

THE DOCKERS WIN— But Watch Those Bosses!

THE dockers have won their fight for voluntary overtime. In the biggest, most solid and determined strike by any section of Britain's workers since the war, the right for a man to refuse to work overtime without being reported to the Board has been accepted by the employees.

The strike never looked like failing—even when, a week before the end, about a thousand P.L.A. perms went back to work, their effect upon a total throughout the country of about 44,000 was negligible.

For reasons we have discussed already, troops were not sent in. The Government knew the immediate effect would be to spread the dispute to relatively unaffected industries, and there was, after two weeks, no possible alternative but for the employers to yield on the issue of compulsory overtime.

The agreement on which the men have gone back is by no means a perfect one, however, and it was touch-and-go as to whether the strike would continue. For the situation outside of London has still to be settled.

The return was decided upon with the full agreement of the rank and file in London of the Stevedores & Dockers, T. & G.W.U. and Lightermen, and of delegates from Hull, Birkenhead, Liverpool and Southampton. The men have agreed to call off their ban on overtime and the employers have agreed not to report any worker for refusing to do it.

This applies to London only, for it is only in London that the ban had been applied by the N.A.S.D. since January, and only in London had the strike been an official one from the beginning, for in the provincial ports recruiting for the N.A.S.D. was going on after the strike started, and the strike was in fact an unofficial one of rank and file of the T. & G.W.U. And of course the employers could not recognise or negotiate with an unofficial body, could they?

The dockers' arrangement then is that all the ports and organisations involved in the strike will hold a delegate meeting in a month's time to review the position, see how it is operating in London and what progress has been made towards getting the same terms in the provinces. In the meantime, discussions between

unions and employers in London will clarify the position—probably on the basis of the proposals put forward by the N.A.S.D. for the replacement of men not able to work overtime.

The point has always been made by the men that they were not against overtime as such—in fact they need it, and piecework, to get a decent wage—but against the compulsion to do it in the employers' interpretation of the word 'reasonable' in the working agreement. Now that has been removed, Dick Barrett's advice, at the mass meeting where the back-to-work decision was taken, to do all the overtime there is, is sure to be taken, especially as the men need all the money they can earn to make up their losses over the last four weeks.

The danger in the present unsettled position lies in that the employers may divert ships from London to the provincial ports, where compulsory overtime agreements still exist.

The employers have agreed to 'no victimisation' as a condition of return, but the dockers know full well that the bosses' word alone is no safeguard. They have won the principle of voluntary overtime by the exertion of their strength through direct action at the point of production. That is the surest way for them to ever defend themselves and remains, when intelligently and

courageously used, the surest means for workers everywhere to achieve their emancipation.

LATER

New Strikes Flare Up

NO sooner had the dockers gone back to work on Monday than thousands were walking out again.

The reason? Their refusal to load or unload vans whose drivers had black-legged during the strike. Chief offender: J. Lyons & Co., a non-union firm.

While the strike was on some van drivers had refused to handle goods from the docks, and had asked the dockers in return to refuse to work with non-union and black-legging drivers on their return.

This the dockers did, to be answered with immediate sackings by the employers. In Tooley Street alone over 60 perms and pool men were fired or suspended by Tuesday morning. Naturally, right along the docks and wharves, the men began walking out again. At the time of writing, 6,000 to 8,000 are estimated out.

Clearly the employers are using this excuse to get their own back on strikers in fact to victimise, although they had agreed not to. This time, however, the strike will have to be official—was already declared so in the London Dock on Monday. And since Mr. Alfred Robens, ex-Min. of Lab. in the Labour Govt., has said the Labour Party could not support the introduction of non-union labour, the employers may find themselves with that rarity, a strike officially supported by the T. & G.W.U. and the Labour Party, on their hands.

Prices Rise - So Do Profits

1. THE annual general meeting of Malayalam Plantations, Ltd., will be held on November 18 in London. The following is an extract from the statement of the chairman, Mr. H. W. Horner, circulated with the report and accounts:

It is a pleasure to be able to submit results in striking contrast to those of 1952-3 owing to the improvement in tea prices combined with higher crops. We produced nearly 1½ million pounds more tea and over 130,000 pounds more rubber than in the previous year. The average net price per lb. of tea was 6.67d. higher than the corresponding figure for 1952-3 and the cost of production lower by nearly 1d. a lb. The profit per lb. of rubber was not materially different but the total profit is greater owing to the larger crop.

The year's profit before taxation is £1,099,590 compared with £527,364, an increase of over 100 per cent. The directors recommend a final dividend of 15 per cent., less tax, making 20 per cent. for the year.

(Manchester Guardian).

2. SHAREHOLDERS in the Great Universal Stores have cause to be satisfied with the year's balance sheet. At the ordinary general meeting last month the trading profit for the year amounted to £15,487,741 being an increase of £4 million over the previous year. In fact the comparative Group Trading profit for the past five years are worth recording:

1950	£5,851,939
1951	£8,116,368
1952	£9,954,976
1953	£11,388,271
1954	£15,487,741

Admittedly the Exchequer swallowed up some £9 million but even so what was left over provided the ordinary stockholders with a 60 per cent. dividend besides allowing for £3.3 millions to be transferred to Reserves. The health of this giant is well shown by the fact that though the issued capital amounts to £6½ millions the Group Net Current Assets amount to just over THIRTY-ONE MILLION POUNDS!

3. THE Radio Corporation of America, of the country's largest electronic, manufacturing and communications concerns, reported that its sales of products and services hit a new high in the first nine months of this year.

The total, said David Sarroff, chairman, amounted to \$660,345,000, an increase of 8.4 per cent. over the same period a year ago when gross income was \$609,428,000.

Earnings for the first nine months of this year, before Federal income taxes, were \$56,423,000, compared with \$53,651,000 for the corresponding period a year ago. After Federal income taxes, net profits of R.C.A. for the nine months were \$27,557,000, compared with \$25,152,000 a year ago, an increase of \$2,405,000, or 9.6 per cent. After payment of preferred dividends, net earnings application to the corporation's common stock were equal to \$1.80 a share, against \$1.62 a share in the first nine months of last year.

In the September quarter of this year the R.C.A. organization also had record-sales of products and services. They amounted to \$215,976,000, compared with \$198,742,000 for the third quarter of 1953, a gain of 8.7 per cent.

Net income for the 1954 quarter, after Federal taxes, was \$8,289,000. In the same three months a year ago the corporation's net income was \$6,967,000. This year's quarter net income represented a gain of 19 per cent. over the similar 1953 period. Earnings a share, based on 14,031,016 common shares outstanding, were 54 cents, against 44 cents a share in the September quarter of 1953.

(N.Y. Times).

We may be sending out
Subscription Renewal Notices
shortly!

Did you attend to the last
one you received?

To Hell with the Lord Mayor's Charity!

ON the morning when the dockers were going back to work the newspapers and the radio carried a news item not exactly calculated to make the strikers feel very sweetly reasonable in their attitude towards the bosses.

Every year, about this time, the Lord Mayor of London holds a charity dinner to raise funds for Dockland Settlements—the clubs and community centres which, throughout the East and South East of London provide the nearest thing to organised communal activity for working class families.

The Lord Mayor's Dinner always raises several thousand pounds. This year, £3,000 had already been raised in advance donations and tickets at £25 a head. But the present Lord Mayor, Sir Noel Bowater, decided to cancel the dinner because of the dock strike, and it was announced that all the monies paid or donated were being returned to their sources although the donors could, of course, decline to receive it back.

The B.B.C. and the daily press carried the same story: that the Lord Mayor had cancelled the dinner 'in view of the attitude of the dock workers'. In the evening papers, however, a correction by the Lord Mayor was published, in which he denied the phrase was his! Since it appeared in the press and over the radio (which is not given to colouring even if the press is) it is hard to believe that it was not part of the official statement even if not coming precisely from Sir Noel himself.

What obviously happened is that since the story broke on the same day that the men were going back to work, it was realised at the Mansion House that it was a false move. So hurriedly the correction was made, and Sir Noel declared that he decided to cancel the dinner because 'with the atmosphere pertaining to it would be inauspicious and even possibly injurious to the appeal to hold the dinner.'

That is certainly true. The financial upper crust which attend these exalted functions are all very much interested in

import, export and shipping, which were affected by the strikers. Sir Noel himself is head of the vast Bowater newspaper empire and is probably very sore at the newspapers having to reduce their size for a week because of the strike.

The charity of these people, however, is invariably only skin-deep. They desire to assist the *deserving* poor—and the dockers are clearly not deserving when they wage the class war like this. Sir Noel, of course, chooses to overlook the fact that although the settlements are in dockland they are not used only by the wives and children of dockers—in fact those are in the minority. What he hopes to do, however, is to make the others resentful of the dockers, and drive a wedge between them and their neighbours.

There is a very simple answer to this. Let the dockers say 'To hell with the Lord Mayor's charity—we'll raise the funds ourselves'. It's not a great task. The Lord Mayor has given a dinner every year for the last 25 years, and last year it raised £3,800. It is the main fund-raising function held by the Dockland Settlements (of which there are nine) and invitations go out to 2,500 distinguished personages.

How easy it would be for the dockers to raise that amount themselves. Five shillings each from the 27,000 on London's river would provide £6,750—getting on for double the Lord Mayor's total.

How about it dockers? How about showing the people of dockland that you can do things for them as well as for yourselves in fields outside of industrial action. The settlements have lost through your fight for an industrial freedom and the employing classes' petty spite in reaction to it. Show the world you can get on without the Lord Mayor's charity—start an annual Christmas Fund for the Settlements now and make the Lord Mayor's total look silly.

ANARCHO-SYNDICALIST.

Scotland Yard gives a hand in Owen Lattimore Persecution

THE revelation that the British police carried out enquiries on behalf of the American authorities engaged in the persecution of Mr. Owen Lattimore has caused a stir in some progressive circles in this country though we cannot understand why since as the Home Secretary pointed out in reply to his questioners, "There is a standing arrangement whereby the police of this country assist the police of any other friendly country in making enquiries in criminal cases. The arrangement is reciprocal and has on many occasions proved advantageous to ourselves."

What happened in the Lattimore case is that at the end of September, New Scotland Yard made some enquiries of Mr. Lattimore's publishers in this country on behalf of the United States F.B.I. To the credit and honour of the publishers no information was given and they refused to allow any members of their staff to give evidence before an American Court.

In 1952 a similar call was made on the publishers, but on that occasion an official from the American embassy accompanied the police officer, and asked questions in his presence.

The Home Secretary in his reply referred to the way these requests were regarded as in order by the police here and were therefore not referred to his department. But he adds that he has given instructions "which should ensure that, in any comparable case which might arise in future, no action will be taken by the police in this country until there has been an opportunity for the matter to be considered at a high level."

This has not satisfied all M.P.s, some of whom such as Mr. Warbey seem to doubt that the police will know how to recognise "a comparable case" when it occurs. By the time these lines appear in print a number of supplementary questions will have been answered by the Home Secretary and perhaps some

details as to the extent of the assistance given in this country to the U.S. authorities in trying to build up their case, will emerge.

Meanwhile the four-year-old persecution proceeds. In spite of the Attorney General's undignified attack on Judge Youngdahl in which he accused him of being biased in favour of Lattimore and requested him to be "big enough, courageous enough and American enough" to disqualify himself, so that another judge could hear the case and so "secure a fair trial" it appears likely that the perjury trial will be heard next January by Judge Youngdahl who has proved to be un-American enough not to be intimidated by the barking Mr. Rover, the Attorney General.

We need hardly add that some American commentators are puzzled by the *Manchester Guardian's* all too rare outbursts of liberalism which sparked off the present interest in the Lattimore enquiries and the columnist of the *St. Louis Post-Despatch* sees it all as "excellent propaganda for the Reds" and asks "Who is behind the effort to stir up the case in the House of Commons". He should ask the F.B.I. to ask Scotland Yard to make enquiries (but *private* ones this time). Probably it's old Guy Fawkes himself who is at the bottom of it all!

Champion Nark?

WASHINGTON, Oct. 28.—A witness who said he had spied on American Reds for ten years named seventy-two men and women to-day as fellow members of the Communist party.

Ralph K. Heltzinger of West Reading, Pa., told the Senate Internal Security subcommittee that he had joined the Communist party in August, 1944, at the request of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. He served as its undercover agent, making regular reports, he added, until last July.

A CENTENARY TRIBUTE TO PATRICK GEDDES

SEVERAL years ago we quoted some remarks by Lewis Mumford on the new edition of Patrick Geddes' book *Cities in Evolution*. "Geddes," he wrote, "is fast becoming a rallying centre for the best minds of this generation: his thought, like that of his old associate and friend, Kropotkin, will probably guide the future, since the mechanists and the Marxists, in the present hour of their triumph, demonstrate the failure of their philosophies to do justice to either life or the human spirit."

Last month Mr. Mumford broadcast a centenary tribute to Patrick Geddes, extracts from which we reproduce below.

LIKE a giant ship, a great man leaves behind a wake, and that wake widens steadily till it mingles with the ocean, as he himself disappears over the horizon. Yet at the moment all but a faint foamy trace of this passage seems lost. The effect and influence of his life and work may be far greater than it was when the observer was closer to the ship and the wake was more visible. But this figure holds it all; it seems especially to fit the career of Sir Patrick Geddes, whose birth a hundred years ago we are now happily celebrating, in the company of disciples and followers in many other parts of the world, France, India, Israel, America, where his challenging ideas and vivid personal impact are still deeply felt.

Even in Geddes's lifetime his hidden influence in the minds of those he awakened and quickened was more conspicuous, so to say, than any external monuments that marked his achievements. I should not be at all surprised, to speak frankly, if many of those who are now listening had before this hardly even heard of Patrick Geddes. But I should be even less surprised to find on their tongues some idea, or some sharp phrase that first originated in the fertile mind of the Scots genius. Perhaps his definition of specialism as knowing more and more about less and less. The difficulty of defining the greatness of Patrick Geddes is largely the difficulty of pinning him down. In that respect he was like Proteus the Sea God, who kept changing his shape to elude those who sought to capture him and make him answer their questions. And as a biologist Geddes looked upon this capacity for self-transformation as the essential characteristic of life itself. Though Geddes studied under a succession of great biologists beginning with Thomas Henry Huxley, and taught zoology and botany, a good part of his life, he cannot be identified simply as a biologist.

From beginning to end life was indeed his subject matter. But he never had the illusion that it could be captured in the laboratories, and adequately studied and post-mortemed to sections; and he never sought to define it in narrow mechanical terms that excluded either its total environment or its ultimate products and purposes, manifested in man's highest perceptions of spiritual truths, and beautiful form.

Again, Geddes came under the influence of Carlyle, Ruskin and Morris, all still alive in his early manhood, and sought to put into practice their moral principles and social ideals. In this effort, without any financial resources of his own, he called little public gardens out of eroded patches of hillside in the old town of Edinburgh. He built a whole series of student hostels, the first of their kind in Edinburgh; and in the

course of a decade or two set in decent order a whole chain of derelict slum tenements.

Thus Geddes learned the art of town planning by practising it, by combining in one operation the offices of municipal councillor, investor, planner and builder. That kind of direct and integrated action was typical of the man. Through Geddes's imaginative work and self-education, he became the most dynamic leader of the town planning movement in Britain, and his activities in this sphere reached a climax between 1915 and 1924 in his plans for Tel-aviv and the University of Jerusalem in Palestine; and in reports and plans on some fifty cities in India. Yet Geddes's work in this field cannot be identified with any single institution, as one identifies Canon Barnard with Toynbee Hall, or Ebenezer Howard with the garden city. He was too big even for his own pigeon holes.

As an educator, Geddes was equally a pioneer. It was he who extended the biologist's field trips into social territory, and created the regional survey which brought together the works of man, and the operations of nature in one comprehensive and unified picture. His followers applied this method, and without it the great Land Utilisation Survey of Britain, so admirably carried through by Sir Dudley Stamp, would hardly have been able to muster so many able amateur helpers.

Geddes's concept of developing the region, and all its human resources as a whole, was one of those seminal thoughts that came to life in the Tennessee Valley Authority, but he tried to save the regionalist movement from imitating the inflated claims of nationalist self-sufficiency, and though he was one of the central figures in the Celtic Renaissance in the nineties, he always saw the culture of the region within the framework of a world community. So it was no accident that it is in the sphere of international education that Patrick Geddes's vision is now most remarkably finding its fulfilment. Back in 1900, in connection with the great Exposition in Versailles in Paris, Geddes organised the International Association for the Advancement of Science, Arts and Education.

In its original form this institution had a short life, but the idea it embodied emerged in our times as UNESCO. Here again a Geddesian seed so long buried has at last sprouted. Any one of these activities might have formed the solid core of an ordinary specialist's life work. To Patrick Geddes, however, they were only parts of an ever-expanding universe of thought and action. So it is not for his eminence in any single vocation that we most wisely honour him. It is rather because he was the exemplary incarnation of a fresh vision of life, which

brought the dispersed fragments of both the community and the personality into a new unity and harmony.

Do you remember William Blake's saying—"More, more is the cry of a mistaken soul; less than all cannot satisfy man."

Geddes was one of the few souls in his generation—and there are too few in any generation—who was not content with less than all. Life as Geddes found it was a continued process of challenge and insurgence, of growth and self-transformation. And the chief sin in his decalogue was the failure to make use of life's myriad possibilities. The millions of unused cells of the human brain were to him the symbol of the immense possibilities of further growth that man would take countless ages to explore; but life could reach its highest expression only when it dynamically maintained its balance and integrity, when the head was separated from the heart and the hand, when the natural was opposed to the ideal, when the inner was divided from the outer, he knew that the processes of life were becoming arrested.

Through that fixation, Proteus, the self-

transforming one, turned into a mummy enclosed in a tomb of his own making. And Geddes's best efforts were directed toward preventing this life-denying arrest, this respectable mummification, this premature imprisonment of the human soul. His lifelong war with institutionalism in every form was an assertion of a primacy of life, and the living person.

Speaking philosophically, Geddes was a holist before Jan Smuts; and advocated withdrawal and return before Mr. Arnold Toynbee; an effective joiner of East and West before Professor Northrop; an interpreter of existence in terms of organism, rather than mechanism, before A. N. Whitehead. But what was important about his philosophic thought was not his priority in these matters—no one could have been less concerned with priority than he—but the fact that he sought to put into practice what others were too often content to leave as abstract doctrine. Perhaps we should not be surprised that for this interpreter and renovator of cities, the highest claim of all is not that of scholarship and science, but of citizenship.

In our day the physical scientists, be-

lately awakened by the awful powers of atomic energy, have suddenly become aware of their social responsibility. But more than half a century ago, Geddes was sternly reminding his colleagues that unless they were men and citizens, before they were scientists, their highest thoughts would come to grief.

The maxim of Henri Bergson that the thinker must think as if he had the responsibilities of a man of action, and the man of action must act as if he had the freedom of a thinker, might have been drawn from his contemplation of Geddes's own example. Geddes's favourite motto was *Vivendo discimus*—we learn by living; and it is by recalling his active example that we can understand the full meaning of his teaching. The transformations that Geddes sought to effect were too basic, too many-sided, above all too alert to life's changing demands to be embodied in any cut and dried programme. The value of his system of thought—and he was a rigorous systematic thinker—derives from his seeking to find a place in his chart of life for the vital kernels of truth in every other system.

But Patrick Geddes's essential contribution was a change in attitude, and in a re-orientation and commitment to life

Continued on p. 2

FILM REVIEW

Slapstick and Society

It is frequently the trouble with experimental films that the audience is made uncomfortably conscious of technique, and with films of social content that the message holds up the movement. Films which are experimental and socially conscious at the same time often have both faults; Charles Chaplin's "Limelight", and Eisenstein's "Battleship Potemkin", for instance, have both too much technique and too much message to be enjoyable as merely good films are enjoyable.

But in Chaplin's "Modern Times", which is now re-issued after twenty years, the most daring experiment and the most forceful social protest are so skilfully blended into a shrieking slapstick comedy that it is faster-moving, and funnier, than it would have been without them. This is a degree of artistic success which has seldom been achieved; if the word genius were not so frequently abused, I would use it here.

"Modern Times" was Chaplin's first sound film, and, the textbooks on cinema tell us, a most important experiment with the sound medium. We hear sound effects, music, singing, and voices from radios, gramophones, and television screens (Chaplin had factory television twenty years ago) but all conversations are silent, with explanatory captions where necessary. The result of this technique is that conversations can be suggested in a very short time with very few words, but sound can be used for any particular effect. And so successful is the experiment that a very intelligent acquaintance of mine saw the film through twice without noticing anything unusual about the voices.

The plot is as socially conscious as anyone could desire. In summary: a worker in a steel mill run on the Ford system suffers a nervous breakdown as a result of his repetitive work. Cured

but unemployed, he is caught up in a Communist demonstration and sent to gaol, where he takes part in preventing a gaol-break, thereby securing his release with a first-class reference from the County Sheriff. For the rest of the film he gets a series of jobs, none of which last more than a day, and has frequent troubles with the law. During these, he befriends a girl juvenile delinquent, whose widower father has been shot in an unemployed riot, and they share their poverty. The girl finds a job dancing in a café, and when he next returns from prison persuades her employer to try him as a singing waiter. His hidden talent is discovered; he, too, gets a regular job; their modest future is secure. Then juvenile officers come seeking the girl, and they run away, back to poverty.

Such is the story Chaplin uses as the vehicle for his humour. Such is the hard metal in which he sets his gems of perfect clowning.

Even the heavy symbolism is indistinguishable from the humour. At the Ford factory he is used as the subject in a demonstration to his employer of a mechanical feeder "enabling your employees to eat without interrupting work". The machine, which is supposed to put food into the mouth of a worker whose head is fastened in a clamp, goes wrong, throwing soup at his face, emptying trifle down his shirt, doing him all the expected injuries and several completely surprising ones. And after each new indignity a mechanical mouth-wiper swings solemnly across and gently but firmly wipes his mouth. This is pure symbolism; but, equally, it is pure slapstick.

Paulette Goddard, as the juvenile delinquent, performs the straight sequences in so exaggerated a manner that in a seriously intended film she would be very funny; it has been said that Chaplin gave

her the part for reasons unconnected with acting. Be that as it may, I cannot imagine the part being better played. The job here is to express stark tragedy during the odd seconds of relaxation from energetic laughter, and a delicate performance would be wasted. There is none of the delicate pathos of "City Lights" here, nor is any intended; nor is "Modern Times" any the worse for its absence.

For in this film we are moved, even as we shriek with laughter, by the tragedy of a shack-dweller going for an early-morning dip in the river which flows behind his rotten home, and being cheated by fate of even that humble luxury; by the heartless injustice of the little man, imprisoned in the same cell with a massive bully; by the horror of a production-line worker, repeating the same motion so many times that when he stops work his hands continue the motion automatically.

This film is worth seeing either as a social protest, or as an essay in the art of cinema. But it is the huge laughter, derived as much from social protest and brilliant direction as from unsurpassable clowning, which makes it a wonderful film. D.R.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

OPEN 10 a.m. to 6.30; 5.0 SATURDAYS

Reprints . . .

Woman August Bebel 2/6

The Sayings of Lao Tzu 5/-

Penguins . . .

Joseph Andrews Henry Fielding 2/6

A Guide to English Literature:

The Age of Chaucer 3/6

Collected Short Stories

E. M. Forster 2/-

As I Was Going Down Sackville

Street. O. St. J. Gogarty 2/6

The Game of Chess H. Golombek 2/6

Second-Hand . . .

A Son of the Sun Jack London 2/6

The Road Jack London 2/6

South Sea Tales Jack London 2/-

Children of the Frost

Jack London 2/6

Michael, Brother of Jerry

Jack London 2/-

The God of His Fathers

Jack London 2/6

Before Adam Jack London 2/-

The Iron Heel Jack London 2/6

Turtles of Tasman Jack London 2/6

An Odyssey of the North

Jack London 2/6

The Call of the Wild

Jack London 2/-

The Profits of Religion

Upton Sinclair 6/-

The State of the Prisons

John Howard 2/6

Early Romances William Morris 2/6

The Plays, Translations, etc.

P. B. Shelley 2/6

Master and Men, etc. Leo Tostoy 2/6

Erewhon Samuel Butler 2/6

I Had a Pitch on the Stones

Jane Brown 2/6

Essays in Freethinking

Chapman Cohen (1st series) 3/-

Now in print again . . .

Sexual Freedom for the Young

John Hewetson 6d.

Postage free 9 all items

Obtainable from

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

Continued on p. 3

Reflections on the First International—3

IV

THE third and last great issue which divided the supporters of Marx from those of Bakunin was that of the attitude to be adopted towards bourgeois radical movements. Bakunin himself, before he joined the International, had taken an active part in the bourgeois League of Peace and Freedom (1867) which was an attempt to link the advocacy of peace to that of European unity under republican government. As leader of the left wing group, he attempted to press on the League a comprehensive and revolutionary social programme. Failing to secure this object, he and his followers seceded at the League's second congress at Berne and decided to throw in their lot with the International. Thereafter, Bakunin and most of his supporters resolutely opposed any form of collaboration with radical politicians and bourgeois movements. Marx, on the other hand, while no love was lost between him and the bourgeois elements, insisted on the necessity for supporting them whenever they were pressing for measures which he considered to be in the interests of the working class—the extension of the franchise and political liberties, the regulation of factory conditions and so on.

In part, this difference of attitude was the result of the fact that, while Marx was influenced largely by German and especially British conditions, Bakunin was thinking mainly of conditions in his native Russia and in Italy. In Russia and Italy the autocratic régimes and the poverty of the peasants and workers made it absurd to think of working for reforms within the existing State structure: conspiratorial revolts and uprisings of the masses seemed to be the only way to achieve any real improvement in the conditions of the

people. In Germany, on the other hand, and in Britain in particular, where capitalism was most advanced, it was possible to win from the ruling classes not inconsiderable reforms. While Marx went much further than the simple reformism of the British Trade Unions, he saw that there was little hope of persuading them to abandon their agitation for political and industrial reforms. Believing that this agitation would have the effect of increasing the militancy of the workers and would lead to a more conscious and closely-knit organisation of the working class in its struggle against the bourgeoisie, he, therefore, refused to countenance the idea of outright opposition to bourgeois movements as such.

It would be a mistake, however, to ascribe the difference in attitude wholly to the difference in conditions between, say, Britain and Russia, or Germany and Italy. Ends to a very large extent determine means and the ends for which Bakunin and Marx were striving were, as we have seen, not identical. The difference was also partly owing to a difference of conviction about the nature of the revolutionary potentialities of the workers. Marx was convinced of the ultimate victory of the proletariat. In this respect he was a true child of the Enlightenment and no different from other revolutionary optimists of his day—save in that his optimism was reinforced by a conviction based on his own metaphysical interpretation of history. But he did not believe that a proletarian victory would be achieved without a solid organisation of working-class forces.

Bakunin, on the other hand, tended to place less emphasis on the need for organising the social revolution. As we mentioned in connection with our comments on the State question, Bakunin believed, at least up to the

last few years of his life, in the creative and revolutionary potentialities of the masses. The masses, he thought, were waiting only for a few vigorous spirits like himself to galvanise them into activity. Once the crust of reaction had been broken in a few places, the whole social order would erupt. The masses would rise, throw off their chains for ever; creative forces, hitherto unsuspected, would be unleashed; the workers would spontaneously form their own free associations in which no man would call another man master: the Social Revolution would have been achieved.

Who was right: Bakunin or Marx? Again, the answer is complicated. It is perhaps unfair to read too much into Bakunin's letter to Elisée Réclus a year before his death. To die disillusioned is the fate of many revolutionaries—and yet revolutions still occur. Bakunin, exhausted by his almost superhuman efforts, was in 1875 a disillusioned man. 'I have found it for a fact,' he wrote, 'and I am finding it every day anew, that revolutionary thought, hope, passion are absolutely lacking in the masses; and when these are absent, it is vain to make desperate efforts, nothing can be achieved.' From continued propaganda something might be hoped for but 'if there were no other means of salvation, humanity would have time to rot ten times over before being saved'. The one real hope for the future that remained was—universal war. And, as he added, and we of the 20th century may well echo: 'But what a perspective!'

It would be wrong, we repeat, to read too much into these words. Nor would we wish to deny that in times of revolution unprecedented results can be achieved by the workers: the course of the Spanish Revolution is

PRESS & PUBLIC

AN example of sensationalism in the worst possible taste was provided by the circulation-hungry *News Chronicle* last week following the disappearance of a white settler near Nairobi. A six column headline NEW TERROR IN KENYA, followed by a four column sub-head "White Man 'buried alive to appease gods'" was entirely based on supposition as anyone reading the text that followed would learn. " . . . Kenya's War Council believe that a new cult has developed—directed by witch doctors . . . The War Council said that [the settler] has probably been buried alive on the slopes of Mount Kenya . . . The sacrifice is believed to have been made near Nyeri . . . Heavy losses in their battles against British troops and police are believed to have convinced the Mau Mau they have lost their god's favour" (our italics).

In other words pure conjecture, but which is given the most prominent place on the front page of this voice of liberalism! By contrast the *Manchester Guardian* quotes a *Reuter* report of the War Council's statement in a five inch column with the heading "MR. LEAKEY BURIED ALIVE? Mau Mau Sacrifice" (Note the important question mark absent from the *News Chronicle* banner headlines) and the *London Times* correspondent quoted by the *N.Y. Times* though mentioning the abduction makes no reference to the suggestion of the victim having been buried alive.

Though a week has passed since the publication of the "news", and a debate on Kenya has taken place in the Commons meantime, not another word has appeared in the *News Chronicle* confirming or denying the first report. The poisonous rumour has been spread, more hatred has been stirred up (as if there were not enough already) and so far as we can understand the purpose of such sensationalism can only be to justify in the public mind, the counter-terror and wholesale detention of Africans to which the Government is having recourse in its efforts to restore "peace" and firmly establish white supremacy in Kenya.

SOME optimists may be looking to the Press Council to curb the excesses of our gutter Press. Their optimism will have been tempered by last week's report of its quarterly meeting at which various complaints were discussed and disposed of.

In one case Mr. Stuart Morris, general secretary of the Peace Pledge Union, complained that the *Times* had closed a correspondence without publishing a reply which it had received from the union, which had been attacked. The council decided to inform Mr. Morris that the editor of a newspaper had the undoubted right to close a correspondence at any moment that he considered suitable.

In another The Typographical Association complained that the *Warrington Guardian* had refused to accept an advertisement for an operative from the Co-operative Wholesale Society's printing works. It was decided to inform the association that the editor of a newspaper has an absolute right to refuse an advertisement at his own discretion.

Obviously since the Editor is responsible for his paper, he must also have the right to decide what is published. But if his motives for rejecting or publishing are beyond question then so far as we can see there is no way of criticising his actions not only when he shows obvious discrimination towards a Union or a potential advertiser from the Co-operative Society but also when he headlines rumours as if

they were fact, as in the case referred to above.

The Press Council being a body formed by the Press itself, cannot, in the circumstances, be considered too seriously. After all its purpose is not to clean up the press, which would mean suppressing most of the daily and Sunday newspapers, but if possible, to try to remove that part of the filth which makes it stink.

But, it will be said, the newspapers that stink most have the largest sales, and one should conclude that the public gets the kind of press it wants. Such an argument is, to our minds, fallacious, because it assumes that freedom of choice is freedom. What is not taken into account is the far-reaching conditioning process to which we are all subjected from childhood, and which only too often determines our tastes, for the rest of our lives. Real freedom of choice depends on minds that are not enclosed by dogma and prejudice (the "what was good enough for my father is good enough for me" mentality) but which, on the contrary, are receptive to and enriched by ideas which do not follow the patterns of traditional thought and taste. Only then does "having a mind of one's own" not mean stubbornness informed by ignorance and "knowing what one likes" stem from deeper personal feelings than the parrot-like repetition of what one's neighbours think he thinks or the professional propagandists and advertisers want to make us think.

WHEN the daily Press will give more straight facts and less fiction; when advertisers will give us specifications of their products and less "lovelies" to put them across; when education in the schools will be comprehensive and not one-sided; when religions will be presented objectively and not as basic truths; when parents will stop lying and passing on their prejudices to their children . . . then is there a chance that freedom of choice will mean what it says. For then we shall also have a say in what there is to choose from. To-day the process is reversed. The monopolists of Industry, of Entertainment and of the Press determine what the choice shall be and then wage psychological warfare on the public to influence their already circumscribed choice.

It is that vicious circle which has to be broken and the task is as great as its success will be far-reaching. The field of action for such activity is not limited by class or caste; all mankind is inside the circle, and all of us should be prepared to attack this iron circle of obscurantism in whatever way we can. Some of us may through our publications, platform and organisations reach a larger public than the individual. But the individual's approach is more direct, more intimate, and ultimately more lasting. And if so many of our problems of adulthood stem from our childhood environment what more effective dents can be inflicted on the vicious circle than by the parent who provides a home environment of freedom for his children?

Reflections on the First International

witness to that. Nevertheless, I believe that Bakunin's last verdict was nearer the truth of the matter. The mass of the workers are not really revolutionary. The average worker is not, and it is doubtful whether he ever was, waiting, even unconsciously, for the moment to throw off his chains. The Shelleyan idea that behind 'the loathsome mask', when it is ripped off, lies the 'sceptreless, free, uncircumscribed' man is nothing but a poetic myth.

Was Marx right, then? Yes and No. Yes, in that he was right in thinking that the revolution must be organised, that workers' organisations must be built up 'in the womb of the old society', that the revolution could not rely on the spontaneous associations thrown up on the day of revolution. The development of anarcho-syndicalist thought since Bakunin's day is indicative of the correctness of Marx's views in this respect.

No, in that Marx was wrong in his insistence that the prime purpose of working-class organisation was the conquest of political power. 'The economical emancipation of the working classes—to quote the Preamble of the First International—cannot be achieved by political means. The question whether every political movement ought to be subordinated to this 'great end' or whether it ought to be subordinated 'as a means' to the end—the question disputed by the Internationalists—is neither here nor there, for all political movements are irrelevant from the point of view of working-class emancipation. In James Connolly's pregnant phrase, 'the workshop is the cockpit of civilisation'. It is in the workshop, in the fields, and in the mines that the real battle for the social revolution is being and will

MAXIM GORKI'S play *The Smug Citizen* was a picture of middle-class family life which was in effect a miniature of bourgeois society. A complacent Babbitt rules his household with an iron hand; the wife is a browbeaten creature, and the daughter Tatiana is a frustrated girl who takes poison when her foster-brother Nil does not return her love. This young man also feels the "smug citizen's" wrath because he rejects a rich girl in order to marry a poor seamstress. The worst offender, however, is the son Peter who is suspended from the university for radicalism and scorns the bourgeois pettiness of his parents' home and society. Peter leaves home with the widow of a prison official who found the company of the prisoners preferable to that of the respectable citizenry. Ultimately Tatiana is left alone, heartbroken and despairing, in this citadel of respectability.

Maxim Gorki always hated the complacent, self-righteous morality of good people, who inflict so much cruelty and repression on the innocent in the name of their abstract ideals, lacking the warmth and generosity of spontaneous life. Gorki ridiculed and satirized their

Freedom Press Publication

COLONIALISM ON TRIAL

COLONIALISM ON TRIAL, (Selected Articles from "Freedom"). Freedom Press, 7/6.

"COLONIALISM ON TRIAL" forms the third volume of the selections from FREEDOM. This one covers the year 1953, and concentrates particularly on the colonial problem, though that is not the limit of its scope.

Colonial questions are now before the general public more than ever before. The usual attitude is contempt for colonial peoples, and a belief that they are ruled by the British for their own good, whether that is in fact the intention of the British or not. Certainly the arrival of the white man put an end to many barbarities, though this was the case in other colonies besides those run by the British. But the Europeans have usually succeeded in bringing in their own forms of cruelty and stupidity, so the situation is not so much improved as it at first sight seems.

On the other hand the position taken up by the "Left" on this matter is inadequate. Modern history provides us with quite a large number of wars of independence, some of which did improve the conditions of those who waged them. But generally the result has been a native ruling class, who by the mere act that they belong to the people whom they rule can get away with a lot that the foreign conqueror would not dare to do.

However it is an exceedingly difficult question. Almost anything would be better than the state of affairs that exists in South Africa and Kenya, and there can be no doubt that, since anarchist

ideas are not widely known in most colonial countries, the people will turn to nationalism as the only alternative.

Reflections on the First International

be fought. Bakunin might have been spared his final disillusionment if he had taken a more realistic view of historical evolution. His famous statement: 'The passion for destruction is itself a creative passion', justifiable though it no doubt is in its appropriate context, betrays an attitude of mind which appreciates only one half of the problem of the social revolution. The social revolution, if and when it comes, will be a great destructive process: mighty will be the rumblings when Leviathan eventually falls. But, if history is any guide, there will be no social revolution—at least no anarchist social revolution—unless it has been preceded by a long and patient process of construction, a building up in the economic field not only of fighting organisations but of organisations capable of undertaking all the functions that will be necessary in the free society. This constructive process implies a tolerance for certain types of reformism which Bakunin never had—and which most anarchists to-day do not have: the reformism seen for example in the attempts to establish worker co-operatives. Bakunin lumped such economic reformism together with political reformism and dismissed them both on the ground that they weakened the revolutionary impulses of the workers.

It is true that there is always the danger that reformism of the co-operative type will, by creating new vested interests, degenerate into a mere bolstering up of the existing order. That is a danger which has to be faced and it provides one more function for the anarchist to perform: to keep alive the true purpose of such reformism.

It may be that anarchists are constitutionally and

ON THE THEATRE

THE SMUG CITIZEN

hypocritical respectability marking their lust for money and power. Private property degrades and humiliates men: it is spiritually ruinous. It means a loss of unity, of all originality: life is determined wholly from without and sinks to an incomparably lower level than that of existence weighted down by toil, fear, and anxiety. The morality of the law-respecting citizen has no spiritual, living source, because it is rooted in fear. Fear paralyses the freedom of conscience and soils its purity. In order to make true decisions and valuations one must be free of authority. Men torture and destroy others, are tyrannical and suppress the freedom of conscience and the spirit in the name of God, in the name of truth and goodness and justice. In *The Smug Citizen* we see that the source of falsity and slavery is greed and the herd-mind.

The deliberate falsity and hypocrisy of the State and the herd-mind morality extends to the most intimate aspects of life, leaving out of account the human soul. The State and the tyranny of the

herd-mind prevents the upward flight of the soul and adapts everything to its own purposes—love, spontaneity, aspiration and creativeness. It allows only the universally binding, the average, the conventional, because it is concerned only with averages and masses. It not only puts up with "socially" useful falsity (useful, that is, to the bourgeoisie or the rulers), but actually demands it and makes a norm of conventional existence (in habits, thought, speech, life, actions, ambitions, sex), cutting off man from the first sources of life, individuality, originality, joy.

The brutality of the Law does not know the inner man; it is externalized, rigid, pitiless, dehumanized; it regimented the life of the outer man in relation to the interests of the rich (in property) or the majority (in prejudice). It rests on the external, not the living sources of life. Consequently, people are too often afraid to open their hearts, to wander joyously and unrestrainedly through the strange mysterious yet glorious and inspiring adventure of life, to be themselves, because of wrong instincts, frustrations, false instilled beliefs, false fears of society and "public opinion", and this prevents the possibility of true sympathy, mutual aid and inter-communion. Anarchy and creativeness are by their very natures opposed to convention, routine, smugness, which consist precisely in the absence of creativeness and the incapacity for it.

Socialism is only a materialistic, false liberation, promising security and contentment in return for obedience and abdication. If liberation is taken to mean giving up the responsibility of individual choice, decision, commitment, throwing off the burdens and difficulties of forming one's own life, attaining satisfaction and getting rid of transcendental terror and tragic consciousness, it always ends in smugness, in meaningless conformity, in soulless "happiness". The mountains receded from view and there is nothing left but an endless flat surface. True liberty, meaning is revealed to me only when I am in myself, self-master, not ego-centrally, however, obsessed with my own importance, but delighting and giving, sharing in the rich bountifulness of my delight in life with my comrades and fellow-adventurers, the free spirits of anarchy. D.M.M.

PATRICK GEDDES

Continued from p. 2

itself, and an effort to evoke in all of us a sense of our unlied possibilities. Too often the people who come after such a pioneer thinker forget their debt to the lonely scout who spied out the land for them, leaving the task of patiently settling down and methodically cultivating it, to his successors. Yet at the very moment we think we have caught up with this adventurous and audacious spirit, and that we have nothing further to learn from him, we may find his mark carved high on a cliff we have not yet ventured to scale.

This very possibility is part of the mystery and wonder of life, that mystery and wonder to which the whole career of Patrick Geddes was, and still is, a faithful living witness.

temperamentally unsuited for the constructive reformist rôle, preferring instead the militant revolutionary type of activity. The not inconsiderable number of attempts by groups of anarchists in the past to form communities and co-operative workshops—the Jura workers had a workshop which helped to support their paper—suggests that this is a doubtful proposition. But, if it be true, it is still beholden on the militants to remember that reformists—of the right type—and revolutionaries—of the right type—are both needed in the great task of accomplishing the social revolution. Reform and revolution, construction and destruction are not alternatives but polarities; the one is as necessary as the other.

In these Reflections I have ranged widely and have presented a personal point of view. I do not expect that all my interpretations and appraisals will meet with the approval of my fellow-anarchists; indeed, I would not welcome it if they did. There is room enough for debate on all the points I have raised.

The International itself was a great forum for debate. Indeed, when Bakunin finally announced his retirement and resignation from the International, he exclaimed: 'In the last nine years there have been developed within the International more ideas than were necessary to save the world, if ideas alone could save it. I defy anyone to invent a new one.' One sympathises with the impatience of the old revolutionary but, for those who were not privileged to take part in the struggles of the first and greatest International, a consideration of its epic history and the ideas to which it first gave definite expression will long remain a fruitful source of inspiration.

GASTON GERARD.

VIEWPOINTS

Intuition and Anarchism

FEW readers of FREEDOM, I think, will be impressed by "S.F.'s" plea for intuition (FREEDOM 30/10/54) and many of them will be inclined to doubt his conclusion that the "emotional" revolutionary is a greater asset to the movement than his counterpart who has arrived at his position by a process of logical thought. Coming from an anarchist, his indictment of the scientific attitude makes somewhat strange reading, for science in general, and the social sciences in particular confirm anarchist theories rather than weaken them, as has been amply demonstrated in these columns by Alex Comfort, John Hewetson and others.

"S.F.'s" main complaint seems to be directed against the scientist, who has, he claims, bereft us of "the ability to perceive, interpret and understand our natural environment". But surely this is just what scientific knowledge enables us to do! With what else is the scientist concerned, if not with our environment, physical and social? Science does in fact increase our perception by developing our powers of observation, enable us to interpret and understand what we see, and re-organize our environment to our advantage. "S.F." mentions the simple soul who displays "a startling amount of understanding and insight": but simple souls, by reason of their very simplicity, live in a simple environment—our environment happens to be complex, whether we like it or not. The value of intuition ("the sum total of past experience") in a complex environment is very limited, since few of us can hope to acquire enough experience to enable us to interpret and understand our environment intuitively. Instead, we make use of scientific knowledge.

Perhaps the greatest disadvantage of intuition is that one has great difficulty in distinguishing it from the less respectable members of the same family. Our reasons for feeling at home with one person and averse to another, on first meeting may be due to prejudice or emotional disorder rather than to intuition: how are we to tell? Many a frustrated hope and many a square peg in a round hole are due to the man who proudly tells you that he can swim a felloe up in half-an-hour. The unreliability of these emotional evaluations and the superiority of rational methods is already demonstrated in any textbook of industrial psychology. "S.F." will perhaps forgive us if we prefer the more effective if less spectacular processes of rationalism.

To what he terms "the thinking revolutionary" "S.F." is less than just, ascribing to him "parrot-like repetitions from this or that authority". Now it is a characteristic of parrots that they do not understand what they say and to describe a "thinking" revolutionary in this way is clearly a contradiction in terms. As for his "delegating the responsibility of utilising our faculties to acquire knowledge to others", he must acquire a good deal of knowledge if the position he adopts is to be a valid one. Before coming to a decision on the question of sexual morality, for example, he must know and be able to evaluate the conflicting views of Unwin and Malinowski. Boat fares being the price they are, he might perhaps be forgiven if he does not make the trip to the Trobriand Islands himself.

Correction

In my article "Old Horizons", reviewing the pamphlet by Wilfred Wellock, I wrote, "Science and the machine have liberated us from superstition. They have also created their own stupidities and superstitions." This second sentence was for some reason omitted, thus giving me the appearance of one of those rather naive freethinkers, who have dropped Christianity, and taken up the worship of Science instead. Science is not a thing completely good or completely bad. One could even say that it is neutral, and can be used for good or bad purposes equally well. At all events it is not worth making into a religion, and I always protest against making things into a religion, whether it be science, or anarchism, or psychology, or the philosophy of Stirner. Fanatical worship of anything usually leads to authoritarianism, and a desire to enforce what one worships. A government by scientists would turn the whole world into a sort of place portrayed in the old "Flash Gordon" serial films.

In the third column I wrote, "To revive it [Christianity] if one could, would be most undesirable."

A.W.U.

If the bureaucrats and the police chiefs are the "psychopaths in office" who are the plague of humanity, then their counterpart in the opposite camp is the "emotional" revolutionary, who adopts the revolutionary attitude because of some psychological imbalance. Many a revolutionary owes his fervour to an "Oedipus complex"! Koestler has portrayed the type well in his novel "Arrival & Departure", in which a young man is motivated to martyrdom for a revolutionary cause by unconscious feelings of guilt. I commend this book to all who rate the "emotional" revolutionary so highly. The "emotional" revolutionary is not concerned to acquire knowledge except in so far as it will enable him to express his revolutionary attitude—"the truth is that which serves the Party" as the Stalinists have it. To say this is not to doubt his sincerity, but there are sincere authoritarians as well as sincere revolutionaries, but they do not commend themselves to us on that account. It is as well to remember that the "psychopath in office" of the present society would be the "emotional" revolutionary in an anarchist society.

Clearly, men are not prompted to go to war with one another by their reason, nor is there any rational basis for McCarthyism, anti-semitism, or even a strict sexual ethic. These are products of the emotions and one of the functions of

FREEDOM is to point out just how irrational they are. Hitler, the greatest "emotional" revolutionary of the century, gained power by his emotional appeal to his countrymen.

As a general rule, we shall do well to be guided by our heads rather than our hearts, nor should we be too critical of those comrades who do not happen to be neurotic!

PETER B. THOMSON.

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 43

Deficit on Freedom 43 x £15 = £645

Contributions received £667

SURPLUS £22

October 22 to October 29

Liverpool Group: £1; London: W.F.* 2/-; London: P.O.* 2/6; Sydney: G.M. 14/-; London: D.R.* 10/-; London: J.S.* 3/-; Llanely: E.G.R. 4/6; Castle Douglas: I.P.S. 3/-

Total ... 2 19 0

Previously acknowledged ... 664 2 0

1954 TOTAL TO DATE ... £667 1 0

BE YOURSELF

SOUNDING more like an injunction than an invitation, the words "Be yourself" either put me on the defensive or lead my thoughts suspiciously to enquire into the motives of him who spoke them. Who is to know who I am? And why impudently imply that I am not as I appear? The chances are that he is not concerned about my being myself or not, but wants me to fit with some image he has built or into some scheme he wants smoothly to run to his own advantage. He has some evidence or simply assumes that I am as others want or wanted me to be, and he would like me to shake off their influence only to accept his own. He does not seem to consider that the other people's will to which I have yielded may be dear to me or that it may be my pleasure to have yielded. He suggests that there is something fundamentally wrong in giving in to other people's will because they are near or dear, and at the same time he wants to draw me closer to him, to endear himself to me. Far from being as frank and clear as they sound, the words are dense with ambiguity.

To be yourself is not an easy task, if you start from the disturbing assumption that you are not what you are. You should logically find out first what you are, and then see whether it is possible and advisable to be something else. The ancients were much wiser and more respectful of human freedom when inviting you simply to know yourself. Their motives also were much cleaner, or at least Socrates' were when he said to Meno that "we shall be better and braver and less helpless if we think that we ought to enquire, than we should have been if we indulged in the idle fancy that there is no knowing and no use in seeking to know what we do not know". The platonists, then, who took over the Delphic exhortation did not intend to meddle with your private affairs for when they invited you to know yourself they meant you to know your self, that is a general and universal self, the soul in each human being which through knowledge and love can set itself free from the bondage of sensuousness and ascend to the vision of eternal ideas.

It is only when the call to be yourself aims at some generality or universality that it can claim to be disinterested. Then it springs from the same kind of pain one experiences at the sight of some deformed human body, and from faith in the possibility for the ugly to become beautiful, the bad to become good, and the false truthful. As modern thought has travelled quite a long way from Plato, any return to his ideas on self-finding and self-realization is more likely than not to take the form of a call to being what you are not but could be, will be, or have to want to be.

If this is the age of anxiety, and for Heidegger and other existentialists (a more precise term than existentialists) anxiety is the feeling of not being, then its reach should extend to the ideal, platonic or other, which is a region of non-being.

The inquiring into it, and the effort to conquer it to being (the Sartrian 'project') have to be included as an essential part of the peculiar condition and destiny of man.

So, coming from them, the call would acquire a particular meaning and tone. Being yourself as a man means to be keenly aware of your human condition, that is of your necessity to be partially always in the future, and of your eventual, unavoidable failure in death when futurity will be no more. The call to this awareness is a desperate call, and its effect is to spread despair, although there seems to be behind and beyond it a faith that something better will result from despair than from all the hopes mankind has lured itself with through all the centuries of its passion. There seems also to be, since a call is a call to someone, a lack of absolute certainty about the conclusions of despair. It is as though the anarchist were not quite convinced that anxiety is a general condition. His call, sometimes made loud by all available means, seems to rest on the doubt and hope that it will be echoed back by all who hear it.

The words "be yourself" come occasionally from an anarchist's mouth or an anarchist's pen, and they are not suffused with Platonism nor have they the quavering violence of the anarchist. I can think of only one case where the words would have a purely anarchist meaning, and that is as an expression of faith in the universality of human dignity coupled with indignation at seeing it threatened by some concrete instance of brutal or crafty compulsion. The words then mean: Beware, somebody is trespassing upon your ground, wrenching away from you that autonomy by which you are you, and you have the power to prevent it; if you don't or can't prevent it you cease to be human, and I who tell you to rebel do so because I am still human and without you I would be less than human; your submission makes a precarious and fragile thing of that dignity I must preciously value and for which I care for you; in order to be fully myself and live I need to believe in its inviolability.

An affirmation of the right, the duty, and power to rebel; a reminder that you are a centre of initiative and decision, that you must remain free both to dissent and to consent, that is all I demand from you. I do not impinge upon your freedom because really I do not tell you what you have to be or to do, but, rather, what others have not right to be or to do with you. The course of action I suggest is one of defence, but if you succeed you will experience a power within you which has an intoxicating effect, and will tempt you to exercise it again. You will then become aggressive. That self which you defended will not be content with the boundaries it has reached in arresting the attempt at intrusion of another self but will want to extend, and as it meets the barrier of other selves it will try to knock them

More Obscenity?

THE anti-obscenity witch-hunt seems to have penetrated to our places of learning. One of the colleges of London University runs a student magazine of a literary and intellectual standard rather higher than most student publications, the "Clare Market Review". In the Summer number there appeared an article entitled "The Sexual Problem". This article is a serious study of the sex problems of university students, the bulk of whom are forced to remain chaste (or pseudo-chaste) for a number of years when the average young adults of the working population have the opportunity to live mature sex-lives.

The article discusses the relevance of Kinsey's two major studies to the essential difference between the problems of male students and of female students. The general conclusion of the article is that much of the general immaturity of students and university graduates is due to the artificial prolongation of adolescence, which may have an unfortunate effect on the personality make-up of the professional and administrative classes.

This article, written in quite a restrained and academic manner, certainly produced no outbreaks of sexual orgy in the college. It had, however, the unfortunate effect of provoking a youth to write an hysterical letter to another college news-

paper "Beaver" (a somewhat Daily Mirrorish production) in defence of the virginity of the female students. He did not seem so concerned for the virginity of the male students, which was the main point of the article.

The article eventually came to the notice of the Director of the college, a venerable gentleman of the name of Sir Alexander Carr-Saunders. He had a chat with the president of the Student Union and "advised" that no more copies of the "Clare Market Review" should be distributed in the college. It touched on SEX; it would be especially bad for the young freshers coming up to college. It is usual to accept the advice of the Director on such matters.

Had the "Clare Market Review" thought fit to deal with sex in a giggling, music-hall manner, it is probable that no-one would have really minded, but because its content was of a serious nature, it was held to be reprehensible and not fit reading for the students at a university. One may only conclude that here is a vicious circle: the way of life forced on students in our society is self-perpetuating, and attempts to research into the sexual aspect of this way of life are taboo, even in a college like the London School of Economics which prides itself on its leadership in social research. S.M.C.B.

*Copies of the "Clare Market Review" are obtainable from Freedom Bookshop at 1s.

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)

NOV. 7—Philip Sansom on THE ANARCHIST REVOLUTION.

NOV. 14—Bert Willis on THE 3 IMPOSTERS: FAITH, HOPE & CHARITY.

NOV. 21—Tony Gibson on ANARCHISM & THE WELFARE STATE.

NOV. 28—Mani Obahigbon on AN ANALYSIS OF AFRICAN NATIONALISM.

DEC. 5—Donald Room on ORIGINS OF THE STATE.

OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting HYDE PARK Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

ANARCHIST YOUTH GROUP

NOV. 6—OPERETTA "DEBATABLE HARMONY" At the Malatesta Club

NORTH-EAST LONDON

DISCUSSION MEETINGS

AT MANOR PARK Alternate Wednesdays at 7.30 p.m.

WED, NOV. 10—Round Table Discussion—IN THE NEWS.

(Please bring your own newspaper cutting).

Apply to Freedom Press for details

GLASGOW

OUTDOORS

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

INDOORS

at 200 Buchanan Street Every Friday at 7 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 s/c Payne, and addressed to the publishers:

FREEDOM PRESS 27 Red Lion Street London, W.C.1 England Tel.: Chancery 8364

GIOVANNI BALDELLI.