

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"If all mankind minus one, were of one opinion, and only one person were of contrary opinion, mankind would be no more justified in silencing that one person, than he, if he had the power, would be justified in silencing mankind."

—JOHN STUART MILL.

Vol. 15, No. 30

July 24th, 1954

Threepence

## THE INDO-CHINA CEASE-FIRE

# ANOTHER KOREA

BY the time these words are in print formal agreement about a cease fire in Indo-China may have been reached at Geneva. The newspapers have concerned themselves with the meetings, exchanges, briefing bouts and so on, but the main issues do not yet seem clear. It seems obvious enough that the French and the Viet Nam administrations want a partition with a maximum advantage and that the Viet Minh want the same but from their opposite point of view. As far as can be judged neither the British nor the American nor the Chinese Government now have any economic or strategic interest in prolonging the war. It is said that the Soviet Government, which does not appear to be physically involved in the war to any great extent, would prefer it to continue because it constitutes a continual drain in France, and Russian interests in Europe are served by a weakened and divided France. Some such broad picture as this would seem to provide the background at Geneva. However, it must be stressed that no detailed information is available either to fill in or modify the picture.

### China and the U.N.

It does emerge however that the Indo-China war has followed to a considerable extent the pattern in Korea. The war has gone on for years, involving vast devastation and loss of life and labour, but the great powers have shown a decisive interest only when there seemed a likelihood that one side would reach a military victory. Such wars are condemned to an outcome of stalemate, and their conduct and prolongation therefore seem particularly wasteful and useless.

Recent developments in South East Asia have brought forward as a major political issue the question of whether Communist China should be admitted to the United Nations. Senator Knowland's group in America who represent the die-hard opposition to any such admission must be regarded as making a political gesture in an election year. It contains no moral content whatever.

Equally devoid of ethics or morality is the "realistic" attitude exhibited, for example, by the Labour Party in this country. On the one hand is Bevan comparing the Chinese Revolution with the Russian Revolution of 1917 and shouting about American interventionism seeking to "kill the Chinese Revolution". On the other is Attlee and the Labour leaders who are to visit China next week, anxious to show themselves practical politicians, etc., etc.

Bevan's comparisons are particularly absurd and misleading. The

Russian Revolution in 1917 was a true uprising of the people only gradually mastered by the Bolshevik counter-revolution. In this the Bolshevik insistence on centralization and militarization were greatly helped by the various interventionist expeditions of the Western Powers. In China there was no uprising of the people, the Communists gaining power by military defeat of the previous government of the Kuo-min-tang and Chiang Kai-shek. The Communist pattern in China has been imposed by ruthless force from above and possesses absolutely no revolutionary content whatever. However, to the politicians of the Left, policy may make it expedient to whitewash Chinese Communism, just as they whitewashed Tito and his administration in Yugoslavia. From a moral point of view such policy is absolutely repellent, and there is simply nothing to choose between Bevan and Attlee and Knowland on such issues.

## What is Obscenity ?

The daily press has devoted very little of its space to the summing up in a recent Old Bailey trial, presumably since it did not involve the gory details of some particularly revolting murder or the "unprofessional" conduct of some professional man—but was simply concerned with the freedom of writers to write and publishers to publish.

Yet the summing-up by Mr. Justice Stable in the case *Regina v. Secker & Warburg and Others* at the Old Bailey on July 2 has been described by the Bookseller "as the most significant judicial utterance on the subject [of books] since Lord Chief Justice Cockburn's definition of the test of obscenity in 1868." FREEDOM reprints it in full not as a "significant judicial utterance", though from the point of view of the society in which we live, it obviously is, but as one of the rare occasions on which words of common sense and enlightenment have emerged from within the unhappy walls of the Old Bailey.

MEMBERS of the jury, the charge against two limited liability companies, whom you cannot see, and one individual, whom you can, is a charge of publishing what is called an obscene libel.

In the ordinary criminal case where

you have three accused persons standing in the dock, the judge directs the jury that they must consider the evidence separately in relation to each of the accused persons. Such a warning in this case would be not merely unnecessary; it would be nonsense, for the reason that everybody agrees here that the two limited companies and the individual director stand or fall together.

Members of the jury, as to this there can be no dispute: the verdict that in the course of this afternoon you will give is a matter of the utmost consequence. It is a matter of very real importance, in its consequences, to the two companies and the individual and the individuals who are associated with the two companies who are charged. It is of importance to authors who, from their minds and imagination, create imaginary worlds for our edification, sometimes, or our amusement, and sometimes, too, for our escape. It is a matter of vast importance to the community in general, to the adolescent, perhaps, in particular, and, in addition to that, it is of great importance in relation to the future of the novel in the civilised world and the future generations who can only derive their knowledge of how we lived, thought and acted from the contemporary literature of the particular age in which they are interested. Your verdict will have a great bearing upon where the line is drawn between liberty and that freedom to read and think as the spirit moves us, and licence, which is an affront to society of which we are all, each of us, a member.

Members of the jury, in discharging that important duty, I would say just two things to you. First of all, the duty rests fairly and squarely on your shoulders. It is not what I think about this book; it is the conclusion that you come to, and you represent that vast diversity of minds

Continued on p. 2

## SYNDICALIST NOTEBOOK

# Dump the Losses off Your Back

THE little red book needs re-writing. The little red-covered I.W.W. Song Book, full of the new words to old tunes which stirred the hearts of thousands of American workers during the Wobblies' rumbustious heyday, is out of date.

Not that it needs a great deal of alteration. Just a word here and there will adjust those bitter, blood-stained words to fit the new situation. In some cases, as the heading above indicates, just a letter is sufficient.

For the American worker used to sing:—

Are you poor, forlorn and hungry?

Are there lots of things you lack?

Is your life made up of misery?

Then dump the bosses off your back.

But to-day, that would never do. To-day the American unionist is singing, not to the oppressed workers of the world, but to his own boss. To-day, when the boss looks like slipping off his back, the Union lifts him up and gently puts him back in place.

The Garment Workers' Union of America has done just that, in lending money to a firm of manufacturers, to get them out of financial difficulties.

The Katiganer Corporation, which makes women's hats, had reached a point where there seemed no option but to close down two of its plants and dismiss 700 workers.

Now, at the last moment, the trade Union is offering a loan of nearly £90,000 to bail out Mr. Katiganer—£20,000 from its own funds and £70,000 from workers' savings.

The loan decision was made with the full agreement of union members by vote, although the union itself is in debt after a 10-month strike against another hat company.

The report from which we take this item gave no details as to whether or not the union had made any recommendations to the management to ensure that their money did not follow that which has already been lost. It would appear not—especially as American unions are even less inclined than British ones to assert any rights of management.

The Garment Workers' leader, Alex

Rose, explained: "Sometimes a union must fight on the picket line and spend its money for strike benefits; sometimes it can best protect members' interests by financial help to the company on which they depend."

The purpose of the loan, he added, is to preserve labour standards and prevent communities turning into ghost towns.

It never seemed to occur to this (typical) union leader that it was not the workers who depended on the company, but quite the opposite. And now, not only does the company depend upon the workers to supply the labour power—but to supply the capital as well!

We have seen similar circumstances as these arise elsewhere—in Italy, for example. There, however, the workers applied a different solution. They occupied the factories and took over the administration themselves—sometimes in the face of armed opposition from the State.

The American workers would probably have been able to take over their hat factories—even by buying, or paying compensation if necessary—and would have been able to run them themselves more economically without a boss, sharing their takings among themselves—even if it meant a loss at first. But if the factories are worth keeping on for a boss, they would have been worth taking over by the workers.

Lest it was confusing to have brought the I.W.W. into this comment, I should of course point out that there is no connection and nothing in common between the Industrial Workers of the World and the reformist American trade unions.

The "Wobblies" have consistently expressed a revolutionary industrial unionist policy somewhat similar to anarcho-syndicalism, whereas the American Federation of Labour and the Congress of Industrial Organisations (A.F.L. and C.I.O.) are similar to our T.U.C.—if not more so!

### UNION DEMOCRACY

THE "great" unions, we are told, are voting for Hugh Gaitskell in the 'Gaitskell vs. Bevan' election for the job of Labour Party Treasurer.

What we are not told in the daily press is how the vote was taken throughout the "great" unions. Letters in *Tribune* (16/7/54) indicate that in the A.E.U. at least there is some discontent at the methods used by the leadership to use the block vote in Gaitskell's favour.

One correspondent writes: "I wonder if you would allow me to

record that the A.E.U. Executive by backing Gaitskell are acting on their own volition.

"We, the members, have not been asked our views and speaking for Basingstoke No. 1 branch, we would repudiate their action.

"Communists, we are told, are allowed to put a "Yes" or "No" at a ballot. A.E.U. members have been denied just that."

Another correspondent draws attention to the fact that even when a majority has voted in a particular direction it is unfair to use the block vote to express the majority decision, since it leaves completely unrepresented what may be a sizeable minority. For example, 200,000 miners voted for Bevan, but under the block vote system, those votes will in fact be recorded for Gaitskell.

The writer of this letter wants those 200,000—and those of all voters to be expressed by a ballot vote. But still at the end, a very large number of Labour members will get the Treasurer they did not vote for. And it may be very nearly half of the entire membership!

This, of course, is a fault of democracy itself. A simple weight of votes; accepting majority rule over a minority, is bound to leave dissatisfied and unrepresented individuals.

### CATCHING ON—3

EVEN a City Editor can sometimes discover that there is a bit more to work than the provision of profits, although for him that is the most important aspect.

Alexander Thomson, *Evening Standard's* financial wizard, drew attention last Monday to a new share issue for Wood & Sons (Holdings), the Burslem pottery firm. After a few paragraphs of patter about the firm's principal, Harry Wood, Thomson writes:

For it's still a craftsman's industry. 'That's why we've never had a dispute that stopped our work,' says Harry. 'The men find pleasure in their jobs.'

I suppose that is the real answer to most labour troubles.

Out of the mouths of babes and City Editors, eh?

ANARCHO-SYNDICALIST.

## POLITICAL PERSECUTION

PIERRE J. GERETY, head of the executive board assigned to determine the loyalty of United States citizens working for international organizations, has announced in Paris that Americans employed in Geneva "who desire hearings" had been invited to come to Paris, where the board has been sitting.

The invitations are a result of the Swiss Government's refusal to let the board conduct hearings on Swiss soil for fear such hearings might be incompatible with that nation's sovereignty.

The invitations were sent to fourteen United States citizens who work for international organizations in Geneva and about whom "derogatory information" had been uncovered by the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the Civil Service Commission. Summaries of this information have been sent to the employees concerned.

The board has arranged to pay the expenses of these employees who avail themselves of the invitations, it was learned, because the trip is an international one.

By offering every facility for these Americans to attend an investigation of their cases, the authorities have allowed them no loophole for not attending. And their non-attendance will, we suppose, be taken as an admission of guilt by default, just as the refusal to testify, by having recourse to the Fifth Amendment, invariably automatically labels those concerned as "guilty".

★

All governments obviously can put a strong case why their employees should be loyal, patriotic, my-country-right-or-wrong citizens, who will be nothing to undermine their power, or the whole concept of authority. It is the whole foundation on which society rests to-day and anarchists, at least, would be de-

fending a doubtful cause besides being opportunistic if they agitated for the admission of "subversives" to government service.

Quite different however, are those cases where political discrimination and loyalty tests are applied outside government service and where no question of "State secrets" and the like are concerned.

A case in point is that of the film industry in Hollywood which dismissed from employment a number of workers who had refused to testify before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The dismissals of twenty-three employees by a number of film companies, including Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, Paramount, Columbia, Warner, has been upheld by a Superior Court Judge in Los Angeles last week.

Declaring that in criminal proceedings and investigations, courts and juries under California law were entitled to draw unfavourable inferences from refusal of persons to testify, the Judge said:

"No reason occurs why those who merely are possible employers should be required to respond in damages for conduct to protect their business interests from the result of such inferences being drawn by their customers."

He saw no bar to employers' agreeing among themselves to deny employment to persons refusing to testify.

In this ruling, surely, is the clear answer to those who deny that political persecution exists in the United States to-day. For, unless one argues that political orthodoxy must exist, not only in government service, but in every branch of industrial life (which would mean equating "democracy" with "totalitarianism"), one must concede that for an employer to require to know the political sympathies of an employee is to apply a discrimination no less despicable and insidious than that of the racists.

### PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!

WEEK 28

Deficit on Freedom

28 x £15 = £420

Received in 28 weeks £244

GAP £176

July 10th to July 17th

Sheffield: H.W. 5/-; Buffalo: G.H. 13/-; Esher: Anon. 5/-; Stroud: S.L.R. 1/6; Warrington: J.H. 5/-; Dublin: J.O. 10/-; Hyde Park: Sympathisers 2/3; London: P.Q.\* 2/6; London: M.S. 2/6; London: J.U. 5/-; London: C.F. 2/-; Molino: E.J. £1/3/9; Torino: G.I. 4/-; London: W.F.\* 1/6; Westcott: M.G.W. 10/-; London: P.Q.\* 2/6.

Total ... 4 15 6  
Previously acknowledged ... 239 1 5

1954 TOTAL TO DATE ... £243 16 11

WHAT IS OBSCENITY? Continued from p. 1

## TO-DAY'S TEST

and ages which represents the reading public of the English-speaking world. You, and you alone, must decide this case and if, in the course of this summing-up, I express my opinion about the matter, you are entitled to ignore it.

## NOT JUDGES OF TASTE

The next thing I want to say to you is this: during the closing speech of the prosecution it seemed to me that there was, if I may say so without offence, a certain confusion of thought. It was suggested that you are, by what you decide to-day, to determine whether books like this will or will not be published in the future. May I venture to say that your task is absolutely nothing of the kind. We are not sitting here as judges of taste. We are not here to say whether we like a book of that kind. We are not here to say whether we think it would be a good thing if books like that were never written. You are here trying a criminal charge and in a criminal court you cannot find a verdict of "Guilty" against the accused unless, on the evidence that you have heard, you and each one of you are fully satisfied that the charge against the accused person has been proved.

The burden of proof in this criminal

case, as in all criminal cases, rests on the prosecution from start to finish. You, in arriving at your verdict, must arrive at a unanimous verdict. If you can all agree, so much the better, but if there is any one of you, or more, who honestly cannot share the view of the others, then it is your duty so to say.

## TO-DAY'S TEST

The test to-day is extracted from a decision of 1868, and the test of obscenity is this: whether the tendency of the matter charged as obscene is to deprave and corrupt those whose minds are open to such immoral influences and into whose hands a publication of this sort may fall. Because that is a test laid down in 1868, that does not mean that what you have to consider is, supposing this book had been published in 1868 and the publishers had been prosecuted in 1868, whether the court or the jury, nearly a century ago, would have reached the conclusion that the book was an obscene book. Your task is to decide whether you think that the tendency of the book is to deprave those whose minds to-day are open to such immoral influ-

ences and into whose hands the book may fall in this year, or last year when it was published in this country, or next year or the year after that.

Considering the curious change of approach from one age to another, it is not uninteresting to observe that in the course of the argument of the case in 1868 the rhetorical question was asked: What can be more obscene than many pictures publicly exhibited, such as the Venus in the Dulwich Gallery? Members of the jury, there are some who think with reverence that man is fashioned in the image of God, and you know babies are not born in this world, be they of either sex, dressed up in a frock-coat, or an equivalent feminine garment.

This book, as I venture to think you will have already appreciated without selecting out of their contexts most of the passages, which I hope have not either corrupted or depraved any of you, is a book which obviously and admittedly is absorbed with sex, the relationship between the male and the female of the human species.

Members of the jury, I hope, in the course of what I have to say to you, that you will each one of you appreciate this; that I, at all events, approach that great mystery with profound interest and at the same time a very deep sense of reverence. We cannot get away from it. It is not our fault that but for the love of men and women and the act of sex, the human race would have ceased to exist thousands of years ago. It is not our fault that the moment in, shall we say, an over-civilised world, if "civilised" is an appropriate word, sex ceases to be one of the great motive forces in human life, the human race will cease to exist. It is the essential condition of the survival and development of the human race, for whatever ultimate purpose, in our turn, we have been brought into this world.

## TWO SCHOOLS OF THOUGHT

Approaching this matter which—let us face it—throughout the ages has been one of absorbing interest to men and women, you get two schools of thought which are poles apart, and in between those two extremes you have a variety of opinion and thought. At one extreme you get the conception, I venture to think, of the medieval Church—that sex is sin; that the whole thing is dirty; that it was a mistake from beginning to end (and if it was, member of the jury, it

was the great Creator of life who made the mistake and not you or I) and the less that is said about this wholly distasteful topic the better; let it be covered up and let us pretend it does not exist, and in referring to the arrival of a particular day, we refer to "the happy event on Monday" instead of saying "a baby was born on Monday"—it means exactly the same thing—and in speech and behaviour the utmost degree of reticence is observed. I suppose the high tide was obtained in the Victorian era—possibly as a reaction against the coarseness of the Georges and the rather libertine attitude of the Regency—when I understand that in some houses legs of tables were actually draped and rather stricter females never referred as such to gentlemen's legs but called them their "understandings".

At the other extreme you get the line of thought which says that nothing but mischief results from this policy of secrecy and covering up, that the whole thing is just as much a part of God's universe as anything else and the proper approach to the matter is one of frankness, plain speaking and the avoidance of any sort of pretence. I suppose that the extreme expression of that view is to be found in the nudist colonies where people, I understand, walk about, weather permitting, without any clothes on at all.

And I suppose, somewhere between those two poles the average, decent, well-meaning man or woman takes his or her stand.

## ADOLESCENT STANDARDS

Members of the jury, turning for a moment to the book that you have to consider, it is, as you know, in the form of a novel. Remember the charge is a charge that the tendency of the book is to corrupt and deprave. The charge is not that the tendency of the book is either to shock or to disgust. That is not a criminal offence. The charge is that the tendency of the book is to corrupt and deprave. Then you say: "Well, corrupt or deprave whom?", and again the test: those whose minds are open to such immoral influences and into whose hands a publication of this sort may fall.

Members of the jury, what exactly, does that mean? Are we to take our literary standards as being the level of

Continued on p. 3

## INSTINCT &amp; IDEAL

INSTINCT is not simple nor perfectly fixed and impeccable, and it could hardly be so, being part and parcel of a changing organism in a changing world. Its structure, even when presenting a clear and compact picture, is that of a mosaic; for an animal is a system of cells, and each cell is an animal unit with its own instinct. The cell in turn is a miniature organism, and the smaller units observed in it are capable of that teleic and characteristic behaviour which we call instinctive. Each unit having to grow and striving to survive in surroundings that are not always friendly, disharmony is as much an aspect of instinct as is harmony. Hunger, for example, experienced as a pressure on those systems of cells on which the organism's food-getting behaviour depends, is at the same time the effect of intercellular struggle for the food still available within the organism.

Instinct can be deceived, but so can the mind of a mathematician and human intelligence in general. A fool is simply a person who sees reality according to his own desire, and we can say that a person or an animal behaves foolishly only when we are in a position to see that reality does not correspond to the picture presented by desire while we ourselves are free from the same.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP  
OPEN DAILY

OPEN 10 a.m. to 6.30: 5.0 SATURDAYS  
Postage free on all items

## Remainders . . .

From the Waste Land Edward Hyams 3/6  
The Guillotine at Work P. G. Maximoff 17/6

## Reprints . . .

Straight and Crooked Thinking R. H. Thouless 2/-  
The Execution of Private Slovic W. B. Huie 2/6

## Second-Hand . . .

The Magic of Monarchy Kingsley Martin 2/6  
Fields, Factories & Workshops Peter Kropotkin 5/-  
News from Nowhere William Morris 2/-  
The Town that was Murdered Ellen Wilkinson 2/6  
Justice in England A. Barrister 2/6  
The Condition of the British People Mark Abrams 3/-  
Angels' Wings Edward Carpenter 3/-  
Rights of Woman Mary Wollstonecraft 2/6  
A Century of Rochdale Joseph Reeves 2/6  
Co-operation F. A. Mignet 3/-  
History of the French Revolution Camilla Jebb 3/6  
Rebel Without a Cause Robert Lindner 3/6  
Pilgrims Ethel Mannin 2/6  
18th Brumaire of Louis Napoleon Karl Marx 3/-  
Lust for Life (Van Gogh) Irving Stone 3/-

## Publications . . .

London Magazine, August 2/6  
The Glass, No. 70 (Blackston, Kirkup, Watson-Taylor, etc.) 2/-

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

Intelligence is a form of knowing other than instinct, and yet it is also biological, and, if characteristically free to serve or not to serve any desire, it is itself a desire, susceptible of stimulation, satisfaction and anguish. Like sexual desire it goes through various stages of development, assumes a great variety of forms, and is subject to inhibitions and fixations. The similarity is such that intelligence can be defined as the potency of the brains, and organic potency the intelligence of the genitals. To continue the antithesis, intelligence is knowing that desires, and any other instinct a desire that knows. The desire of knowing aims at exercise and fulfilment, at a vigorous and unimpeded activity of the brain. Sexual desire similarly aims at exercise and vigour of the sexual function with all obstacles removed.

There are differences, however, between intelligence and the general instinctive form of cognition, and one of them is that the knowledge of instinct is all intrinsic, and that of intelligence extrinsic to a large extent. Animals carry all their knowledge within themselves while men can rely on theirs being available when necessary by other men, by books, and all sorts of monuments, records and tools. Knowledge with the human species is transmittable by other means than procreation, and that accounts both for man's superior power and for his freedom, in the sense given it by Simone de Beauvoir. In India, in the absence of books, some girls were trained to carry in their head poems tens of thousands lines long, and we can be sure their freedom was thereby impeded as if they had been pregnant all their life. Intelligence is memory, but within limits and with qualifications. As a power of retention that needs reiteration it can be most stultifying, as many a teacher knows from sour experience.

Dealing with artistic achievement Paul Valéry spoke of "a kind of mental object in which the spirit recognizes what is desired . . . although it did not know what it recognizes". A similar kind of mental object is also a constant element of an instinct situation. In recent books, by N. Tinbergen, E. Russell, A. Gesell, Carmichael, Buystendijk, F. Bourbière, and E. A. Armstrong, in which the notion of instinct reconquers the field of biology that was once its own, example after example can be found of this transpatial yet natural feature of instinct. I shall mention that of the marsupial embryo that when only a few weeks old finds its way from the vagina to the nipple of the parent where it completes its development, and that of the human embryo developing respiratory organs long before there is any need of them, examples showing how stolid and futile it is to try to explain animal behaviour merely in terms of function and structure, of stimuli and reflexes. As one of the authors mentioned above puts it, "the world would be a chaos for the animal if it did not receive from it the stimuli which it expects" (italics mine).

A chaos it would also be for modern man, and reason would founder if the world did not broadly behave in a rational way. Reason, as disciplined and systematised intelligence, contains an instinctive element precisely in this expectation. Reason, existentially considered, as part of the life of a subject, is affective and even magical in that it

does not only expect but also demands from the world to behave in a rational manner. The fruit of mathematical and scientific intuition, what is stated as a hypothesis when perceived with sufficient clarity, may also be defined as "a kind of mental object in which the spirit recognizes what it desired".

In his analysis of love Stendhal spoke of a phenomenon of crystallization by which he metaphorically described the sudden recognition in a corporeal object of what previously lay suspended in the mind as a mental object of desire. This kind of mental object has been called by some a "stereotype", although Stendhal, who was thinking of representatives of the human species nearer to nature than present day specimens, would not have liked the term. A stereotype (in the case of love the member of the opposite sex possessing certain characteristics) can be partly accounted for by biological and psycho-analytical data, but it is also to a great extent the product of a culture, that is of that kind of knowledge which I have called extrinsic.

Although a stereotype can long and fondly be cherished, and its approximations in reality eagerly and indefatigably sought, it is not cultivated in the full sense of the word; it is added to, and corrected, but does not actually grow. It is given by the culture in which it obtains, and is not created by the individual who plays therefore a rather passive rôle, although, insofar as his needs coincide with those of his culture, he finds in this coincidence elation and fulfilment. Stereotypes encourage passiveness in still another way: being explicit and well-defined, they act as moulds for individuals in which to shape their personality and modes of behaviour. They are a constant temptation to that objectification by which one is most sure to become socially acceptable or sexually desirable.

But the stereotypes of a given culture had to be created in the first place, and since *ex nihilo nihil* there must have been for them a biological, not to say a metaphysical, foundation. It is indeed an outstanding feature of the human species that its stereotypes are constantly subject to revision and replacement. I suggest the word "ideal" for the newly created mental object, which is not yet a stereotype and may never become one. Corresponding to an individual need, not yet part of a culture, but as a piece of potential culture, of a new culture in the making, an ideal is primarily intrinsic. Reacting to or rejecting the prevailing stereotypes it is critical; because of its creativeness it is revolutionary or, at least, evolutionary: because of its newness it will not find approximations in reality but by expressing itself it will conjure and stimulate reality to produce them. Mental objects, on the other hand, which have no creative and actual desiring force behind them, although acknowledged as ideals by a given culture, in the sense I suppose that they are not susceptible to realization, are not ideals according to my definition.

An ideal (as, for example, that of an anarchist society or of anarchist relationships within an anarchist society) being a mental object is best related to other mental objects, and intelligibly accountable in terms of the mind, so that any reference to a biological foundation may seem both unwarranted and unnecessary. It may so seem, however, only if we for-

get that a division between the biological and the mental or spiritual is arbitrary, and merely a matter of clarity and expediency. To hold fast to the division would lead either to Paul Valéry's belief, recently emphasized by his interpreter Norman Suckling, in the complete irrelevance of spiritual values to biological continuity, or to Yvon Belaval's assertion that there are no psychological depths, but that only the body is profound. Holding to a unitary view of the world, I, instead, am inclined to see in ideals a variety of the teleic element present in instinct, and do not consider spirituality as alien to the purposes of life nor life alien to the purposes of the spirit, whatever life and spirit may mean when not the objects of a single intuition, and however misleading the word purpose may be when not shorn of its anthropomorphic connotations.

GIOVANNI BALDELLI.

## THEATRE

## The Moscow Puppets

MOSCOW STATE PUPPET THEATRE COMPANY (LONDON CASINO).

IT seems peculiarly appropriate that the Russian government should send the Moscow State Puppet Theatre on a visit to this country, when one considers that the Russian people themselves are the unresisting puppets of a power-hungry and power-corrupted bureaucracy.

## "OBEDIENCE.

*Bane of all genius, virtue, freedom, truth*

*Makes slaves of men, and of the human frame,*

*A mechanised automaton."*

That weird and horrible phenomenon of life which to-day is called the "totalitarian" State is not a temporary and accidental phenomenon of a certain epoch. It is a revelation of the true nature of the State, of sovereignty and power.

The puppet-show belongs fundamentally to the expressionist movement, whether it be the survival of the crude folk-type or a sophisticated modern derivation. Although puppet-shows have never died out completely, they were at a very low ebb at the end of the nineteenth century. When modern forces set to work, however, one of the results was a revival of the inanimate actor, in the theatre and in life. The puppet is indeed particularly well suited for mimicry and satire, and has often been employed for that purpose. But there is something sinister in watching puppets in a theatre, especially when their gestures and movements are as subtle and realistic as these Moscow puppets of Obretsov's. What is life after all, but an amazing show of puppets, an astounding dance of lay figures, animated by strings of which the ends opposite from men are lost in infinite distance? To dance, or not to dance, is all the choice men have, and rather than play the contemptible parts which fall to our lot in authoritarian society, there are times when it seems better to break the strings and let the miserable marionette fall into the black hole behind the stage. "I perceive that the vain are ever good actors; they play desiring that others may love to behold their playing—and all their mind is in this purpose."—Friedrich Nietzsche.

## Tug-of-War BY RODERICK

LOVELL. (Theatre Royal, Windsor)

"TUG OF WAR" is a somewhat pedestrian title for Roderick Lovell's new play, which is distinguished and occasionally fascinating. Applause has been defined as "the echo of a platitude". Rapturous applause followed the final curtain of this play on the first night, so it will probably be added to the lengthening list of plays transferred from this theatre to the West End. There are certainly quite a lot of platitudes in *Tug of War*; I found the frequent references to the Bible, God, the soul and the ten commandments excessively tedious, and they seemed to spoil the ideas and arguments of the play. "Thou shalt not steal" the wealthy successful thief, who is therefore a "good" man, reminds us. No, don't steal. Thou'll never thus compete successfully in business. Cheat instead. Exploit and rob the people of the fruits of their labour. "Blessed are the meek for they shall inherit the earth". Very true; the financiers and the faithful, the priests and the police, the capitalists and the clergy, the bishops and the bankers, they have indeed inherited the earth. And they have defiled and corrupted and made horrible the lives of men. Dominating *Tug of War* is the 84-year-old aristocrat, who is living in a "police" state (as if every state did not have police) with her family—an ostensibly quiet group, minding their own business and brooking no trouble with the authorities. Yet this house, with its secret panel, is a key-link in an escape organisation. Into the house via the balcony comes a young man who is wounded; they give him succour, keep the police at bay and arrange for his escape from the country. The intruder's resemblance to the great grandson of the Baroness, mown down with machine-gun bullets with his mother in the street, eventually leads to the break up of the organisation, partly through the way the boy's father trustingly takes the intruder, who is "a plant"—the instrument by which the authorities hope to wreck the organisation and capture its members—to his heart. But the young man's affection and sympathy for the members of the aristocratic Contomichalos family as human beings destroys his loyalty to the State machine and its ruthless aims, so that he decides to escape from the country with them. The character of the old Baroness provides a magnificent part for Helen Hays. D.M.M.

## COMMONSENSE FROM THE BENCH

IN this issue of FREEDOM appears verbatim the summing up of Mr. Justice Stable in the recent case in which a well known publisher was acquitted of obscenity. It may well be asked why FREEDOM interests itself in this matter at all, and this question will serve to draw attention to several related issues.

The law on obscenity constitutes a form of censorship and anarchists therefore would naturally view it with a critical eye, the more so as the connexion between enforced conformity to sexual taboos and conventions and the political subjection of the individual is becoming a matter for study and discussion. But this law is one of the very vaguest in definition. Hence a writer does not know clearly where he stands, and in such a situation will tend to seek safety in keeping well within conformity. Such a law operates through fear and is thus almost certain to be pernicious in its effect.

The definition of obscenity speaks of the possibility of depraving those whose minds are open to such immoral influences. Now one of those facts that everyone knows, that candid people admit, but about which the law is quite silent in that obscene, or thought-to-be-obscene literature has a fascination for a very large number of people indeed. A prosecution for obscenity will immediately convert a book into a best-seller. Surely, if this is admitted, it can only mean that a very large number of minds are open to such immoral influences, and the law stands thus as an instrument which deprives such people of something they very much desire. Such a situation seems to us quite absurd.

But it does not seem absurd at all to those who regard anything even faintly erotic as "filth". Such people are convinced with emotional force that the public must be protected, and they are not unduly worried by the fact that they have to be protected against themselves. Nor do such people trouble to wonder whether the law has a right to censor people's reading in this way, or whether it is in fact well fitted to do so.

Some anarchists may be disturbed that a Judge's remarks are quoted with some approval by an anarchist paper. If such support for legal utterances were of frequent occurrence in FREEDOM, purists might well wonder whether some revision of anarchist theory had taken place. Actually however the rarity of such approval in fact provides the exception which proves the rule—the rule that the law is an ass, and a wrong-headed one at that. Many distinguished writers have been labelled obscene by obscure judges. But the U.S. Judge Woolsey, who ruled in the mid-thirties that James Joyce's "Ulysses" was not obscene, and Judge Stable's summing-up in the present case, just because they are exceptional, underline the general rule.

Despite Mr. Justice Stable's remarks, however, literary taste is not formed in law courts, but in the reaction of the public at large and of particular individuals who make themselves felt, or who bring these issues to a clear exposition. Even though the verdict in this case cannot but be healthy in effect, the fact remains that it is an absurd arrogance for courts of law to take upon themselves the right and the ability to protect the public taste in these matters.

Having regard to the actual state of affairs, however, in which the law is in fact the arbiter in many such matters, it would be absurd to undervalue the decision of the jury in the present case, and churlish not to acclaim the commonsense summing-

# MARXISM AND ANARCHISM

**SOCIALIST THOUGHT: MARXISM AND ANARCHISM, 1850-1890, by G. D. H. Cole.**

WITH this, the second instalment of his projected five-volume *History of Socialist Thought*, Professor Cole has placed all students of socialism heavily in his debt. The first volume, issued last year and sub-titled *The Forerunners*, took the story from the French Revolution down to the issue of the Communist Manifesto. It dealt with the great so-called Utopian thinkers—Saint-Simon, Fourier and Proudhon in France, Godwin and Robert Owen in England, and a host of lesser luminaries. The period covered, as Professor Cole points out, was one of which it is hardly possible to say that the socialist movement existed. It was a period of revolution and reaction which witnessed in Western Europe the emergence of the industrial bourgeoisie. The socialist thinkers who saw the slogan of 'Liberty, Equality and Fraternity' for what it was—the battle cry of a new ruling class which wanted liberty to exploit, equality with the aristocracy in the distribution of privileges, and a fraternity of property—were only dimly aware of the need to harness to the chariot of revolution the forces of the industrial workers and peasants as a class. They preached to the well-intentioned of all classes or, like Fourier, they patiently awaited the millionaire who would finance their pet schemes.

After 1848, the Year of Revolutions, such utopianism was at a discount. As the working classes of the economically advanced countries began to realize a sense of class unity, they turned away from the doctrine of class collaboration (except in Britain where they were granted a share of the spoils of bourgeois victory) and began to organize themselves for their own revolution. Socialism, as an international movement, was born.

It is with this period which saw the birth-pangs of international socialism that Professor Cole deals in the present volume. On any account, it is the crucial period in the development of the working-class movement. For it was in these years that the important decisions were taken on the subject of the strategy and form of the revolution. Whether for good or for ill, what comes afterwards is a natural sequel to the momentous events of these two or three decades.

The great question that had to be determined was the attitude of the new movement to the State. The question was over-lain with many confusing side issues but, expressed in its simplest terms, the problem was: Could the revolutionary forces utilise the existing State machine for the introduction of socialism? If not, and the bourgeois State had to be overthrown, must the workers set up a new State to replace the old or should they dispense with the State altogether?

Over the first part of the question the Marxists joined issue with the followers of Ferdinand Lassalle. Lassalle, a brilliant demagogue and opportunist, had launched in 1862 the German Workmen's Association with the object of winning universal suffrage as an essential preliminary to the introduction of State-aided workers' Co-operatives. Marx, though insistent on the need to establish an independent working-class political movement, wished to use that movement to destroy the bourgeois State and to set up a workers' State in its stead. In the event a compromise was reached at the Gotha Congress in 1875: the Lassallians joined with the Marxists in creating the German Social Democratic Party, a party ostensibly Marxist but one which in practice adopted Lassalle's theory of the State as the representative of the people. Marx himself had opposed the compromise but was persuaded to accept it. In the 20th century, however, the compromise was shattered and the dispute was renewed in the struggle between the Social Democrats and the Bolsheviks, with Kautsky on the one side and Lenin on the other.

The second part of the question was more fundamental, involving as it did the very existence of the concept of a centralised State. It is that aspect which forms the main theme of the present volume and explains its sub-title. The stage was set for the controversy with the formation in 1864 of the International Working Men's Association—the "First International". It began as a purely trade union body but, owing to the British trade union leaders' lack of interest in Continental affairs, Marx was able to dominate its General Council in the early years of its existence. He was determined that it should become the vehicle for the propagation of his own conception of the road to socialism. His first step was to organise the defeat of the important element in the French section which favoured the mutualist ideas of Proudhon. But after their withdrawal he found himself confronted with a more formidable opponent. Michael Bakunin, the apostle of liberty and the enemy of the State in all its forms. Between two such men and two such conceptions of the revolution, there could be no compromise.

Apart from the not unimportant question of differences in temperament, the issues between Marx and Bakunin were three. First, the question whether each national section of the International should be allowed to shape its own policy without direction from the centre. Marx thought of the revolution as an authoritarian process to be organised on "military" lines, whereas Bakunin insisted that centralised dictation would destroy local initiative. Second, the question of collaboration with radical politicians and bourgeois movements. Marx was prepared to countenance such collaboration for limited ends which would make it easier for the

workers' movement to operate within the existing system: Bakunin argued that compromise and working for reforms would sap the revolutionary impulses of the workers and end in the subjection of the movement to capitalism and to the State. Third, and most important, the question of the State. For Bakunin the workers' State favoured by Marx, the *Volksstaat*, was a contradiction in terms. It could result only in the imposition over the workers of a new tyranny even worse than the old. The State must not 'wither away', it must be abolished and superseded by a free federation of autonomous communes.

In the middle of the dispute came the rising and crushing defeat of the Paris Commune, 1871, an event which both sides claimed as vindicating the truth of their respective theories. As much as the theoretical differences, it was the liquidation of the French section during the Commune which led to the disintegration of the International. The final show-down came at the Hague Congress in 1872. In Cole's words, 'Marx was finally determined on having his own way, and on destroying the International rather than run any risk of letting it fall into his opponents' hands'. The Congress was carefully packed with Marx's supporters. The majority voted in favour of political action and at the same time agreed to transfer the seat of the General Council from London to New York—a move which meant in effect a sentence of death, for there was no movement in America capable of sustaining it.

The minority, having withdrawn from the Hague, disavowed the decisions of that Congress and formed an International of their own on the basis of complete autonomy for the national federations composing it. But the damage was beyond repair. The authoritarian tendencies of Marx had effected a rupture in the working-class movement, the evil consequences of which have continued up to the present day.

All this and much else besides is chronicled in Professor Cole's book. English students who have hitherto lacked a reliable account of the First International—Stekloff's work on the subject is a partisan Marxist history—will find it an indispensable source of references. In addition, anarchists will be grateful for the lucid summary of Bakunin's thought and for the chapter on Bakunin's successors, the anarchist-communists. Those who recall Kropotkin's attack on the metaphysical abstractions of Marx's theoretical economics will also enjoy Cole's own more weighty comments in the same vein on the subject. It should, perhaps, be added that Cole writes with an air of detachment which is in the best academic tradition but he is never dull. We can look forward eagerly to the next volume which will deal, among other things, with the flowering of the revolutionary syndicalist movement, in the years before the First World War. O.

## What is Obscenity? Continued from p. 2

### Function of the Novel

something that is suitable for the decently brought-up young female aged 14? Or do we go even further back than that and are we to be reduced to the sort of books that one reads as a child in the nursery? The answer to that is: Of course not. A mass of literature, great literature, from many angles is wholly unsuitable for reading by the adolescent, but that does not mean that the publisher is guilty of a criminal offence for making those works available to the general public.

#### FUNCTION OF THE NOVEL

Members of the jury, I venture to suggest to your line of thought the function of the novel. I am not talking about historical novels when people write a story of some past age. I am talking about the contemporary novelist. By "the contemporary novelist", I mean the novelist who writes about his contemporaries, who holds up a mirror to the society of his own day, and the value of the novel is not merely to entertain

the contemporaries of the novel; it stands as a record or a picture of the society when it was written. Those of us who enjoy the great Victorian novelists get such understanding as we have of that great age from chroniclers such as Thackeray, Dickens, and many others of that age.

In the world in which we live to-day it is equally important that we should have an understanding of how life is lived and how the human mind is working in those parts of the world which are not separated from us in point of time but are separated from us in point of space and, at a time like to-day when ideas and creeds and processes of thought seem, to some extent, to be in the melting-pot and people are bewildered and puzzled to know in what direction humanity is headed, into what column we propose to march. If we are to understand how life is lived in the United States, for example, or in France, Germany, or elsewhere, the contemporary novels of those nations may afford us some guide, and to those of us who have not the time or the opportunity or the money or the inclination to travel, it may even be the only guide.

#### LIVES OF PEOPLE LIVING TO-DAY

This is an American novel written by an American, published originally in New York and purporting to depict the lives of people living to-day in New York, and it purports to portray the speech, the turn of phrase and the attitude in general towards this particular aspect of life in New York. If we are going to read novels about how things go in New York, it would not be of much assistance, would it, if, contrary to the fact, we were led to suppose that in New

York no unmarried woman of teen age has disabused her mind of the idea that babies are brought by storks or are sometimes found in cabbage plots or under gooseberry bushes?

This is a very crude work, as you may think. It may be that you may think that it is not altogether an exaggerated picture of the approach that this society is seeking to reproduce towards this great problem of sex, and you may think that if this does reflect the approach on that side of the Atlantic towards this great question, it is just as well that we should know it and that we must not close our eyes or our minds to the truth because it might—not shock or disgust—conceivably corrupt or deprave any somewhat puerile young mind.

#### PUTTING IDEAS INTO YOUNG HEADS

You have heard a good deal about the putting of ideas into young heads. Really, members of the jury, is it books that put ideas into young heads, or is it nature? When a boy or a girl reaches that stage in life's journey when he or she is passing from that state of blissful ignorance through that most perilous part of the journey that we call "adolescence" and finds himself or herself traversing an unknown country without a map, without a compass, and sometimes, I am afraid, from a bad home, without a guide, it is the natural change from childhood to maturity that puts ideas into young heads. It is the business of parents and teachers and the environment of society, so far as is possible, to see that those ideas are wisely and naturally directed to the ultimate fulfilment of a balanced individual life.

#### CREATED BY AN AUTHOR

The determination of this case is a matter exclusively for you. If you do not agree with any view that I may indicate or express, well, you do not agree with it; that is all, and your disagree-

ment is paramount. You may agree that it is a good book, or a bad book, or a moderate book. It is at least a book. It is the creation of a human mind and it depicts people created by the author in the environment in which that portion or portions with which the book deals of their lives were spent. You may agree or you may not—I do not know—that it is not mere porographic literature, the filthy, bawdy muck that is just filth for filth's sake. Probably you ladies have never seen such a work except, perhaps by accident. Some of the men, in their younger days, may furtively have glanced at the sort of literary output of Port Said and felt rather ashamed of themselves afterwards. This book purports to be a picture of contemporary life in New York and, of course, the subject-matter of the work is the relationship of the two sexes. If you look at the front page, you will see the text. It is taken from a Victorian poet, Browning:

"What of soul was left, I wonder,

When the kissing had to stop?"

and I suppose men and women of all ages have wondered that.

#### THE THEME OF THE BOOK

The theme of this book is the story of the rather attractive young man who is absolutely obsessed with his desire for women. It is not presented as an admirable thing, or a thing to be copied. It is not presented as a thing that brought him happiness or any sort of permanent satisfaction, and throughout the book you hear the note of impending disaster. He is like the drunkard who cannot keep away from drink although he knows where it will land him in the end, and, so far as his amatory adventures are concerned, the book does deal—if you like, with candour or, if you prefer it, with crudity—with the realities of human love

Continued on p. 4

# LIVING ON A VOLCANO

WHEN as a child I read of the Japanese peasants who lived on the fertile slopes of volcanic mountains which were occasionally active, I was incredulous. How could one live, cultivate fields, build villages, plan a stable existence when one knew that at any time the mountain might erupt and sweep away both one's life and the whole of one's life-work in a torrent of lava? It appeared that these volcano-dwellers must never know any sense of permanency in their lives; that they must go to bed half listening for rumbles in the mountain and awake to look for smoke in the sky.

A macabre and nerve-wracked existence it seemed to me, and I wondered why they did not leave the fertile slopes and live just anywhere out of range of the terrible and unpredictable threat of the volcano.

I little knew that in my own life I would come to know just what it was to live in the shadow of a volcano, and why one clings to the fertile slope, and how one manages to find a measure of peace and contentment in one's own personal life.

I refer, of course, to modern life in a city such as London, threatened as it is by physical annihilation by the curious neurotic policies of the ruling power-groups in the world to-day. Before me as I write lies a vista of grey buildings, new and old, which mark the historic dwelling-place of many generations of men from Roman times or before. It is quite possible that soon it will be turned to pulverised dust. This city can disappear into a vast desert with less to mark its site than the ruins which mark the sites of bygone cities of the ancient world. The thought of what will happen to the vast population of this city, this huge conurbation of urban districts, if it is subjected to the atomic bombs which have already been prepared for its destruction, defies imagination.

## Life Goes On

Will millions of people stay put in their homes in the face of annihilation against which there is no defence? Will they flood out into the counties around London—and if so, how will they travel, how will they be housed, how fed? In such a situation there will be a gigantic dislocation of every sort of service, for the whole manner of life of some fifteen million people in Southern England now depends upon the centralized services of London. As far as I know, no real consideration has been given to this problem; it is too great for proper comprehension or solution.

We live in a city which is perhaps doomed. Yet each and all of us act in

the manner of the past. We paint our house, build new ones, plan for future development, and act in all things as if there were an assured future, as though London will surely carry on as it always has carried on in past centuries, despite war, plague and civil strife. To admit any other possibility in our daily life would be intolerable. Intellectually we know very well that there may be no future, that the bomb-damaged sites in London which are now being cleared for future building programmes may never again be occupied by living communities; yet we simply cannot let the ugly knowledge gain acceptance in our emotional cognisance of the world. We must all act as the Japanese peasants on the mountainside, when they till their fields as though the volcano will never erupt again.

## "Anarchy"?

A few years ago there was a movement initiated by the Glasgow anarchist group to clear out of Britain while the going was good. They reasoned that had it been possible to arouse a substantial section of people to a realization of the seriousness of the existing threat to the life of the whole community, there would be sufficient resistance to the present suicidal policy, and the calamity might be averted.

But as the full meaning of the danger remains unrecognised and as the great mass of people continue to be apathetically acquiescent in the machine which is being prepared against them, the sensible course for the enlightened minority is to get out of this island before it becomes their grave.

The result of this agitation came to very little; a few comrades, including the main propagandists, emigrated to the colonies. The rest of us stay on, privately wondering just what we will do if the mountain gives a yet more ominous rumble.

It is not just the prospect of the sheer annihilation of cities which confronts us; it is the awful chaos and destitution which threatens a heavily urbanised community such as England if the main urban centres are blotted out. Supplies of food *could*, of course, be imported by air-lift after the ports have gone; millions of people *could* live under hedges; existing social organisation *could* be replaced by martial law.

But will there be just a helpless disorientated mob of people cluttering up the non-radioactive areas of the countryside, at the mercy of the forces of coercion who will have the monopoly of

food supplies? It would be ironical indeed if this form of "anarchy" were to be the final result of the long-term planning of governmental agencies.

We have heard of it happening in too many areas of the world in recent years; emotionally we cannot accept the fact that it is writing on our own doorstep. Famine, plague and wholesale massacre are not phantoms from the past, they are the present reality in the world to-day.

I know that in writing this I may be accused of some form of "heresy" by anarchists who see in the present situation the chance for a thoroughgoing revolution—for the broken machinery of the State under conditions of chaos to be replaced by autonomous free communes. Indeed, it seems as though we are witnessing the accuracy of Bakunin's prophetic insight: he of all the 19th century revolutionaries seems to have clearly foreseen the coming of the totalitarian State, and to have envisaged a general libertarian revolution after the clash of the war machines of the great military States had broken down the existing social order.

Lenin took over the idea— "... a series of frightful collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois States will be inevitable. That means that if the ruling class, the proletariat, wants to hold sway, it must prove its capacity to do so by military organisation also." For Lenin the triumph of Bolshevism over the whole world was the ultimate good. I, like George Woodcock, would like to believe that it is possible that "... the rural districts and the small towns will remain, and a new decentralised form of society will perforce have to emerge on the ruins of the old."

## Already Planted

But such a hope for the future does not remove the ugly, sordid fact that we in this island are trapped, and that our peculiar position is somewhere between the hammer and the anvil—the American *versus* the Russian war machine.

In such a situation astounding illusions arise to cloud the brain, such as that our Civil Defence scheme can hope to guard against A- and H-bomb attack, such that amassing a store of these bombs in this country somehow contributes to our future safety. In the unreal circumstances of to-day almost anyone's guess about the future is as good as anyone else's.

To the present writer it seems not improbable that Britain is already honey-combed not only with American and Russian agents, but with A- and H-bombs placed at strategic places, which can be conveniently detonated by wireless from America or Russia. Indeed, it would seem a clumsy omission on the part of the Great Powers if they have not already accomplished this elementary piece of strategy. We live in a world which is constantly overtaking the more idiotic horrors of Science Fiction.

Towards the end of the 1930's we saw the world going steadily madder. Enlightened people in this country had so thoroughly repudiated war in the 1930's that they could not accept the plain evidence of their intellect that the Great Powers intended to go to war again. Among other conflicts, Japan invaded China, Italy attacked Abyssinia, and Spain was used as an international cockpit for trying out new weapons.

Emotionally we could not accept the prospect of global war; we believed that the European States were sufficiently civilised to stop short at the final madness. We were wrong. The war had two opposite effects on "enlightened people": either they reorganised their shattered illusions to accept every fantastic beastliness asked of them in the name of Democracy (an attitude which has fundamentally altered the "progressives" of the post-war era to accept totalitarian ideas), or they realised that their erstwhile concept of the nature of the State was based upon a fundamental illusion.

## The Anarchist War

There was no cause for surprise, no reason to be bewildered, the Great States were simply acting in accordance with their true nature. It was out of this great and painful object lesson in the nature of the State that the anarchist movement in Britain revived during the war. The Spanish revolution of 1936 had provoked a lot of interest and enthusiasm, but it took the war for the movement to grow.

"These days, continually fuddled with drink,

I fail to satisfy the appetites of the soul.

But seeing all men behave like drunkards,

How can I alone remain sober?"

So wrote the Chinese poet Wang Chi at a time when politics ravaged his country and war became ever more certain. For the anarchist another way lies open, that of trying to understand, of trying to keep clear of the power-machine, of trying to cultivate one's own garden and showing it to all who will look. In such a way we continue to live on the volcano because, after all, our interests lie here, and curiously enough we find that we can achieve some contentment and some satisfaction in living even on its uneasy slopes. G.

## In Brief

**HISTORY** (By arrangement with Franco)

BY a small majority (18 votes to 14) the Brazilian Senate has refused to ratify a cultural agreement with Franco Spain, which included a clause requiring history textbooks in Brazil to have the approval of the Spanish Government.

According to reports, the fight against ratifying the agreement, signed in Madrid recently, was led by Senators Hamilton Nogueira and José Ferreira de Sousa, both of whom are strongly anti-Communist and also critical of the authoritarian nature of the Spanish régime of Generalissimo Francisco Franco.

**PRIVATE ENTERPRISE IN BUILDING**

THE Senate Banking Committee, which is looking into scandals in connection with the post-war Federal housing program, questioned William J. Levitt. He is one of the builders of Levittown, the Long Island community development which has 18,000 individual homes. Mr. Levitt testified that he cleared more than \$5 million profit on the sale of 4,028 of the homes. Government-insured mortgages totaled nearly \$30 million, but the actual construction cost was \$24,160,000. He denied that this was "windfall" profit, but Sen. Capehart thought it was. Another builder, Alfred Gross, said his family corporation similarly cleared \$6 million, thanks to government-insured loans for construction of Glen Oaks Village, in Queens. (N.Y. Herald Tribune, 19/7/54).

## LAST WORD IN PROGRESS

NEW YORK, July 18 (A.P.).—Police took mobile "drunkometer" units on to the streets of New York, Friday in a drive against drunken automobile drivers.

"Drunkometers" have been used by city police on an experimental basis since last November. However, until Friday it was necessary to take drivers suspected of being drunk to the police station, where the meter was set up.

Persons taking a test, blow up a balloon and then air from this balloon is passed through a chemical solution which measures the alcohol level.

## What is Obscenity? Continued from p. 3

### The Sum Total of Thought

or of human intercourse. There is no getting away from that, and the Crown says: "Well, that is sheer filth".

Members of the jury, is it? Is the act of sexual passion sheer filth? It may be an error of taste to write about it. It may be a matter in which perhaps old-fashioned people would deplore the reticence that was observed in these matters yesterday. But is it sheer filth? That is a matter, members of the jury, you have to consider, and ultimately to decide.

Now, there is another aspect of the book, and it certainly is not pretty and it certainly is not particularly attractive, but that is not what you have to consider. I have told you the test and I will not repeat it. That is the story of this young man's adolescence, and the story begins on page 76:

"But Russell never told Robert that his own first memory, dating from about the age of three, was of being waked in the middle of the night by two shouting voices, of hearing a plate crash and his father's voice raised almost to a high-pitched scream", and so on, and the author is tracing the moral thought of this man back to his childhood where the unhappy relations between his mother and father left a sort of permanent bruise on his personality.

Then it goes on to describe the pitfalls of slyness and filth into which the unhappy adolescent, without knowledge or experience, without the map and compass and without the guiding hand of a wise parent or the example of a well-ordered, decent home, stumbles; and you will have to consider whether this author was pursuing an honest purpose and an honest thread of thought or whether that was all just a bit of camouflage to render the crudity—the sex of the book—sufficiently wrapped up to pass the critical standard of the Director of Public Prosecutions.

## THE SUM TOTAL OF THOUGHT

Let me remind you of this: the literature of the world from the very earliest days when people could write represents,

so far as we have it to-day, the sum total of thought of the human mind. Literature sacred and literature profane, poetry, prose, varied civilisations and varied times; the sum total of thought of the human mind throughout the ages.

Are we going to say in England that our contemporary literature is to be measured by what is suitable for the fourteen-year-old schoolgirl to read? You must consider that aspect of the matter.

## A RISK

And there is another aspect of the matter which I should like you to consider before you come to your conclusion. I do not suppose there is a decent man or woman in this court who does not wholeheartedly believe that pornography, filthy books, ought to be stamped out and suppressed. They are not literature. They have got no message; they have got no inspiration; they have got no thought. They have got nothing. They are just filth, and, of course, that ought to be stamped out. But in our desire for a healthy society, if we drive the criminal law too far, farther than it ought to go, is not there a risk that there will be a revolt, a demand for a change in the law, and that the pendulum may not swing too far the other way and allow to creep in things that at the moment we can exclude and keep out?

Members of the jury, that is all I have to say to you. Remember what I said when I began. You are dealing with a criminal charge. This is not a question or a case of what you think is a desirable book to read. It is a criminal charge of publishing a work with a tendency to corrupt and deprave those to whom it may fall. Before you can return a verdict of "Guilty" on that charge you have to be satisfied, and each one of you has to be satisfied, that that charge has been proved. If it is anything short of that, members of the jury, the accused companies and individual are entitled to a verdict at your hands of "Not guilty". Members of the jury, will you consider your verdict?

## London Anarchist Group 8th Annual Summer School

To be held in London  
At the Malatesta Club  
155, High Holborn,

(few minutes from Holborn Town  
Hall and Holborn Underground  
Station)

August Bank Holiday Week-end  
31st July—August 2nd.

### PROGRAMME

Saturday, 31st July  
2.30 p.m.—Lecture G. Ostergaard  
"Anarchism and the Labour  
Movement"  
7.30 p.m.—Lecture Tony Gibson  
"The Mythology of the Class  
Struggle"

### Sunday, 1st August

11 a.m.—Lecture John Hewetson  
"Sociological Aspects of Anarchism"  
Afternoon—Hyde Park Meeting  
Evening—Social.

### Monday, 2nd August

11 a.m.—Lecture Sam Fanaroff  
"Man—the Anarchist"

Attendance at individual lectures will cost 6d. 1/6d. for all four.  
Main meal charges have been tentatively fixed at not more than 2/6d. each. A small charge may have to be made for some accommodation for comrades who are coming from outside London.

### IMPORTANT!

London comrades are asked to book their meals at the Malatesta Club not later than Wednesday, 28th July.

Will provincial comrades, if they have not already done so, state time of arrival so that catering arrangements can be completed.

## FREEDOM PRESS

**VOLINE:**  
*Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed)* cloth 12s. 6d.

**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, *Manifesto* paper 7s. 6d.  
Vol. 2, 1952, *Postscript to Postscript* 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. paper 6s.

**GEORGE WOODCOCK:**  
*Anarchy or Chaos* 2s. 6d.  
*New Life to the Land Homes orhovels?* 6d.

**F. A. RIDLEY:**  
*The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age* 2d.

**Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications:**  
*Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute* cloth 5s.  
*Journey Through Utopia* cloth 16s. (U.S.A. \$2.50)

**K. J. KENAFICK:**  
*Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx*  
**27, Red Lion Street, London, W.C.1.**

## MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

### LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

LECTURE-DISCUSSIONS  
Every Sunday at 7.30 at  
THE MALATESTA CLUB  
155 High Holborn, W.C.1.  
(Nearly opposite Holborn Town Hall)  
JULY 25—BRAINS TRUST

OPEN AIR MEETINGS  
Weather Permitting  
HYDE PARK  
Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

### NORTH-EAST LONDON

DISCUSSION MEETINGS  
IN MANOR PARK  
Alternate Wednesdays  
at 7.30 p.m.  
AUGUST 4—"Contra" on  
APATHY  
(To be held at East Ham)  
Apply to *Freedom Press* for details

### GLASGOW OUTDOORS

(Weather permitting)  
MAXWELL STREET  
Every Sunday at 7 p.m.  
Speakers: Hugh McCutcheon  
Mark Kramrisch  
Hugh McKeefery

### INDOORS

at *Workers' Open Forum*  
50 Renfrew Street, Glasgow.  
Every Thursday at 7 p.m.

## The Malatesta Club

Gramophone Recital  
WED. JULY 28—Mani Obahiagbon  
Some African Music

## 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