named Brian Hayward. He pleaded guilty and accepted full responsibility for what had occurred.

According to the press "medical evidence corroborated stories told of the suspects being tied up with leather thongs around their necks and of some who claimed that their ear drums had been burnt with cigarettes".

Hayward was sentenced to three months' imprisonment and fined £100. The ten African Kikuyu members of the team who admitted acting under instructions and also pleaded guilty were fined £5 and one day's imprisonment.

The Tanganyika government claimed to take a very serious view of this case although counsel for the defence, pointing out that this screening team "had obtained valuable information, including the existence of Mau Mau funds", added that the Tanganyika government was

using this information "in spite of its righteous horror at the methods used".

It is hard to believe that African opinion will regard these sentences as very heavy—especially as the magistrate deploring the fact that an inexperienced youth of 19 should have been placed in charge of such a commission excused him also on the grounds of Mau Mau terrorist acts. He remarked that he did not consider that the sentence would blight his career.

The whole conduct of this case sheds light on the attitude of the colonial authorities, first in putting such activities in the charge of a man of Hayward's age. But the Tanganyika authorities must also have made facilities available and more people than the 11 accused must have known what was going on. The magistrate's "speech in mitigation" is also rather extraordinary for it implies that the terrorism of the Mau Mau partly justified Hayward's actions, without any reference to the fact that the victims were no more than suspects and were being screened because they were Kikuyu tribesmen living in neighbouring Tanganyika. A similar justification could have been used in favour of Nazi methods but would cut little ice in Europe. The difference illustrates how very different is the attitude of Europeans towards the natives of Africa.

Progress Report 2

LONDON ANARCHIST CLUB

THE latest figures for promises towards the Club Fund are given below.

Readers will see that Londoners are now committing themselves on paper and that we are within striking distance of half the original target for the initial fund and that the monthly guarantees show a total that should cover what we had in mind as a feasible rent.

These figures do not include offers made by comrades on conditions. These are the £10 I mentioned in the last Progress Report, dependent on 9 others offering a similar sum (an invitation nobody has taken up!) and an offer of 2 guineas yearly by a London comrade on conditions we have a licensed bar.

This latter point had been considered before and had been generally thought undesirable at least at present. For one thing, to have a licensed bar means your premises must be open to police inspection at any time—which might be inconvenient when plots are being hatched! Further we are not particularly keen on the club becoming a rendezvous for those

interested only in getting a drink after hours. I am not suggesting this applies to our comrade, but it would to others.

If, however, these two conditional donations can nevertheless be counted in, then we are well over the half-way mark, which I feel is not too bad for a beginning.

On suggestions for raising money, we have had a letter from a Leeds comrade who says some nice things about FREEDOM and urges comrades to pay fourpence for their copies, the extra penny to go to the Club Fund. This, of course, is open for anybody to do, but it can lead to confusion and it keeps separate activities clearly apart if separate payments are made. Perhaps I should stress here that although offers of pounds are being discussed and promised, pennies are appreciated no less.

The premises problem is still not solved, but there is one possibility in the offing which may enable us to make a start on a part-time arrangement that will give us the opportunity to get an organisation working and build up resources for a full scale effort. More of this in the next report.

P.S.

CLUB FUND COMMITMENTS

London: N.1: S.B. 10/- (10/-); N.8.: H.N. £5 (£1); N.W.3: R.J.B.A. £1 (10/-); R.S. (10/-); K.H.L. (10/-); E.P. (£1); A.W.U. (£1); E.7: W.E.C. 10/- (4/-); W.C.2.: M.C. £2 (8/-); S.E.13.: J.B. £4 (10/-); N.W.6.: B.C. £2 (10/-); S.E.1.: C.Q. £1; E.5.: J.S. (8/-); W.C.2.: E.B. (10/-); Killin. Perthshire: R.T. 5/-; Hayes, Kent: M.S. £5 (£1); Swansea: R.L. £1.	Total	£22. 15s. (£8. 10s.)
Previously Acknowledged	£20. 14s. (£4. 4s.)	
Guaranteed to Date	£43. 9s. (£12. 14s.)	

OFFERS OF HELP:
Kilburn, N.W.6.: B.C.; Clapton, E.5.: J.S.

FREE EUROPE ?

HOW free is a police State? That all depends, of course, on which side of the iron curtain it happens to be. An advertisement in the *Observer* (15/11/53) announces a series of articles to commence in *The Times* (beginning Nov. 17) on "Communism in Free Europe—its present strength".

"Free Europe", it seems, is a very loose term, for this series of articles is contributed by *The Times* special correspondents in all countries outside of Cominform domination. This apparently is enough to make them "free"—but in the list of countries and special areas with which the articles will deal appear the names Spain and Yugoslavia!

How flexible the words "free" and "freedom" appear to be!

The Future of Conscription

THE debate on National Service served to display once again the virtual identity of outlook of the Conservative government and the Labour opposition. Mr. Attlee pointed out that the increase of the period of service from eighteen months to two years was a product of the crisis caused by the Korean war, and ought to be reviewed in more normal times. He underlined the necessity for conscription at the moment but implied that the Labour Party did not regard it as an inevitably permanent institution.

The Prime Minister, in the adroit parliamentary manner which comes easily to him, opened by expressing his gratitude to the Labour Party for having had the courage to introduce peace-time conscription—by which he placed responsibility equally on Labour shoulders. He, too, hastened to envisage the possible abolition of conscription altogether, but then concentrated on arguments in favour of retaining the two years period at the moment.

The debate soon developed into a discussion on the rather narrow topic of whether the international situation, and the needs of the armed forces would now permit of a reduction in the period of service. Churchill said outright that no such reduction could be contemplated. The Labour Opposition would not commit themselves to saying that it should be reduced, but sidestepped this responsibility by asking for an annual review of the matter.

In short, the only difference is that the government are in power and the Opposition are in "opposition". Conscription is to stay and there is no discussion of the basic objections to it because neither Party regards them as having the slightest validity.

Meanwhile, the Duke of Edinburgh, has added a few words of his own in the general desirability of compulsory military service as a good thing in itself. He has been severely taken to task by the Social-

ist *Forward* of Glasgow who point out that not even the government go this far.

It seems perfectly obvious that the virtues of conscription as envisaged by the Duke of Edinburgh are only valid in our competitive fear-ridden world: that conscription is necessary to the present stage of national and economic organization; and that to oppose conscription alone, as an isolated phenomenon, is, like simple opposition to war alone, doomed to failure and sterility. Conscription is part of our type of society, and it will be successfully abolished by changing the basis of our society. Neither parties in power and opposition nor reformist opposition have any wish to make any such revolutionary change or support it if it comes from a more widespread popular base. A practical opposition must therefore spring from a revolutionary attitude towards the present social and economic systems.

ONE has only to read copies of those sections of Hansard dealing with the written answers by Ministers to statistical questions put to them by members or glance at some of H.M. Stationery Office publications to realise what an army of bureaucrats are busily engaged year in year out keeping tabs on everything that is happening, and being able to provide answers to the most abstruse statistical question which one feels would tax even the ingenuity of the most eminent experts in the science of football pool permutations and combinations!

Actually, the publication which has prompted these remarks can be considered one of the simpler examples of Whitehall's statistical ingenuity. We refer to the first volume of the *Census of Distribution and other Services 1950** prepared by the Board of Trade which deals with the 'Retail and Service Trades'.

At a glance (with the aid of a magnifying glass) one is able to ascertain that there are no less than 2½ million persons engaged full time and 593,723 part-time in 688,812 establishments and who receive £563,972,000 in wages, whose job it is to distribute goods and services in Retail Trades to the population of Gt. Britain, numbering 49 millions at the time of the Census. In other words approximately one person out of every eighteen is in one way or another engaged in the business of serving you at the counter in the greengrocer's shop, the fishmonger's the butcher's and the grocer's shop, not to mention the baker's assistant and the waitress; or fitting you for a pair of shoes or a new suit. Indeed if you are a woman you may even need one of 3,337 full- and 1,570 part-time assistants to help you fight your way into a corset two sizes too

*Published by H.M. Stationery Office, London, 1953, 7s. 6d. net.

A Picture of Economic Injustice

flattering, or appeal for moral support to one of 2,371 furriers to persuade your husband that any self-respecting woman should possess a mink coat! You may even be asking one of 51,000 booksellers (and stationers) to order for you a *Freedom Press* publication or one of the 90,000 persons engaged in the "Furniture group" for anything from veneered orange-case furniture to some exquisite piece of Louis Quinze. You may be buying a picture or a Radio set, from one of the 110,000 assistants in the Hardware Group; or handing in your N.H. shilling to one of the 72,000 full- and part-time dispensing chemists. And when you buy your bar of chocolate, your newspaper, or your cigaretttes, remember that sharing the fate of that unhappy-looking assistant cooped up in her wind-swept kiosk like a chicken being fattened up for Xmas, are nearly one quarter of a million like sufferers throughout the county, half of them engaged full-time in this occupation, and whose average wage amounts to less than £2 a week.

The smile from the florist's assistant (7,000 of them) is as much part of her job as the look of condolence your relatives will get from the Funeral Furnisher (12,000) when you are dispatched. But surely it seems unfair that (even) a forced smile should receive only half the wages paid to the professional mourner!

But one thing is certain: whether you are engaged in the "Jewellery, Leather and Sports Goods group" or are heaving coal in the "Coal, Builders' materials, corn group": or are one of the 75,000 hairdressers of Britain; or doling out fish and chips in the "Catering Group (400,000), or changing the wheel on Lady Docker's gold-plated Daimler in the

"Motor Vehicle repairers, garages group" (143,000); or perhaps selling one of those aristocratic models in prams in Baker Street in the "Motor Vehicles, cycles and accessories group" (55,000) . . . we said, one thing is certain, that you are among the worst paid members of the working class, in spite of your pin-striped trousers and your well-groomed hair, or your Persil white apron and jacket! For the figures we quoted at the beginning show that even assuming that the 688,812 part-time workers earned nothing and the £564 million in salaries and wages went entirely to the 2½ million full-time workers, the average wage would still only amount to £225 p.a. or 86/- per week. With deductions for N.I. and bus fares the average shop assistant will take home a little

more than 75/- for having stood on his or her feet for 44 hours a week in conditions varying from the spacious luxury of Harrod's to my newsagent's dingy shack by the railway bridge.

★
THE publication before us presents us with a vast mass of statistics, classified, it is true but lifeless. With patience, a slide-rule and some social feeling it is possible to translate them into human problems and see the deep divisions which create and perpetuate social and class distinctions.

To illustrate this within the limits of an article we must compare extremes. The census provides us with the details of Retail Trade and Trade Services for every town in Gt.

BRITAIN with a population of not less than 25,000. As presented it seems to us that the most accurate picture of conditions can be adduced from the figures for towns with a population of not less than 100,000 inhabitants but not exceeding 250,000. And within these limits the most striking contrast can be seen in comparing a town such as Reading (pop. 115,770) with one of almost the same population such as Rhondda (pop. 112,300).

Compared with an average expenditure for the whole country on Retail trades and Service trades of £120 per head, the comparable figure for Reading is £160 and for Rhondda £68. Of these amounts Rhondda spends on food (excluding sweets) £42.6 to Reading's £55.2. And there is a noticeable difference in the kinds of food the people in these two towns can afford. Rhondda

Continued on p. 3

REVIEWS

THE SOCIAL INSECTS

THE SOCIAL INSECTS, by O. W. Richards. (Macdonald, London).

THERE is no need to imagine inter-planetary journeys if we find mankind too self-repetitive and uninteresting. Animals on our planet can give us all the strangeness and otherness we may desire, and if we lack leisure and opportunities to observe them directly we can always do so through a book such as "The Social Insects" by O. W. Richards, and be richly rewarded with skillfully arranged material both for wonder and speculation.

Social insects deserve our special attention because we are too inclined to think of society as a human prerogative, and because, if we assume an evolutionary link between rudimentary and complex forms of society, we can better describe its biological origin in the insect world than in the human. What applies to in-

sects does not necessarily apply to men, yet, however distantly related the two groups may be, it is not without emotion that we can imagine ourselves in a predicament peculiar to an insect's individual or evolutionary life. I hold, intuitively but not altogether irrationally, that both emotion and imagination are in this case a token of the unity of all species, and that Jung's notion of the subconscious should be taken to include memories from even the remotest of our animal ancestors, those also, therefore, that carried the seed of both insect and human evolution.

With bees "the male is always killed in the act of fertilization, since he can eject the sperm only by generating great pressure of his blood. Under this pressure the hinder part of his genital system is forced out and is left behind in the body of the queen" (Richards, p.106). From this tragic sacrifice, to which we must add that of thousands of other drones that die of hunger and cold, and never mate, queen bees are born, and the continuation of the bee-colony ensured. But in other species of hymenoptera it appears that under special circumstances queens may be produced without the co-operation of the male. It follows that the bond between male and female cannot be taken as the basis of social life. "All the advanced insect societies", instead, "appear to have arisen from a progressive development of maternal care, the social unit being the mother and her offspring rather than a collection of brothers and sisters" (p.34). Moreover "a true social insect may be defined as one in which the female helps or tends to construct a brood-chamber for an egg (or larva) laid by another female" (p.37). Using for the sake of convenience the terminology of instincts we could say that the maternal instinct in the female is stronger than the mating or sexual instinct, and that by sacrificing the latter to the former workers are produced with no sexual life, and society emerges and acquires its distinctive features. Turning to Freud, then, we gather that a similar sacrifice is at the basis of human society also, and we understand how social life imposes such a strain on libidinal impulses.

The cause of the formation of castes among social insects is that originally similar grubs develop differently according to the type of food they receive. The evidence is rather stronger for the first interpretations, but experiments and observations are not lacking to support the second. Wesson, for example, has found that well fed grubs of one species of ants gives a high percentage of queens while poorly fed ones give a great majority of workers. Scarcity of food and the impossibility for all individuals to live a fully sexual life may thus be an additional factor of society-formation. Considering, then, how the life of workers is strictly subordinate to that of the queen to the extent that the original colony of a species may die off when an alien queen introduces herself and has her own brood brought up by the invaded species, one is tempted to identify work with slavery, and to think of society more in terms of degeneration than of evolutionary progress.

Some species of ants have developed, together with or to the exclusion of workers, a military caste with sickle-like mandibles that give them easy victory over other species while making them unable to feed themselves. By raids in the nests of other species they capture slaves by whom they are attended and fed. Biologists call these raiding species degenerate, but the world would better fit the slave species, one of which, the

Tetramorium, has been observed to help the slave-owning species in carrying out other raids on its own kind. Having relinquished sexuality, the worker devotes all its energies indifferently to the good of its kind as to that of an usurper's brood, while the fully-sexed usurper makes a point of preventing its host from producing sexual forms.

With the exception of parasite species, "insects do not normally fight unless one forms the natural food of the other" (p.204). Aggressive behaviour is shown only by females for an oviposition-site. What makes for mutual tolerance and indeed for social life is not the fact of belonging to the same species or even to the same family, but, as testified by parasites, artificial introductions, and the undisturbed existence of many alien insects in ant-nests, the acquisition of a common smell. "If ant-colonies are split into two artificial nests, the two halves may fight if reunited after an interval of some months" (p.203). It seems obvious to me that neither racial or economic factors are the real cause of war between human societies but, the same as in insects, the lack of a common smell, or, to put it less crudely, the result of not having grown up in what may be called the same nest.

Some form of language has been discovered in ants and bees, but the part played by it cannot account for the high degree of co-operation in insect societies. Nor can we find in them any system of government or coercion. Caste-determination has been explained by Grassé as a 'group effect' acting through the nervous system. It is an unsatisfactory explanation. Queens, males, and various kinds of workers are produced according to the changing needs of the colony as though each individual knew what these needs were and developed accordingly. This fact will never be understood as long as we consider other species inferior to ours, and try to explain their behaviour in terms of our own individual or group psychology. Before saying that insects do not know what they are doing or why they are doing it in one way instead of another, we should ask ourselves whether our ordinary and scientific knowledge can tell us anything about the how and why of any activity involving us as members of the species 'man'. Do we know, for instance, why and how we think, or how and why we built so many artifacts instead of splitting up in a variety of physiological castes? It is a psychology of species that we need, a study of the "Will" or the "Unconscious" such as Schopenhauer and Hartmann have indicated, a knowledge not only based on experiment and observation, but also enlightened by sympathy and intuition.

GIOVANNI BALDELLI.

"The state has forbidden to the individual the practice of wrongdoing, not because it desires to abolish it, but because it desires to monopolize it . . . The warring state permits itself every such misdeed, every such act of violence, as would disgrace the individual man . . . It absolves itself from the guarantees and contracts it had formed with other states, and makes unabashed confession of its rapacity and lust for power, which the private individual is then called upon to sanction in the name of patriotism."

From Freud's "Thoughts on War and Death".

OUR RULERS

UNSURE HERRSCHER (Our Rulers) by W. Engler. (Carus, Zurich, Switzerland. 120 pp.)

THOUGH the author makes no mention to that effect, this book is based on the theories of the land and money reformer Silvio Gesell, a German, who published his book: "Die natürliche Wirtschaftsordnung", (The natural order of economics) at the beginning of this century.

The first half of Mr. Engler's book is a shattering critique of the contemporary capitalistic society. The second half, with the title: "Zukunftsland" (Land of the future) is the story of a future society, an Utopia, a production of the author's imagination. To libertarians,

this Utopia cannot be other than unacceptable, because it is a society divided into classes and estates in a state ruled by supermen.

The author criticises only private capitalism and enterprises seeing in them the only reason for all the evils of to-day; the sinister rôle of the State is never mentioned. Of course he could not oppose the State, because in Silvio Gesell's Utopia the State will play an important part; it will own all the land, since it belongs to all the people who live on it, and it would be a gross injustice if any person could claim a piece of land for his private property. And if the value of a piece of land increases, and more rent is paid for it, then the whole country shall benefit. The State will rent the land to the highest bidder, and use the income from rents to pay for its expenses, which will suffice, so that the people will not have to pay any taxes.

The author's intention is not to abolish capitalism. On the contrary his object is to stabilize it for all time by land and money reforms. The banks pay no interest on deposits, but so long as the money is deposited in a bank it doesn't lose its value. Since money in circulation loses 1% of its value every week, after two years of circulation it becomes valueless. Therefore, so goes the theory, all the money in circulation, and in the banks will cry for investment in enterprises in order to maintain its value and bring profit, and that will keep business and work continuously moving at high speed.

In his Utopia the author describes these reforms in action. No more taxes, neither direct or indirect; no duty on goods to, or from foreign countries; no slumps, full employment in the workshops and factories; business is at its best all the time; no necessity to work for armaments, because the workshops have plenty of orders to keep everybody employed, therefore everybody is against war if it can be avoided. And everybody with a little spirit of enterprise can become a capitalist, for they can obtain money from the bank free of interest, but of course only against security. (Here we see a flaw in the theory. Neither Silvio Gesell nor the author explains how a poor devil can make a start, giving security, and competing with a millionaire. The State sees to it that the value of money remains stable, there being neither inflation nor deflation. What a

man could buy for a shilling to-day, he will be able to buy in twenty years' time, or could buy twenty years ago, no more, nor less, etc., etc.

In the author's Utopia the economic set-up is satisfactory, and that is all that matters. Capitalism is shorn of its bad habits and outgrowths, and is made to function for the benefit of humanity. Free enterprise, scope for adventurous business men, each for himself, the weak left to sink, the sooner the better, these are the slogans of Utopia. Only the daring adventurous men, who will have brought benefits to the people and country are the governors. Only in relation to his deeds is a man treated and judged, and accordingly has a higher or lower rank in the different estates or classes in the country. The Masters are the highest estate, they have 6 votes in an election, the Freemen are the next estate, they have 3 votes, and the last estate with votes are the citizens who have 1 vote each. But the proviso for every voter is that his ancestors shall have lived for the last 100 years in Utopia, otherwise they cannot vote. The last estate are the commons, the weak, who are not able to support themselves. They have no right to vote, and are also forbidden by law from having any descendants. Women have no vote, because they are not supposed to have a clear conception of public affairs. Raising children, and working in the kitchen is considered the most fitting work for them.

That members of the higher estates are not so heavily punished, when they have committed a crime, as members of the lower estates for the same crime is "natural" to this society, etc., etc.

But there are in Utopia arrangements with which we can agree. For instance the power of the churches is broken, and no priest or preacher is allowed to exploit the people.

The mammoth workshops which employ thousands of workers, are decentralized, and split up into small workshops, and so is it with the big cities. Now the people live in small towns and villages, where industrial and agricultural work are combined.

The book is written in a concentrated language, a large part of it in aphorisms and by examples, and there is more in its 120 pages than in many a book of 500. It can be recommended to students of economics and sociology, even if they do not agree with the general trend of it, for they will nevertheless discover new horizons for thought when they read it.

WILLY FRITZENKOTTER.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

OPEN 10 a.m. to 6.30; 5.0 SATURDAYS

New Books . . .

England—Your England

George Orwell 12/6

Jung's Psychology and its

Social Meaning Iva Proggoff 18/-

Sexual Behaviour in the Human

Female Kinsey 50/-

Sexual Behaviour in the Human

Male Kinsey 47/6

Reprints . . .

From the Edge of the Primeval

Forest Albert Schweitzer 5/-

News from Nowhere

William Morris 3/6

THINKERS LIBRARY at 1/6 each

Origins of Religion; Evolution of

Society; Clearer Thinking; The Dis-

torted Mind; Select Works of

Voltaire; Let the People Think; Jesus;

Myth or History? Life of Jesus;

Men versus the State.

Remainder . . .

The Incomparable Aphra (Behn)

George Woodcock 5/-

Second-Hand . . .

Paradox of Oscar Wilde

George Woodcock 6/-

WE CAN SUPPLY THE FOLLOWING

PERIODICALS:

Socialist Leader 3d.; Peace News 4d.;

Freethinker 4d.; L'Adunata 3d.;

Volonta 1/-; Industrial Worker 3d.

(Add three halfpence for postage)

Obtainable from

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

PRODUCTS OF ANXIETY

FREEDOM has often had occasion to stigmatize our age as an age of anxiety. In the past we have usually pointed to the political uses to which mass anxiety is put. The cold war is presented to all the participating nations as a struggle to prevent potentially hostile powers (with whom however a state of nominal peace exists) from securing a decisive position of advantage from which to strike the opening blow in a new war. And it naturally follows from such a situation that all kinds of unpopular measures from military conscription to high taxation can be presented as necessary evils. We have come to recognize that whenever a political campaign is conducted in the newspapers of which the obvious effect will be a feeling of insecurity and anxiety, then we may expect some unpalatable measure to be foisted on the population by the government.

Anxiety thus serves political ends by making it difficult to pursue radical and long term aims, because there is always some immediate need created "by the prevailing international tension" to push them aside. Mass anxiety permits of a policy of temporizing in important affairs.

Such arguments are not new in FREEDOM, and they are confirmed every day. But there are other aspects of the same problem. Anxiety is not only fostered by governments but also by prevailing ideas of education and of conduct. Children are taught to obey by discipline and punishment. It is still exceptional for them to learn co-operation with others through freedom, the absence of coercion and moral harangues, and the gratification of their needs.

Many people are exceedingly intolerant of this kind of argument. All this concern about upbringing seems to them to be sentimental and trifling. "Children have got to learn to make their way in the world", they need, in the words of the Duke of Edinburgh, as he commended conscription, "to have their edges knocked off them". FREEDOM does not accept the force of these arguments put forward by people who conceive themselves to be practical.

One may frequently learn important general lessons from extreme cases. It is reported that in his confession, the farmer Gaston Dominici who is charged with murdering Sir Jack Drummond and his wife and daughter, is said to have been taken by Drummond for a tramp and was so incensed at being so regarded when in fact he was the owner of the land on which the camp was set that he shot both the adults and then killed the child. Now, a man who is at peace with himself and the world does not get greatly incensed if a stranger takes him for something other than he is. A most eminent surgeon at one of the leading London hospitals who was not very imposing to look at used often to be asked by patients' relatives on visiting days to tell them where such and such a ward was in a way that showed that they mistook him for a porter. But instead of resenting their mistake, he would simply answer their queries without even revealing to them that they had made a mistake. He was sufficiently sure of himself to be in no way upset either by their mistake or by the fact that his appearance permitted such a mistake to be made, as it was, very frequently.

Taking the Dominici confession at its face value (we will not discuss whether an English Court would accept an information "voluntarily" given after 48 hours of continuous

DWIGHT MACDONALD'S accurate profile of Roger Baldwin (*The New Yorker*, July 11 and 18), "The Defense of Everybody," leads to reflections on the current state of affairs in civil liberties.

Macdonald traces Baldwin's pilgrimage from the far west of politics to a "homogenized" pan-Americanism embracing everything as far east as MacArthur. World War I conscientious objector, anarchist, founder of the American Civil Liberties Union, editor of a volume of Kropotkin's "Revolutionary Pamphlets," Baldwin, in the last stages of his progress, acquiesced in the deportation of the Japanese from California in 1942, abandoned the conscientious objectors in World War II, undercut the campaign for amnesty for all draft-law violators, and whitewashed the American occupation in Japan. But whatever damage Baldwin did to civil liberties in his later years, it is done; he is no longer director of the ACLU, and unhappily his migration across the political spectrum is not exceptional enough to detain us.

I. Liberty—Legal and Illegal

When we think of "civil liberties," we think first of the "constitutional rights." During the Twenties and Thirties, these were the centre of concern. A wall of local ordinances, arbitrary law authorities, professional vigilantes, stood between the union organizers and radical "agitators" and the audiences they sought to reach; often enough, instead of a wall it was a club or a rope. Company towns and injunction-judges mocked the workers' freedom of association. In breaking down these barriers, and in protecting people from arbitrary police authority, from search and seizure, from extreme censorship, from legal frame-ups—in all these spheres the ACLU, and the persons it has bestirred to action directly and indirectly, has had notable if far from complete success. So long as our liberties consist only of restraints on government, so long as power and monopoly dominate our society, this vigilance, coupled with assertion and exercise of these liberties, are our protection. Neither the Department of Justice, nor the Supreme Court Harry Truman bequeathed to posterity, are going to look out for us.

But there is also another kind of liberty—one on which there is no constitutional rights to appeal to. It was, curiously and significantly, just in this kind of issue that the ACLU was born.

(questioning) it might be thought that his reaction of rage was very exceptional. But in the Clapham Common stabbing case the whole affray started because one of the attacking boys resented a derogatory remark passed by the victim. And how many times in every day experience does one not see evidence of excessive resentment where self pride is concerned. People who react in that way are plainly so insecure that they resent the casual opinions of complete strangers.

Fantasies of revenge are regarded as quite natural, and one often hears people make some such remark as "If I thought he (or she) had done that I'd kill him". One may deplore the violence which leads to murder, but restrained and calm behaviour is not only comparatively rare, but is not even regarded as particularly desirable, pride and the wish to avenge a real or fancied slight being accepted as natural to a man "with red blood in his veins".

Yet every person of insight knows that this latter is the attitude of individuals who are unsure of themselves—who suffer, in fact, from anxiety. In theory, of course, men and women who are wise and balanced and are able to regard minor affronts without undue passion, are admired. But not in practice.

Governments and insecure people thus exhibit an interplay of anxiety in which a hierarchical system flourishes, and wisdom and calmness are relegated to a very minor position. Both on the political and the personal level individual insecurity shows itself as the hallmark of the "age of anxiety". Murders and the politics of fear are alike symptoms of a sick society. And the anxiety they spring from militates powerfully against the establishment of a reasonable society.

Of more importance is the change the years have wrought in the ACLU, and in the panorama of the civil liberties.

Macdonald quotes Clifford Forster, the Union's special counsel, as saying: "The Union began outside the legal system and in opposition to the government. But in recent years it has gradually become assimilated into both."

For his own part, Macdonald observes: "Our politics, like our milk, are now homogenized. American capitalists compete with liberals in supporting the Bill of Rights—with a few reservations on both sides about national security in wartime . . ."

"To-day even protests against the social system have become part of that system . . . and the Department of Justice has its Civil Rights Division, which defends the rights of some citizens while the rest of the Department is busy taking away the rights of others . . ."

"The old order changeth, yielding place to the new; the moralist is replaced by the specialist; Jeremiah and Savonarola have given way to the technicians of worthy causes."

What was legal about the refusal of conscientious objectors to serve in the Army in the first World War? What was legal about the Wobblies' and Socialists' and anarchists' violation of the sweeping laws against "sedition" and "criminal syndicalism"? What was legal about the radical opinions and activities of "aliens" when Congress had revoked their rights to these views and the Supreme Court had upheld Congress? There were illegal abuses, of course, and the lawyers could try to set technical limits, within the law, to the government's proceedings. But the proceedings were legal, and liberty was illegal.

From the perspective in vogue now—when conditions are very similar—to oppose such a repressive legality, to defend the illegal liberty, is futile and possibly dangerous. Certainly it is a losing fight! Yet in that earlier period the ACLU, and similar groups, strove by publicity and education to persuade people that these proceedings, though "legal," though established by Congress and validated as 'constitutional', were destructive of liberty—and liberty was more important than law. What a splendid losing struggle! When the war was over and the hysteria died down, Americans were ashamed of the barbarities inflicted on the COs, they were ashamed of the sedition indictments and the deportations. (Nowadays, the blackest page in the history of American civil liberties, the deportation of the Japanese from California, could be duplicated without a moral qualm.)

To-day, we have more security in our "constitutional rights"—but we have fewer of them! And such as remain are vitiated. The Supreme Court upholds the "investigative powers" of Congress, it upholds the laws aimed at the Communist Party.¹ Who would dream of challenging again the constitutionality of conscription?² Certain details can be

¹ These prosecutions go on and on. On August 25 in Pittsburgh, Federal Judge March sentenced five Communists to five years imprisonment under the Smith Act. One, 73 years old, is to be sent to a prison with facilities for tuberculars. Since passage of the 1948 conscription law, a "preliminary survey" shows, 350 conscientious objectors, excluding Jehovah's Witnesses, have been arrested, and at least 227 sentenced to prison. Most sentences exceed two years. (*The Reporter of the National Service Board for Religious Objectors*, Sept., 1953.) This is to say nothing of the COs the deprivation of whose liberty is limited to assignment to "alternative service."

Economic Injustice

spends more than Reading on groceries but less at the butcher's (£2.63 as against £6.15 per head per annum) or with the milkman (£2.6 as against £5.5). There are also more canteen facilities in Reading (64 to 19) and though Rhondda has the greater number of fried fish shops (50 to 40) the takings in Reading shops were higher (£84,000 to £70,000). If you lived in Reading you would spend more than twice as much as the man from Rhondda on sweets and tobacco, on clothes, and on boot and shoe repairs. You would spend a guinea a year with your hairdresser compared with his four shillings and sixpence, and even your funeral arrangements would be in the region of 3 to 1 in their grandeur. Most striking is the difference in such categories as the "Motor vehicles, cycles and repairers and garage" groups where you would spend £20 a year against Rhondda's 23/-. And on "Jewel-

carried to the courts—in this way, protection under the Fifth Amendment was affirmed—but against the system as a whole, there is no legal appeal. By and large, it is not a time for lawyers, it is not a time for "homogenized liberals" and "technicians of worthy causes." It is a time for the defense of the illegal.

II. Law vs. Liberty

What is legal to-day?

For having written a book, a man may be summoned before a Congressional Committee and required to state his political views, or declare that frank testimony might end in prosecution, or go to jail. (Did the author ask the State Department to buy his book? He might retort—*caveat emptor*.)

For having made errors in testimony, a man is in danger of prosecution for perjury. (Or for making what are thought to be errors.) To be sure, to convict it must be shown that the errors were willful; but a jury can do no better than make vague guesses about the state of a man's memory and the state of his intent.

For having attended a public political meeting, a person's name may be supplied to the FBI for its files, by policemen who note down the license plates.

III. Liberty to Be Stupid, Liberty to Conspire

The liberty of each of us depends on the liberty of all of us. Now this is even a rather hackneyed idea that is always very easy to understand in the case of a very remote country; but it is a vanishing number of Americans who are willing to act, in America, on its consequences.

The liberals who want to deny free speech, free conspiracy, free association, freedom to work at their professions, etc., to Communists, and yet do not like McCarthyism, are in the position of a man who eats meat but complains about the murder of cows in the slaughter-houses. To be sure, there is justice in their complaint that the McCarthys are careless about distinguishing between New Dealers and Communists, and are grinding many unpleasant axes. But it is utter nonsense to pass laws against Communists and not enforce them—as the liberals sometimes seem to want. If the laws, if the purposes of the laws, are to be served, then the government must send its stool-pigeons into private organizations, it must use a broad concept of perjury, it must take down license numbers, and do many another unpleasant thing.

To inquire into the opinions of one man, is to deprive every man of a part of his liberty. A man who is "free" to speak in public, but dares not for fear of what may befall him to-morrow or twenty years from to-morrow, enjoys a very peculiar sort of freedom. Or suppose the speaker dares, he is a bold type. The people who are "free" to go hear him but dare not go lest no good come of it, are also enjoying a funny kind of freedom. (For an obvious parallel, freedom of religion in Russia will do.)

This compels a choice: either accept the consequences, the impairment of the liberty of us all—and this is already the fact—or give up the objectives. The second choice means, to grant to everyone, Communists included, complete freedom of speech, freedom from harass-

We choose at random, and instances as likely to affect non-Communists as Communists, non-radicals as radicals.

To get evidence against Communists, to establish the identity of all Communists, to root Communists out of the professions, all very "legal" aims, the government exposes every citizen to the same threat. Every citizen who expresses an idea to which Communists agree—which is to say everyone—every person who is unorthodox in an unorthodox way (perhaps he has late parties at his house every week—this has happened), every person who is in bad with a single informed or hysterical patriot, runs the risk of "exposure," public embarrassment, a cloud of suspicion, and possibly the familiar graver consequences.

In this atmosphere, only conservative opinions can survive, only the hardest souls will take the risk of unconformity.

None of this is news. We were writing about it in *Resistance* three, four, five and more years ago. Liberals are generally aware of the facts. (Though it is easy to over-estimate the number of people who see them, or are willing to see them. The majority of newspaper editors on the committee that considered the Wechsler-McCarthy case could see no "clear and present danger.") Unhappily it is no longer gloomy prophecy; and it is no longer enough to perceive it and warn against it—but to attack its sources. And these sources are not merely McCarthy.

ment, freedom of association. And none of these rights can be secure, unless everyone has privacy of opinion—even if it is absurd, even if it is conspiratorial.

As anti-Communists of long standing—as persons who were anti-Communist in the days of the Soviet-American alliance—we unhesitatingly choose liberty for everyone, including the Communists. We believe that those persons who care seriously about the civil liberties must begin to take a clear stand, not only against the "excesses" of McCarthyism, but against the aims and methods of the Smith Act and every succeeding act of repression in the last dozen years.

Continued on p. 4

FREEDOM PRESS

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

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

PROTESTANTS PROTEST TOO MUCH

TO-DAY, religion does not seem to trouble the minds of revolutionaries. Anarchists are generally more concerned with the secular state and its increasing powers over the individual than with the power of the Church, although reason for the ease with which the State manages to manipulate the individual can often be found in man's acceptance of a spiritual power above and outside of himself. It is an easy step from the belief in the domination of the spirit to domination by the state of the physical being.

It is held by most secular groups today that the power of the Church is on the decline, but it would be perhaps truer to say that the Church has accommodated itself to changing ideas while still retaining its basic influence, thus giving the impression that it is losing its hold.

It would be a mistake for us to underestimate the influence of the Church, politically and spiritually, and to ignore the fact that in the major Western European countries to-day the chief political positions are held by devout Christians.

We can perhaps take solace from the fact that the two important religious sects—Protestants and Catholics—are delicately at each others throats, and although they would like to present a united front their historical differences and struggle for power will inevitably continue.

LONDON BY-ELECTIONS

Continued from p. 1

prove once again that the capitalist-minded masses do not yet understand and desire Socialism.

Our guess is that it will cost their party just about £1 per vote to discover this. We would give them the information for half the price!

★

Of the issues in these by-elections we don't think it necessary to say anything. Everybody knows the difference between the Labour and the Conservative Parties, don't they? Well if they do, we wish they would write in and tell us, because we can't tell them apart any more.

The difference between the Holborn and the Paddington by-elections, however, is that in the former it looks as though the Anarchists are going to win without trying, while in the latter a conscious "don't vote" campaign is to be carried on by Anarchists in the area.

Meetings will be held and anti-election leaflets are being produced. Comrades willing to assist in the campaign between now and polling-day, December 3rd, are asked to communicate with our comrade:

S. E. PARKER,
79 Warwick Avenue, W.9.

The Logic of Liberty

IV. Pragmatic McCarthyism

There is a type of liberal, for instance Arthur Schlesinger in the current issue of the *Progressive*, who knows what the Inquisition is doing to our society, and is anxious to proportion the sacrifice of liberty to the necessity. Polemicizing against a McCarthyist, Schlesinger urges that the crisis is past—American Communism is broken—and anti-Communist measures should be viewed in this light. For those attempting to trim the liberal course, this is an attractive position, but lamentable.

The trouble is, first, that the people who have the power to turn the Inquisition off and on—if anybody has that power—are not liberals and do not have any concern for liberty. In the second place, the courts do not recognize laws that vary with expediency—they have no truck with a "clear and present danger" that comes and goes according to the political analyses of the liberal magazines. In the third place the habit of liberty is a frail thing, and when it is lost for a time, people grow alarmingly accustomed to being without it. (The civil liberties are, after all, significant directly only in the lives of non-conformists.)

Liberties under government must be clear, unambiguous, legally plain, or they are at the mercy of every policeman, magistrate and investigator. Once the pursuit and prosecution of Communists were legalized, once the appropriate agencies were authorized, a force was set going that will not be turned on and off as some objective "necessity" requires. After all, it was factors other than strict "necessity" that set it in motion. If it is turned on and off, it is in accordance

An insight into what goes on underneath the surface as well as to the fears of the Anglican Church on the influence of Rome can be read in a recent publication, *Infallible Fallacies*—a rather futile pamphlet concerned in proving that the Anglicans are truly Catholic and their bishops divinely chosen to administer sacraments—Rome has been maintaining for centuries that they are imposters.

In answer to the Roman Catholic accusation that Henry VIII founded the Church of England for somewhat despicable reasons, the Anglicans claim that the English reformation would have taken place if Henry VIII had never been born, which is probably true since the national and political interests of Britain would have clashed with Rome sooner or later.

The reason however given for Henry's desire for an "annulment" of his marriage to Katherine is so thin that only the devout will be impressed. Certainly the Roman contingent must be chuckling at the naivety of the explanation.

According to the writers of this pamphlet "What Henry asked the Pope for was not a divorce but an annulment of his marriage to Katherine on the grounds that it was not a true marriage at all. She had been the wife of Henry's deceased elder brother Arthur. By Church law a man might not marry his deceased brother's wife, but Henry had obtained a special dispensation from a previous Pope, in order to marry Katherine. He now argued that a Pope had no authority to set aside the laws of God... and he asked the new Pope to declare that, since his predecessor had acted contrary to God's law in granting the dispensation, the marriage to Katherine was no true marriage, and that he was free to marry Anne Boleyn, to whom he was now greatly attracted".

We further learn that the Pope would have no doubt granted Henry's wish but for the fact that the Emperor Charles V the nephew of Katherine "had recently sacked Rome but had not yet touched the papal lands or possessions". Here are the materialistic reasons for the frustration of Henry.

It is probable that *Infallible Fallacies* has been published at this stage in an attempt to counteract the possible support for Rome because of the "martyrdom" of catholic priests in Stalinist countries. Martyrs, as we all know, can often further a cause much quicker and more effectively than years of propaganda by word. Unfortunately for the Anglican Church it is in this matter, as in many others, a step behind Rome.

Another pamphlet published at the same time by the Committee of the Congregational Union of England and Wales entitled *The Pope's Men*, is more intelligent in its approach to the Roman Catholic Church. It deals with the psychological and political effects of the Roman Church and compares it with other authoritarian creeds. It points at the same time to the failure of the Protestant Church in many instances to offer an effective spiritual guide to individuals struggling alone with their problems and their conscience, which is supposed to be the essence of Protestantism, whereas the Roman Church "caters for fearful spirits... it will treat them as children and be content to keep them as children; it is the mother Church".

But alas, they are all agreed on the "great fundamentals of the Christian faith, that we worship God as Father, Son and Holy Spirit, that Jesus Christ is the son of God, the saviour of the World, that he died for our sins, that he rose again for our justification"...

R.M.

Limits to Anarchist Thought?

GIOVANNI BALDELLI and Milward Casey (Letters, Nov. 7) disagree with me on the same subject, but their letters are different enough to justify my replying to them separately.

Comrade Casey appears to have misunderstood my meaning. That "anarchism is the simple negative belief that coercion between persons should not take place" is not a dogmatic assertion, but a definition. Anyone who holds that belief is, Comrade Casey must admit, an anarchist; anyone who doesn't, isn't. I suppose it is possible for anarchism to be a blind faith, but in practice every anarchist (including myself) can justify anarchism with evidence to be found outside anarchism itself, and apply anarchism to social situations. The frequent statement, "there are as many kinds of

anarchism as there are anarchists", means that each anarchist has a unique way of justifying and applying his belief.

Everything people do or think about has sufficient to do with anarchism to be discussed at anarchist meetings or in the anarchist press (I have never denied it); but there cannot be an anarchist viewpoint on everything, because anarchism, as such, is limited by definition to situations where coercion might take place.

By all means let us consider and learn about art, science, philosophy; but we should avoid giving the name of 'anarchist' to our several aesthetic, scientific or metaphysical beliefs. I admit to not understanding Tragedy, but, as far as I can see, there is no more of an anarchist answer to Karl Jaspers' ideas than there is an anarchist answer to the new skirt

length. Comrade Baldelli made the grave error of using "anarchist" to mean his metaphysical ideas (which is what I meant when I said he confused his anarchism with his mysticism); but his language and subject matter are so obscure he can get away with it.

Or perhaps (turning to Comrade Baldelli's own letter), he was writing of ideas to which there can be an anarchist answer, but in words so beyond me that I classified the ideas wrongly. Comrade Baldelli admits that it is possible to be an anarchist without awareness of tragedy. More important, he does not deny that parts of his article were unfortunate as propaganda. I climb down willingly on every other point, acknowledging that Comrade Baldelli understands the article and I do not.

Let me classify my position somewhat. I have no reasonable objection to what I (no doubt wrongly) called 'mysticism'. I am emotionally repelled by the language in which it is expressed, because I associate such language with religion, and religion caused me unnecessary suffering in childhood. So to understand it I must try to avoid emotion, and investigate it, as far as possible, with reason alone.

I began my investigation into "awareness of tragedy" by assuming it was something I had but called by another name; but the dictionary was worse than useless, and no amount of self-analysis could discover an emotion or idea that seemed to fit. So I decided it was something I didn't have. This does not mean it didn't exist; some people are colour-blind or tone-deaf, but they cannot therefore claim that colours or tones are illusory. They can, in fact, prove other people's awareness of such things.

The colour-blind scientist Dalton, in the early eighteenth century, described how a colour-blind person can prove the validity of colour to himself with the assistance of any two colour-sighted persons. As a tragedy-blind person (as it were), I am still looking for two tragedy-aware people.

Investigating the "soul" and "sin" in a similar way, I have met people who assured me they were aware of these things; but when I have asked their assistance in devising and carrying out experiments to prove their awareness of such things, they have been most unco-operative.

Some people are bewildered and never seem to understand the request; others actually get angry and give voice to swearwords like "materialist" or (in the case of one mystic) "child of the Devil". Again and again, I get the impression that I am interfering with peoples' pet neuroses, and blind dogmas.

DAVID WIECK,
(Resistance, New York).

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

"Return to Paradise"

I AM surprised that, while a long review in *FREEDOM* is devoted to a mediocre film like "The Sun Shines Bright", no mention has been made of another recently released picture, "Return to Paradise", the first twenty minutes of which are excellent. An American arrives at a Pacific island and finds it under the domination of a puritanical Scottish parson, whose wardens regiment and control every activity of the people's lives. There is even a curfew; and unmarried young men and women must carry lanterns in order that the wardens can know where they are. All the people are compelled to attend church, the wardens check their names, and those who do not come are punished. The film clearly shows that the tether which holds men back from the land, and the other good things of this world, is composed of two strands, closely twisted together so as to form a mutual support, and they are the church and the State. One binds the mind, and the other the body. One teaches that it is immoral to exercise one's natural liberty, and the other that it is illegal. Slaves of God men must also be slaves of church and State, in so far as the State is consecrated by the church. "Christians and camels receive their burdens kneeling."—Ambrose Bierce. The priest in "Return to Paradise" is also the ruler of the people.

The American does not suffer himself to be ruled by the parson; he defies him. One Sunday the American is building his hut near the church. The priest comes out after the service, and tells him that he is desecrating the Sabbath. He commences to pull down the hut, and commands the people to assist him, which they reluctantly do. When the hut has been pulled down, the American takes his shot-gun and fires through the stained-glass windows of the church, shattering them. He then leads the people in re-

volt against their oppressors: the jail is burnt, and the wardens are driven from the island. The people are once again free and happy without rulers. In the immortal words of Bakunin: Neither God nor master. The film illustrates that the tether of the church and the State is the only thing which stands between man and freedom. It looks very formidable, but before we get through it we shall find that its strength is more apparent than real; that its strength is wholly in the ignorance of those who are tethered by it.

DOUGLAS MUIR McTAGGART.

Windsor, Nov. 14.

The Law's Sense of Values

ARTHUR MOYSE raises a subject of great difficulty, especially in the case of anarchist parents, it is a difficulty of which I have had personal experience.

Foremost psychologists and educationists such as Reich and Neill are agreed that sexual relations between adults and children are very bad. The compulsion to which some individuals are subjected makes it certain for such relationships to occur. What is the anarchist parent to do when such an occurrence comes to his own home? In this instance the individual concerned was asked to leave, but he is still at large in society. Had I called in the police regardless of anarchist beliefs he would have been imprisoned and then released at some future time more unbalanced than before.

Looking at the problem from the rational and long-term viewpoint, most leading progressive psychologists and sexologists are agreed that a non-repressive and non-coercive early environment and a proper emotional relationship between mother and child during the period of breast feeding (*Sources of Love and Fear*, Dr. A. Bevan-Brown) is the means of preventing such abnormalities.

The child with no guilt-complexes with regard to sex is least likely to suffer from such relationships but even so over a period of time damage could be done.

The anarchist can do much by spreading modern psychological knowledge among parents and teachers, for it is the parents primarily that create the problem child, and the problem adult, by their coercive and repressive attitude towards their children.

London, Nov. 10.

A.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting
HYDE PARK
Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

TOWER HILL
Tuesdays at 12.30 p.m.

NORTH-EAST LONDON

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

TYNESIDE ANARCHIST GROUP

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

FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

Postal Subscription Rates:

12 months 17/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)

6 months 8/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)

3 months 4/6 (U.S.A. \$0.75)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies

12 months 27/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)

6 months 13/6 (U.S.A. \$2.25)

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

FREEDOM PRESS

27 Red Lion Street

London, W.C.1 England

Tel.: Chancery 8364