

In this Issue :
Comment on
 Billy Graham - p. 2
Recent Trends in
 Psycho-therapy - p. 3
Educating the
 Educators - p. 3

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 16, No. 22

May 28th, 1955

Threepence

WILL THEY BAN STRIKES?

The Threat Comes from the Labour Leaders as well as the Tories

IN last week's FREEDOM, we quoted some words of Mr. Harold Watkinson, Ministry of Labour Private Secretary, on the question of the unofficial strike.

Mr. Watkinson said: 'One great threat to our national prosperity is the unofficial strike. The TUC is as worried as we are. The Conservatives, if elected, would take counsel on the problem with the TUC and the National Joint Advisory Council.'

When the Tories take counsel on working-class action it is with one end in view: how to stop it. The indications are, then, that attempts will be made in the near future to make unofficial strikes illegal. And the likelihood is that whether Labour or Conservatives are in the saddle after the election, some attempts will be made in that direction.

Tribune has seized upon Watkinson's statement and made a story out of it for election purposes, bringing forward also quotes from *The Economist*, from Lord Kilmuir and Mr. R. A. Butler, to show that Conservative opinion in the country is preparing to take legal action against the strike.

Threats to Official Strikes Too

The Economist has certainly made a point also in saying: 'If small unofficial strikes arranged by thoroughly irresponsible individuals or organisations could be stemmed... then big official strikes by more responsible organisations might also be discouraged.'

In other words, taking away the right of workers to withdraw their labour without the sanction of the leadership opens the door to banning the withdrawal of labour even with official sanction after the negotiations have failed.

But *Tribune* omits completely to mention the threats from Labour Party members. A fortnight ago we published the substance of a speech by Tom O'Brien, Labour candidate for W. Nottingham and Gen. Sec. of the National Association of Theatrical and Kiné Employees, virtually threatening anti-strike legislation and saying nothing against it. Certainly not pledging himself to fight it.

Again, presiding at the Trades Council annual conference at Wey-

Newspaper Sales Drop

Advertiser's Weekly has interviewed a number of newspaper circulation managers about the reported drop in the circulation of most London newspapers since last month's strike. Not one of them would commit himself about the newspaper or group for which he worked, but they variously estimated the overall drop in sales as "quite a slump" (*News Chronicle*), "between half and one per cent." (*Daily Herald*), "very slight" (*Daily Telegraph*) and "an absence of the expected seasonal increase" (Beaverbrook's, and Associated Newspapers).

The full extent of the decline will not be known until the next report of the Audit Bureau of Circulations; but the fact that circulation managers admit to a drop indicates that it is very considerable. They attribute it to two main causes: the temporary increase in size, which means the same number of words for less money, and the increase of 4d. in the price of evening papers. They are all sure it is a temporary setback. (One of them adds in parenthesis that "the interference in buying habits may have something to do with it.")

mouth last Saturday, O'Brien referred to 'wildcat irresponsibility of sections of our movement.'

It was time the trades councils should speak out on this question of irresponsible sections in various groups and industries, he said. "It is holding up development, expansion, and discipline in the trade union movement. Our work is going to be frustrated considerably unless the minorities in our movement do what the majorities are doing—play the game."

"We are engaged on the highest level of responsibility with Governments of the day, whether Conservative or Labour. All through the years we have fought for our rights and the right to strike for better conditions."

TUC Would Support It

But now, it appears, Tom O'Brien wants the right to strike to be vested only in the official bodies of the movement—who hardly ever use it anyway. And in view of the fact that the two big current strikes—the Stevedores & Dockers and the footplate men on the railways—are officially-led strikes, what is his attitude on them? The TUC is opposing both, O'Brien is vice-chairman of the TUC, and we can hardly believe that he would oppose action which would stop these strikes.

Indeed, hatred and fear of unofficial strikers comes as much from Transport House as it does from Tory headquarters. The TUC, as O'Brien says, is engaged with the governments of the day, whether Conservative or Labour, and is embarrassed by a militant rank-and-file.

We don't know what plans the TUC has for development and expansion in the TU movement, but we do know what is meant by dis-

cipline. And it is precisely the discipline which they wield over the workers which makes the official Trade Union movement of such value to the government of capitalist Britain—whether Conservative or Labour.

And that value remains as long as it can maintain that discipline. The officials' jobs are safe, their importance assured, as long as they can keep their members quiet. And to safeguard their positions, the big boys on the TUC and their hangers-on and hopeful successors right down the TU hierarchy, will in fact welcome governmental action against rank-and-file militancy.

They'll be Redundant

This *Tribune* does not mention. It attacks the Tories on the issue, without pointing out to its readers that there is in the Labour Party and the TUC just as much support for the idea of taking action against unofficial strikes.

After all, who is going to be rendered redundant when the workers develop their own strength at the point of production? Who but the Labour fakirs who mislead them now? When the workers finally realise that they can get on better without leaders, the present crowd will get the push—and they will do anything to prevent that. Even unite with the Tories on anti-working-class legislation.

But the workers will still have the final answer. The power of the Trade Union movement—of the whole economy for that matter—rests entirely upon the industrial strength of the workers. No legislation could avail against that strength if it is properly used.

There is one very good answer to anti-strike legislation: bigger and better strikes.

P.S.

Dockers Strike for Recognition

LAST Monday more than 18,000 dockers and stevedores in London, Birkenhead, Liverpool, Manchester and Hull came out on official strike on the instructions of the executive of the National Amalgamated Stevedores & Dockers' Union.

This is the small (the 'Blue') union which has been recruiting members in the four provincial ports within the last year, and in so doing has incurred the displeasure of the Trades Union Congress to the extent of being expelled from that august body.

The NASD was expelled from the TUC following complaints from the mighty Transport & General Workers' Union (the 'White' union) of the 'poaching' of members. It seems that if you once belong to a trade union, you must never leave it to join another, no matter how fed up you are with it.

This was laid down years ago in the Bridlington agreements, and what they really mean is that the workers have been divided up between the existing unions and no movement from one to another, and no creation of new unions, except for hitherto unorganised classes of workers, can be tolerated.

The Switch

Most dockers throughout the country are organised by the Transport & General Workers' Union. Until last autumn only 7,000 portworkers (excepting lightermen, tugmen and bargemen) were outside the T.G.W.U.; they were the members in London of the NASD. But, as readers will probably remember, last year there was a strike at Hull over the antiquated methods used there for un-

loading wheat. The TGWU officials admitted that the methods should have disappeared with Queen Victoria, but had nothing to offer the Hull men but to try to drive them back to work.

After all their experiences and frustrations through the years, this tipped the scales, and the Hull dockers applied to the Blue union for an official to go from London to speak to them and then they asked to join the NASD.

Hull was later followed by Birkenhead, Liverpool and Manchester. But it cannot be denied that in every case, the initiative came, not from the union but from the workers in the ports. In other words it has been a genuine example throughout of workers fed up with one organisation, which they feel (rightly in our opinion) does not represent them adequately, and looking around for an alternative.

The NASD's recruitment, at the request of the dockers, has however been denounced as poaching and much bitterness is now expressed between the two unions.

Why No Representation?

In London, the Blue union has long had the right to represent its 7,000 members on the industry's joint consultation committee and in time of dispute. Now, having built up a membership of 10,000 in the provincial ports, the union is demanding the right to represent them there too.

The NASD is an officially registered legally constituted union, and the employers in the provincial ports are prepared to recognise it and negotiate with it. This, however, is bitterly opposed by the Transport & General, which

POLICE NEWS

The Nark Takes Them for a Ride

THE general attitude of the public to the police is that they are a "necessary evil". "After all—they argue—we must be protected from the burglar, the cosh-boys and the sex maniacs". The curious thing is that in fact in most cases the rôle of the police is to find the criminal after the crime has been committed. And if one gives the matter a moment's thought it's obvious that short of having a policeman patrolling every street and alley night and day it is quite impossible to prevent "crime". Except of course when the police are tipped-off by a nark in the confidence of burglars who are preparing a job. Much of the credit for the police's efficiency in getting their man must go to the underworld's informers rather than to their intelligence as sleuths. And because they rely so much on the informer they sometimes come unstuck or are double-crossed. Such a case occurred recently in Nottingham where they were given a tip that a garage was to be raided one night at 10 o'clock. Three detectives watched the premises for two hours. In the meantime their informant and another man were busily breaking into two other garages in the same road!

★

MORE serious however is the behaviour of police in their dealings with suspects or sometimes even miserable motorists who cause an obstruction.

THE RAIL STRIKE

WE have already dealt with the issues (wage differentials) behind the rail strike threatened for this weekend.

The crisis has arisen again because negotiations have collapsed. And, as in the case of the dock strike, opposition to the ASLEF's claims comes as much, if not more, from the fellow- but much larger, union, the NUR, which is urging its members to stay at work while the footplate men strike.

Strike threats by railway unions, however are becoming rather like the boy's cries of "wolf!" It is quite likely the strike will be called off once again for further nattering.

"The ballot is nothing more than a paper representative of the bayonet, the billy, and the bullet. It is a labour-saving device for ascertaining on which side force lies, and bowing to the inevitable."

—BENJAMIN TUCKER,
 ("Instead of a Book")

And most serious of all is the power of the policeman's word in our Courts. The attitude of most magistrates and judges is that a policeman could not lie or perjure himself and it is all to the good when the infallibility of the policeman's evidence is questioned publicly. Two most interesting letters appeared recently in the *Evening Standard* written by men who have considerable experience of the Courts. The first, a Mr. W. H. Eaton who has been practising in the British courts for nearly forty years wrote:

"I am sure I speak for the great majority of the legal profession when I express concern at the growing notion "that police evidence carries some right by its origin to be respected." Unfortunately, this fallacious idea is not confined to the minds of jurymen, or even magistrates, but one meets with it far too frequently in the minds of our High Court judges.

All those who have had any great experience of criminal litigation know that evidence is frequently tendered by the police which is later shown to be false.

In all my cases of recent years when police evidence has played a material part, I have always made a practice of warning defendants under no circumstances to challenge such evidence, even though it is known to be false. Experience has proved to me that there is no surer way for a defendant to lose his case than to say in effect: the police are lying.

The prevalence of this notion, which is contrary to every principle of British justice, frequently places the solicitor and his client in an inescapable position and I am sure is responsible for many cases of miscarriage of justice."

He was supported by Mr. C. H. Norman who is a Law Courts shorthand writer who submits an experience of his as explaining "the attitude of many magistrates on the matter of police evidence". He writes:

"In a case tried by the late Mr. Chester Jones, London stipendiary magistrate, the evidence for the Crown consisted entirely of police and official witnesses. All the policemen admitted in cross examination that they had altered their notebooks to agree with one another. The defendants called many independent witnesses besides giving evidence on their own behalf. The magistrate convicted but only imposed a nominal penalty.

I must have shown facially my surprise at the decision, as that evening in the club of which we were both members the magistrate came across to me. Suddenly he said: "I noticed you seemed very surprised at my decision." When I referred to the bad showing made by the Crown witnesses, he said: "We magistrates must support the police in these cases, otherwise we should be lost."

—Continued on p. 4

Commies have always been against the breakaway, for it is easier for them to work within the massive TGWU than in the smaller NASD, and their leaflet calls upon the unions to discuss and for the dockers and stevedores to maintain the friendliest relations. 'We (i.e. TGWU members) must not allow ourselves in any shape or form to replace anyone who is on strike' says the leaflet.

In other words—try not to blackleg, but don't come out in sympathy with your fellow workers. And of the Communists themselves in the docks, the well-known figures came out on strike, while the less well-known members reported for work.

For the Anarchists in the docks there is no such dilemma. We are not impressed by the Blue union and don't think it has much more to offer the dockers than the TGWU. But there is a principle at stake; that workers should be free to belong to the organisation of their choice—and that organisation should have the right to represent them.

In defence of that clear principle all dock workers should be united.

LATER: Just as we go to press we hear that a rank-and-file delegation has been elected from working dockers in London to go to Transport House to try and persuade the union leaders to open negotiations.

Also Rochester has joined the strike, making 6 ports affected.

The Principle is Clear

The situation is very confused. And isn't clarified by the Communists who are playing their usual double game. The C.P.-controlled TGWU Liaison Committee, the unofficial body within the TGWU, has issued a leaflet appealing for unity—between the unions. The

Co-operative Oligarchy

CO-OPERATIVE DEMOCRACY, by J. A. Banks & G. N. Ostergaard. Co-operative Union, Is.

THIS booklet is the second of a new series of research papers sponsored by the Co-operative College. The first, published last year, was an essay by Mr. Youngjohns tracing the development of the Co-operative Movement's relations with the State and politics... Mr. Youngjohns, a liberal Co-operator of the old-school, tactfully ended his account in 1914—three years before the Movement abandoned its tradition of political neutrality and formed the Co-operative Party. But this was not sufficient to prevent the politicians, like Mr. Jack Bailey of the Co-op Party, from indulging in a fit of literary hysterics when they read it.

The new paper is less controversial. Written by a couple of detached academics, it is more likely to send its readers to sleep than to provoke fits of apoplexy. But the facts and figures that it so drily presents underline the 'senility', if not the 'impotence', of the modern Co-operative Movement.

The paper is in the nature of a report of an empirical investigation into aspects of the democratic process in a limited number of retail co-operative societies. Divided into two parts, the first is concerned with member-participation in co-operative business affairs in a group of societies situated mainly in the Midlands area, while the second is a case study of the electoral process in a large and, from the economic point of view, successful Midland society.

The first part reveals that the T.G.W.U. is a live democracy compared with the Co-ops: apathy in the trade unions is nothing to the apathy in the Co-operative Movement. The figures of 2% members attending business meetings and 5% members voting in elections of management committees are shown to be optimistic myths instead of the deplorable facts they are usually cited as being. The true figures to-day are more like 0.25% and 1.3% respectively. Moreover, while the Movement as a whole has increased its membership by some 65% in the last 20 years, there has been—in the societies investigated—an absolute, and not merely a relative, decline in the number of members actively participating. A further fact of interest is

*Reviewed in FREEDOM

revealed by the analysis. There is *prima facie* evidence to suggest that, generally speaking, apathy is greatest in the largest societies: the larger the society, the smaller the proportion of members attending and voting.

The second part—the case study—is concerned mainly with an analysis of the various social groups which have run the affairs of 'Midland Society' since the war. This society is untypical in that it places no bar on the number of employees who may serve on the Board of Management—most societies limit the number to 2 or 4, while some prohibit them altogether. In view of the general apathy, it is not surprising to find that with 'full employee membership rights', as it is called, the employees of Midland Society, who constitute 3% of the society's membership, have 10 out of 14 'representatives' on the Board. What is surprising is that apparently this position of so-called 'employee domination' was reached when in practice the employees constitute less than one-third of those voting. It is the ordinary members, in other words, and not the employees themselves, who put employees on the Board. The situation in Midland Society is often regarded as tantamount to syndicalism(!); if so, it looks as though 'syndicalism' is what the activists in Midland Co-op want! In fact, however, as the authors suggest, the 'syndicalism' of Midland Co-op is more spurious than it looks, even at first sight. For the bulk of the employees who get elected to Co-op Boards are not rank-and-file workers but employees of managerial status. The facts about so-called 'employee representation' suggest, not so much that the Co-ops are going syndicalist as that they, too, are in the process of undergoing 'the managerial revolution'. Even so, it is a 'revolution' tacitly or actively aided by the members and employees, for the managers constitute only 0.3% of the society's membership and could only secure election on the votes of the non-managerial group.

The authors are content to state the facts as they find them and not to theorize about them. But clearly the facts here presented are of great value to those who are interested in the sociology of workers' movements. The Co-ops began, it will be remembered, as a libertarian, non-Statist movement aiming at the emancipation of the workers. The Co-op Shop was merely the ante-chamber to the millenium. That the movement has not achieved its original aim is not necessarily the fault of co-operators: anarchists, too, await the millenium! But the question remains: How do we account for what has happened to the Movement since it first issued forth from the fertile brains of Owen, Thompson and King? The answer is not simple. But, as far as Co-op Democracy is con-

Comment on Billy Graham Show

On Hearing the First Cuckoo in Spring

IT was a fine spring evening—at least it wasn't raining—when I stopped at the stage door of the Palladium to see why everybody else had stopped there.

By everybody else I mean three thousand young women.

And they had all come to gaze on the masculine beauties of a smiling young man in a duffle coat who suddenly marched along a parapet, swung his legs over the edge and threw a fistful of photographs of himself to the crowd.

They screamed and fought for the pictures while a cameraman's electronic equipment flashed and flashed to record the moment for posterity.

"Sing, Johnny, sing," they yelled.

The young man's teeth gleamed whiter than any advertisement model's. "What shall it be, 'Cry'?" he asked.

Three thousand tightly-braced bosoms let out a searing scream of approval.

He opened his mouth and began to gesture. I was only ten feet away from him and I could just hear his words. The rest of the crowd could not have possibly done so.

But they screamed—and wept and swayed on their feet—they would have swooned to the ground had it not been for the crush.

The innocents who composed the crowd may not have known it, but they were exhibiting every symptom of an orgasm. And so was the hardly-audible singer.

His popularity can be partly attributed to his unusual off-the-beat and off-the-note style, partly to his engaging manner which calls for one to feel motherly towards him.

But, above all, his incredible sway must consist in the fact that his act amounts to a vast, communal release of emotional energy dammed up in the hearts of so many, many girls whose financial circumstances, drab tenement and factory-bound lives, and unintelligent upbringing have left only the back-

cerned, part of it is to be found in the work of Roberto Michels. The Co-operative Movement, in fact, is a perfect example of a democratic movement succumbing to Michels' "iron law of oligarchy": the law which states that when an organisation reaches a certain size and degree of complexity, the people who exercise authority in it by virtue of their office, cease to be controlled positively by the lay-members. A more appropriate title for this booklet would be, not 'Co-operative Democracy' but 'Co-operative Oligarchy'.

GASTON GERARD.

row-of-the-stalls cuddle and participation in this theatrical orgy as socially permissible outlets.

For if such an experience is enjoyed in a great, anonymous crowd it at once gains in intensity, and the crowd forms a code of morality that is the lowest common multiple of that of the individuals composing it.

Too little is known of the psychology of crowds, but it is clear that they have an attraction all of their own—witness Wembley stadium used by those latter-day gladiators, the Cup finalists. The blood-lust of the spectators is canalised and sublimated into hatred of "the other side"—and, usually, the referee.

But Wembley stadium has also served as a centre for the twentieth-century mysteries; the initiation ceremonies of Billy Graham's Greater London Crusades.

If you have not indulged in this mystical participation, come with me in your mind's eye to one of Billy's meetings.

★

ONE hundred thousand people pack the arena. They listen to the 3,000-strong choir practising. Then over the powerful loudspeakers echoes the disembodied voice of a tall, broad-shouldered representative of young America who can just be seen far away in the arc-lit stand at one side of the arena.

"There's a blessing for you if you'll sing the chorus of 'This is my saviour all the day long'," he says. They sing.

Now the Bishop of Barking comes to the microphone to lead this immense congregation in prayer. His black gaiters are replaced by the trousers of a genial giant who sings a hymn in cowboy style.

He turns away and in an instant Billy Graham, with a tired thinner face than his photographs, is there to say how pleased he is to see representatives from Hong Kong, India, America (big businessmen who have helped his campaign "and want to see how their investments are paying") and from Scotland.

A Scottish evangelist comes to the rostrum and thanks Billy for his great work in Glasgow.

Now, while the choir sings, a retired general appeals for funds. "Your seat costs 3 shillings; offerings have averaged a shilling, though one blind woman has just given £1,000."

At last, the big moment. With a microphone clamped to the lapel of his raincoat, a black morocco Bible in his hand, Billy Graham comes forward. There is a moment's silence.

Against the dark blue and vivid pink

of the heavens, a jet plane conjures up a man-made sunset as its vapour trail shines with a brilliant gold. The Union Jack and the Stars and Stripes flap in an icy wind.

"There is a hunger deep in your soul," blare the loudspeakers. It is the voice of a kind, deeply sincere man who speaks.

Not the voice of logic. It argues that what Jesus says must be truth, for Jesus is truth, truth Jesus—and the proof is in the words of the Bible.

But it is not your intellect, not your emotions that Billy wants you to give to Jesus. It is your will.

There is nobody present who does not wish to be cleansed from sin—and all men who fall short of the blaster of the fig tree are sinners.

And Christ who has numbered the hairs of your head has atoned for your sins on the Cross. All you have to do is to make a gift of your soul to God. He will do the rest.

You don't have to reform. Just leave your seat and, as if you were carrying the Cross to Calvary, walk to the rostrum.

The voice has changed now. It urges you to come down from high at the back of the stands, urges, urges in the smooth level tones of a hypnotist.

"If you come here your soul can be saved NOW. Don't put it off. You cannot receive Christ when you are alone. You need help. Counsellors will come forward and advise you what church to go to, what prayers to say, and Christ will be with you.

"I don't understand how it happens, but it does. And Jesus will make you happier, aid businessmen to make decisions, help factory workers to work better and relieve the suffering. Come!"

A man, cloth cap in hand, hurries forwards with his Cub son. A charwoman walks across the grass pitch. A coloured man comes out. A businessman, umbrella in hand; a crowd of schoolgirls; tens; hundreds; now they come in their thousands from the stands like sand trickling in an hour glass; more and more and more.

Two hundred arc lights blaze up, illuminating a text in six foot letters "I am the way and the life".

Billy's eyes are closed. He is praying harder than they have seen a man pray before. And still they come.

Now the Bechstein piano and the organ on the rostrum play quietly as the counsellors, co-ordinated by men with walkie-talkie sets, gather little groups together to give out literature and advice.

Those who have made no Decision hurry out of the stadium to their trains, coaches or Rolls Royce cars. They don't talk much about the rally. They are back to normal.

What a waste. What a waste of oratory, sincerity, organisational genius, and money. How few lives have really been changed for the better.

It all amounts to just another mass phenomenon—impressive while it lasted, but now just an interesting memory.

Whatever the eternal verities may be, they are not as simple as Billy makes out. Jesus is not the universal panacea; there is no such thing. And how many more crimes will be committed in his name?

This warm spiritual bath is not true religion, whatever religion may be, any more than our young man is purely a singer. The Crusade's success is the sign of a spiritually weak and intellectually weak society.

But, despite Billy's complaints, the society is not sinful. It hasn't got the guts to be.

A. NINNYMOUSE.

CINEMA

MISLIKE ME NOT FOR MY COMPLEXION

CONNOISSEURS of musicals can be recommended to see *New Faces*, though they may have some difficulty in tracking it down. This film was made by an independent producer and has not been given either a West End showing or a general release.

None of the cast has been seen on the screen before, but I hope we shall have the chance to see some of them again. One face at least will be familiar by now to many—that of Eartha Kitt. She is nothing if not earthy, and she has, to adapt a memorable phrase, a real hydrogen fallout voice. The most notable of the other new faces are those of Robert Clary, the diminutive leading man with a pleasant Franco-American accent, and Ronny Graham and Allen Conroy, two talented comedians.

We are shown more or less the complete Broadway show, which looks as if it might well have been photographed *in situ*. At any rate it clearly owes far more to New York than to Hollywood. The sketches are witty, as are many of the lyrics, some of which are sung without apology in French, and one, Eartha Kitt's "Uska Dara", in Turkish. The satire is in the best *New Yorker* style. The victims include the Marquis de Cuevas, the city of Boston (a girl who missed the best things in life because the books she should have read are banned there), Hollywood (the sentimental drama of an ageing pickpocket whose only son is breaking his father's heart by refusing to take to a life of crime), TV panels, and women's clubs.

One of the more felicitous numbers, "You can't chop your mamma up in Massachusetts", was suggested by the sad case of Lizzie Borden, the girl who took an axe and gave her mother forty whacks.

I particularly liked the shaggy-dog quality of the sketch about a snake-

charmer in an office. This is a model of its kind.

The film is in CinemaScope, and the colour, which is not specified in the credits, looks more like Ansco than any other.

Love, Soldiers and Women is another Franco-Italian *Trio*. Three strangely assorted stories are linked together by a few words spoken by the shadowy figure of Destiny, who only underlines his redundancy when he tells us that he has little to do with planning our lives and that we choose our own fates.

The first story, *Jeanne*, has been dubbed into English, but that is not its only fault. It deals with an episode in the life of Joan of Arc just before her capture by the English. We shall never know the truth about Joan: the fog of superstition and nationalist prejudice surrounding the contemporary chronicles can never be penetrated by even the most impartial of historians. We can take the legend for what it is worth; but even with disbelief suspended Joan does not make a sympathetic heroine, and even when interpreted by Michèle Morgan she appears as a rather priggish religious bluestocking. Perhaps the chief merit of *Jeanne* is that it shows us something of the pigsty existence of life in the Age of Faith.

The second story, *Elizabeth*, in spite of its shaky direction, is by far the best. It succeeds in capturing both the spirit and the flavour of the short story.

Elizabeth (Claudette Colbert) is the widow of an American soldier who was killed during the war while trying to get through the German lines after escaping from a P.O.W. camp. She has come, late after the war, to visit his grave in a military cemetery near the village where he hid after his escape. Anxious to

learn something about his last days alive, she decides to visit the farm where he sheltered and met the family who looked after him when, wounded, he was on the run. Now the farmer and his wife are dead, and only their daughter Angela (Eleanora Rossi-Drago) remains to look after the farm—Angela and her ten-year-old son, whose paternity we at once suspect. It is an interesting situation, and it is credibly worked out with coolness and a welcome absence of mawkishness.

Hollywood must have covetous eyes on Eleanora Rossi-Drago. Dressed in the drab garments of the poorer Italian peasants, and with hair awry, she makes many elegant ladies who are dressed by the world's most expensive couturiers look dowdy by comparison. And she is an actress of ability.

This is also the most satisfactory of the trio linguistically: the characters speak their own languages well and each other's indifferently ("I call to him: 'Venga! Venga! Non avere paura' But he not understand").

The third story, *Lysistrata*, owes only its plot to Aristophanes, whose comedy has been turned into farce. As everyone knows, it is about a *grève de l'amour*, so perhaps it is appropriate that it should be played in French. The dubbing, unlike that in the first story, is well done, but even so one cannot help but marvel that Paolo Stoppa (Niciphorus) and Raf Vallone (Callias) should speak such fluent French. Martine Carol is a provocative Lysistrata but no more hellenic than Marilyn Monroe. This story is played with all the zest of an undergraduate frolic, but that is really all one can say for it.

Showing in the same programme is *Le Blé en Herbe* (reviewed previously and recommended). E.P.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

OPEN 10 a.m. to 6.30; 5.0 SATURDAYS

New Books . . .

Double Talk: the Language of Communism H. Hodgkinson 16/-
Failure of a Revolution: Germany in 1918-19 R. Coper 25/-
Stalinist Russia: a Marxist Analysis Tony Cliff 7/6

Reprints (Everyman) . . .

Selected Works Ovid 6/-
Fathers and Sons Ivan Turgenev 6/-
Virgin Soil Ivan Turgenev 6/-

Second-Hand . . .

Don Quixote Miguel Cervantes (2 vols.) the set 5/-
Essays in Science & Philosophy A. N. Whitehead 3/-

William Godwin and His World R. Glynn Grylls 5/-
Hostages of Civilization Eva G. Reichmann 2/6

Prophecy of Famine H. J. Messingham and Edward Hyams 5/-
Free Expression in Industry James J. Gillespie 2/6

Intruder in the Dust William Faulkner 3/-
Geneva, Cymbeline, etc. George Bernard Shaw 4/-

Wind, Sand and Stars Antoine de Saint-Exupéry 4/-
To Beg I am Ashamed Sheila Cousins 3/6

The Last Tycoon F. Scott Fitzgerald 4/-
The Beautiful and the Damned F. Scott Fitzgerald 5/-

The Conflict Between Religion and Science J. W. Draper 2/6
Plays Georg Buchner 5/-

Periodicals . . .

Organic Functionalism (May) No. 3 2/6
(May) Vol. 2, No. 3 2/6

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

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

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 20

Deficit on Freedom £300
Contributions received £266
DEFICIT £34

May 13 to May 19

London: Anon. 1/2; Guernsey: B.S. 3/-;
Denver: R.B. £1/15/0; Los Angeles: "Man"
Group, per J.S. £3/10/0; Maidenhead: L.S.
1/-; London: Anon. 1/6; London: Anon. 5/-;
London: B.L. 1/-; London: R.S. 10d.;
Mexico: M.F. £1/15/0; Rossendale: W.G.
2/-; Rochford: D.W. £1/15/0; Sheffield:
H.W. 3/6; Cookham: G.H. 10/-

Total 10 4 0
Previously acknowledged 256 14 10

1955 TOTAL TO DATE £266 18 10

GIFT OF BOOKS: Maidenhead: J.S.

EDUCATING ONE EDUCATORS

IN a report issued last week by the National Foundation for Educational Research the investigator, Miss Alice Walker, who has spent the past five years examining the methods by which local authorities keep records of the pupils who pass through their schools, admits that teachers and education advisers have in general failed to evolve a satisfactory method for assessing the "personal qualities and character" of the children in their charge. As a result, she thinks, most education authorities are at present sceptical about records that profess to give character-portraits of children.

★

AT about the same time a mother of four children was being fined by the magistrates of Dereham in Norfolk for disobeying a school attendance order for them. The mother, wife of a journalist, told the magistrates:

"I think that, up to the age of 10, a child's place is in the home.

"I teach them to speak clearly, good manners, cleanliness, courtesy, consideration and gentleness, which I consider more important than reading, writing, arithmetic.

"I want my children to develop as they are, and not as other people think they should be. I want them to grow up as individuals and not part of a mass.

"I teach them reading, writing and arithmetic, tell them about such other subjects as I can, let them listen to lessons on the wireless and question them afterwards."

Of the results the senior schools inspector for Norfolk said that he found the children, aged 6, 7, 8 & 9 respectively, were "pleasant, cheerful and of good intelligence". The boys (the two eldest) could add and subtract, "but did not know money, weights or measures. The nine-year-old could not turn 3s. 4d. into pennies, or work out the cost of four 1½d. pencils". The boys were "18 months behindhand at reading, and the girls could only write capital letters and not words". He added: "I could see that the boys were just longing to go right ahead. It's a great pity they have lost so much."

The mother, who was fined £1 for each child said afterwards: "I still shall not send them to school. I am their mother and it is for me to decide."

★

WE do not think that the problem posed is a simple one, unless one is prepared to argue that "compulsory education" is wholly harmful and that attendance at school should be a matter of free choice. Even then one finds oneself asking the question "whose choice?". In the case we have reported the mother, Mrs. Baker, has herself decided what is best for her children—and we have no doubt from our reading of the Inspector's evidence, as well as the photograph of the family group (*News Chronicle* 21/5/55), that the advantages derived from her choice outweigh the fact that the nine-year-old could not convert shillings to pence or work out what four three-halfpenny pencils would cost. Against that one wonders whether the children do not miss the fun of mixing with other children and may even feel a little isolated from the life of the village.

Again, while it is probably true that the "personal qualities and character" of children can best be developed in the home since they have the attention and understanding which is impossible in a village school where the teacher may have to spend more time in trying to manage her over-crowded class than in getting to know her wards, it is nevertheless a fact that so far as the majority of mothers are concerned,

the facilities, the time and/or the ability to attend to the education of their children do not at present exist.

Mrs. Baker would seem to hold the view that in order that her children should "grow up as individuals and not part of a mass" it is necessary to segregate them, to avoid contacts and influences which might be harmful to her purpose. Children cannot surely be treated like hot-house plants; at some time or other they will have to play, work and live with other people as well as understand them. It seems to us that more "problem children" are the result of an unsatisfactory home environment than of the inadequacies of, and lack of understanding shown to them in, the schools. The negative aspects of school education are generally easily overcome by a free, friendly and uninhibited home atmosphere; just as, conversely, progressive educationists lament that so often the good results they achieve are off-set by the conventional, repressive homes to which the children return during their holidays.

★

THE case of Mrs. Baker is a good example of the lack of elasticity (that is, of the human touch) which is inevitable in any centralised society. The Act of 1870 empowering School boards to introduce compulsory education at the age of five was a progressive measure in so far as it helped to put an end to the exploitation of child labour. Even to-day many of the older children in large families, too poor to afford a home-help, would, if it were left to the parents to decide, be deprived of a school education in order to help with the house-work. The Law deals with such cases as well as with the case of Mrs. Baker with exactly the same machinery, instead of recognising that they are at opposite extremes, that the former needs material help whilst the latter on the other hand should receive every encouragement!

Miss Walker in her report adds her warning that though form-filling record cards are coming to play an increasingly important part in school life they should not be regarded as a "substitute for consultation between teachers and parents, or for direct study of the child."

The Mrs. Bakers are the exceptions to the rule to-day simply because life is geared to the machine of production and more production, instead of that machine being used to create more leisure. For it is only when there will be more leisure that a new, more human attitude can be adopted to such problems as the education of children, for then education will become a vocation in which professional teachers and parents will combine to ensure that their children shall "grow up as individuals and not part of a mass" yet, with all that, deeply conscious of a sense of community.

We know most of the arguments put forward by the critics of present day education and are entirely in agreement with them and use every occasion to draw attention to the inadequacies of the State schools as well as the sinister political and religious undercurrents which tend to produce an obedient, easily managed and exploitable mass. But at this stage it seems simply slogan-mongering to advocate the abolition of State schools, or of this or that Act simply because it is the Revolutionary thing to do. The social revolution will be a reality when enough of us will not only feel dissatisfied with the kinds of life we live and the relations we maintain but will also have, each in our particular sphere, a fairly clear understanding of what will take the place of the authoritarian institutions that we wish to destroy. It is not a question of a rigid blue-print but simply a recognition that no-one will discard the values of the present until he feels convinced that he has something better to take their place. Life cannot stop; it cannot afford a spiritual or material vacuum.

Recent Trends in Psychotherapy

WITH even the psychiatrists publicly admitting that they are not sure what they are doing the time seems ripe to look at what has been happening since Sigmund Freud shuffled off the scene in 1939. As long as the old man was alive he saw to it that he lived up to his self-appointed rôle as Moses the Lawgiver. To query Freud's basic dogma of pan-sexuality and the Death Wish was to court banishment to outer darkness.

Entering the charmed circle was not so difficult, but once having sipped of the heady wine of psychoanalytical mythology (Freud's own description), it took nerve and egotism to break the spell. To paraphrase Koestler, "the last battle will be between the Freudians and the ex-Freudians".

Jung and Adler took the plunge early on; so did Wilhelm Reich later in the day. Each wove around himself a fresh incantation—a new Gospel to which they and their followers are slaves for the rest of their days. Not that their bondage involves any great financial sacrifice, except on the patient's part. But then, nothing makes a new religion go with such a swing as a fully-booked programme of crucifixions.

With the death of the Master things loosened up a good deal. There had been signs of serious cracks in the edifice for quite a while and many workers in the field were beginning to wonder if these gaps might not reveal an empty shell. On the theoretical side Freud himself was never happy about the Death Wish and the contradictions it involved. After all, if everyone has a will-to-die as well as a will-to-live it is a little difficult to be sure whether you are coming or going.

From a practical point of view it was an open secret that as a therapeutic agent psychoanalysis was a failure. In the words of Freud himself, "So not only the patient's analysis but that of the analyst himself has ceased to be a terminable and become on interminable task". As has been pointed out with some force recently, the concrete evidence that psychoanalysis has any therapeutic value is slender, to say the least.

Fortunately, some Americans have a pragmatic disposition. They never have been able to reconcile themselves to the Stoic view that if something does not work you just have to put up with it.

In the thirties the neo-Freudians, in particular Horney, Fromm, and Sullivan, shouldered the burdens that the old man was bequeathing the world. Without

abandoning enough of the classical mythology to invite excommunication they nevertheless managed to bring a breath of common sense into the closed system. The work of Malinowski, and later Mead, Boas, and Benedict had demonstrated that the Freudian universals such as the Oedipus complex were products of a particular social system, and a close examination of Freud's background revealed just how special was the social milieu which gave birth to psychoanalytic theories.

Some of the lumber was jettisoned or merely left in the attic, perhaps later to be dug out, refurbished and put on show as holy relics. And the rest was held onto less tendentiously and more in the manner of a man who bales his leaking Ark while looking for a landfall.

Medical War

But still there remained a crying need for a realistic approach to the problem of widespread neurosis. Few people can afford five hours a week for three years at two to five guineas per hour even if there were some guarantee of being cured to illuminate this weary trail. Quite as great a barrier to a psychologically healthy society is the Thurberesque prospect of an army of analysts swarming over the urban scene, each with his portable settee tucked under his arm.

The selection and training of competent psychotherapists is no small matter, and this complex problem is further bedevilled by the undercover war that is currently raging as to who has the right to inflict his theories on the patient and relieve him of his cash. One might imagine that with the need for efficient therapy so apparent and so ill-met that there must be ample room for any hardy pioneer to stake out a claim in these lush pastures of human misery—but this would be to underestimate the sense of public duty and grasp of *realpolitik* of the medical profession.

The argument runs something like this: only the medically qualified are entitled to treat the diseased. Although there is nothing physically wrong with some patients they are mentally diseased. Ergo, they need a mental doctor, a psychiatrist. The catch in this argument is a linguistic one. Anyone who is ill is defined as being diseased. Historically this may be justified, but it conceals a vital flaw; the distinction between organic diseases and functional disorders that has arisen out of empirical observation.

Resistance Movement in Russia?

[In the editorial on "The Boy from Stalingrad" (*FREEDOM*, April 2), we quoted from the sketchy reports of the press conference at which the youth Valery Lisikov declared that he belonged to an "anarchist" group and commented that "It would have been interesting to have asked Lisikov what he understood by the word anarchism". It now appears according to the duplicated journal of the American Libertarian League Views and Comments that this and other relevant questions were asked.]

New Hope in Soviet Russia

THE American press recently mentioned the existence of a secret anarchist club in a Soviet school in East Berlin in articles concerning Valery Lisikov, an escaped Russian student. The interview as reported had been tailored to suit the needs of American war propaganda. The "anarchist" angle was played down and the major stress placed on the youth's admiration for all things American.

The Russian émigré paper, *Russkaya Zhizn* of April 7th gave a more extensive verbatim report of the interview. For example: "Question—Was your organization based on the classical ideology of anarchism? Answer—We had no ideology. We were fascinated by the exploits of Batko Makhno. Communism in our opinion was equivalent to absolute lack of liberty. We were against communism and for absolute freedom. In our opinion such absolute freedom is to be found in Anarchism." . . . And further along . . . "Question—How will your flight to the West affect your father's position? Answer—My father is an old communist and therefore a conservative (?) like all the other communists. It is not his fault that I left but he will certainly have to leave Germany after this and return to the U.S.S.R." The parenthetical question

mark is neither Lisikov's nor our own. We include it as it appears in *Russkaya Zhizn*, a reactionary sheet that could hardly be expected to distinguish between communism and radicalism.

The Russian émigré press represents innumerable splinter movements from the Anti-Stalinist left all the way to the monarchists. It is a rich source of information, eye-witness accounts, and rumours concerning the internal situation in Russia to-day. The mutual animosities of these various tendencies keeps them from slanting their reports in a uniform manner. The stereotyped interview in which the escapee is prodded by leading questions to describe Russian hatred of the Bolshevik dictatorship in terms of a "return to religion" and an overwhelming admiration for the "American way of life" does not appear.

The readers of the émigré press would not be satisfied with information rehashed and "analysed" by American "experts". Disregarding the ideological commentaries of the various editors, one is struck by the general pattern. It differs from the approved capitalist attitude as completely as it does from the official Stalinist line.

Through all these reports of strikes, sabotage, illegal pamphleteering, terrorist activities and actual armed partisan resistance, there runs the constant theme of proletarian rebellion against the State, the bureaucracy and the police. There is no evidence to support the thesis that this very real revolutionary undercurrent has as its goal the establishment of capitalist democracy. There are no calls for the reopening of the churches, the return to private ownership or the establishment of parliamentary government.

This mass of reports strikes at the heart of capitalist propaganda which assumes only weak conservative opposition or mass apathy and that effective resistance is only to be expected at the bureaucratic top. Such of the facts as are known do not appear to bear this out.

Medical men are trained largely to deal with organic diseases, and only since the turn of the century has it been generally recognised that many patients have nothing wrong with them in this sense, or more often that their physical symptoms are due to an emotional disturbance rather than a microbe. Faced with this fact the medical profession has eased its own conscience by doling out placebos of coloured water, recommending marriage to the single or a family to the childless. Such is the folk-lore that masquerades as psychological medicine. The more progressive element recognises that a year or even two years learning to produce convulsions tacked on the end of five years at medical school is needed to make an expert in this minor branch of medicine.

A Separate Field of Study

But the hard fact is that functional disorders happen not to be a minor branch of medicine but a field of study in its own right with a new profession of clinical psychologists arising to deal with its problems. Members of this new profession do not pretend to a general knowledge of anatomy and physiology, although they study closely the physiology of the central and autonomic nervous systems. Nor is it necessary that they should be able to set broken bones, amputate limbs, or remove appendices. Instead they spend their five or six years of undergraduate and postgraduate study concentrating on the behaviour sciences, abnormal psychology, and therapeutic techniques; precisely those areas which are most relevant to the understanding and treatment of functional disorders.

Why, then, is the medical profession on the whole so reluctant to come to terms with reality and recognise its incompetence in this new field? Well, if you bear in mind that perhaps as many as 50% of the cases that the General Practitioner has to deal with are basically functional disorders it is not so surprising that he should see the invasion of this field by clinical psychologists as a threat to his security and attempt to operate the closed shop principle against them. Having, as he does, a well-entrenched and powerful Trade Union behind him he is in a position to make life difficult for these upstarts.

Consequently, it is almost impossible for the genuine psychotherapist to practise his art within the structure of a Health Service which is dominated by specialists in organic disease. So he finds himself relegated to the minor and socially inferior rôle of administering psychological tests and making diagnoses under the aegis of a psychiatrist who then proceeds with the actual therapy, qualified by his six months' concentrated reading of Freud and fortified by his unique skill in clapping on electrodes and wielding the insulin syringe.

Because of the pressure of work the clinical psychologist may actually be permitted to carry a few cases unofficially, but in general he can attempt only the more superficial kinds of therapy. Naturally, he can fight back through his own Trade Union, but short of going into private practice there is no way that he can escape the supervision of the psychiatric Commissar who knows next to nothing of psychotherapy. To quote Freud again: "psychoanalysis is not a 'special branch of medicine. I cannot understand how one can resist recognising that psychoanalysis is part of psychology; not medical psychology in the old meaning and not psychology of the pathological process, but pure psychology; certainly not the whole of psychology but its underground, perhaps its foundation. One should not be deceived by the possibility of its application to medical purposes. Electricity and X-rays are also applied to medicine, but the science of both remains physics. Neither can historical argument change the fact that psychoanalysis belongs to psychology . . . The argument has been brought forward that psychoanalysis was discovered by a physician in his efforts to help patients. But this is immaterial in its evaluation."

And Freud was originally a qualified medical practitioner.

BOB GREEN

(To be continued)

**Don't forget
the
DEFICIT!**

(see page 2)

The Church Deals with Material and Moral Welfare!

THE Church Commissioners have little to learn from the City of London when it comes to the manipulation of wealth, as a recent report of Church property and potential property sales show. Last week the Church Commissioners realised over a million pounds in sales of property which were part of the Paddington Estate. The gross yearly income from the properties sold amounted to £77,500. It came from shops, business premises, licensed houses, blocks of flats and building sites.

It is reported that:
Among the 100 lots sold were two hotels at Lancaster Gate, which were bought by their present occupiers for £34,000 each, a public house in Queensway, for which the successful bid was £18,000, and a number of smaller properties which averaged prices of between £5,000 and £6,000. Thirty-one lots were sold on Wednesday for £162,400, and before the sale 71 lots were disposed of to the L.C.C. and Paddington borough council for housing purposes for the sum of £335,000, making a grand total of £1,073,800.

A representative of the Church Commissioners expressed satisfaction at the results of the sale. He said that there would be a further disposal of their properties in Paddington next year, when Westbourne Terrace, Eastbourne Terrace, Cleveland Square, Cleveland Gardens, and Gloucester Terrace would be auctioned. With the completion of the sale about one-quarter of the estate in Paddington would have been sold.

The Commissioners also own properties in Maida Vale and Hyde Park, but the official said it is not proposed to put these up for sale. Nor would the Paddington Station site be sold. It is expected that more than £2m. will be realized from the combined sales, which have been made because of the difficulty and expense of upkeep.

(Times, May 20th).
The Church, like any other financial enterprise, is interested in high profits and is not really very concerned where the money comes from. Like the State, it operates a code of double morality and while it is very anxious theoretically that our sexual behaviour should conform to the Christian ideal it has always maintained that it was unable to do anything about some of the Church property being used as brothels which was the case in Paddington. We are, however, unconvinced by the arguments. If, as they profess, morals mean more than money why did they not get rid of the property suspected as being used as brothels years ago?

Would it not be true to say, since prostitutes have to pay enormous rents in areas where they work, that any land-

lord who owns property occupied by prostitutes has a vested interest in prostitution?

But, just to prove that the Church is really interested in our moral welfare, a report on marriage and divorce appears in the press on the same day (in bigger headlines, of course, as the announcement about the property sales.

The Church of England report, drawn up by a commission of twelve clergymen including five bishops and four Q.C.'s recommends that all but one of the defects which make a marriage void under the *Matrimonial Causes Act* should be incorporated into Canon Law. Conditions under which a marriage can be declared void are these:

1. That either party to the marriage was under the age of sixteen.
2. Impotence or incapacity to consummate the marriage. This includes malformation and frigidity.
3. Wilful refusal to consummate the marriage. Inability or refusal to bear children is not a ground for nullity.
4. Bigamy, i.e., where a former spouse is alive at the time of the second marriage and the previous marriage has not been dissolved or annulled.
5. Insanity at the time of the marriage, of such a nature that the party does not know what he or she is doing or has insane delusions about the ceremony of marriage. In addition, the Act of 1937 provides that (subject to three conditions), therein mentioned a marriage can be declared void if either party is at the time of the marriage of unsound mind or a mental defective within the meaning of the Mental Deficiency Acts, or subject to recurrent fits of insanity or epilepsy.
6. (Subject to the same three conditions, that the respondent was at the time of the marriage suffering from venereal disease in a communicable form.
7. Subject to similar conditions, that at the time of the marriage the wife was pregnant by another man.
8. Marriage induced through force or fraud.
9. The parties were within the prohibited degrees of relationship.
10. The marriage was not celebrated with the forms and ceremonies required by law.

(Journal of Sex Education, April, 1949).

What these old men cannot accept however, is the clause which allows for nullity of marriage where there is refusal to consummate the marriage.

In this connection Sir Alan Herbert has pointed out that when the Bill was in the Lords not one Bishop uttered a word against the provision which they think should now be repealed. He points out:

"Anyone who reads this report would suppose that the Church had no voice in making the State law.

"But I must point out that in the House of Lords sit two Archbishops and 24 bishops.

"They rightly filled many columns of Hansard when the Bill was in the Lords. But not one bishop said a single word against the provision which, according to the Commission, should now be repealed.

"If it is, the bishops will have to explain why they approved of it 18 years ago."

It is difficult to find a logical reason for this and can perhaps only be understood as another attempt to prop up a dying cause.

What is clear to us however, is that on matters which should only be the concern of individuals the Church is ever ready to interfere and lay down patterns of behaviour, but, when it comes to social problems like poverty and war it is strangely silent.

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.
- HERBERT READ :**
Art and the Evolution of Man 4s.
Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism 3s. 6d.
Poetry and Anarchism cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d.
The Philosophy of Anarchism boards 2s. 6d., paper 1s.
The Education of Free Men 1s.
- GEORGE WOODCOCK :**
Anarchy or Chaos 2s. 6d.
New Life to the Land 6d.
Homes orhovels? 6d.
Railways and Society 3d.
What is Anarchism? 1d.
The Basis of Communal Living 1s.
- PHILIP SANSOM :**
Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step 1s.
- JOHN HEWETSON :**
Sexual Freedom for the Young 6d.
Ill-Health, Poverty and the State cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.
- 27, Red Lion Street, London, W.C.1.**

Police News Continued from p. 1

I could not help reflecting how such an attitude fitted in with the judicial oath, but I did not say anything.

Another incident was a case in which Mr. Justice Jelf questioned a police inspector on these lines: Was it not the fact that policemen who were diligent in bringing cases stood a better chance of promotion? Answer, Yes. Was it the fact that policemen who brought cases where no conviction resulted were under a cloud? Answer, Yes. Mr. Justice Jelf turned to the jury, saying: "I always thought this was so: but the high authorities persistently deny it!"

A CASE of police violence has also been brought before the courts recently. Mr. Charles Charlrick is a cockney flower-seller who declares that he is "an Englishman and I fight for my rights". He told Ipswich magistrates that after selling flowers in Ipswich he went into the station waiting-room to wait for the 2 a.m. train to London. He put his stock of roses on the table and went to sleep. He was awakened by a young policeman who wanted to know his name and address and told him to put his money on the table.

"I told him my name. I said if he wanted to search me he would have to take me to the police station."

Charlick said Hopkin was joined by Police Constable George Bezat, aged 37 and Railway Constable Arnold Youngs. "Police Constable Hopkin struck me in the eye. Then they searched me, took my money out of my pockets, and put it on the table. There was about £16.

"Constable Hopkin said: 'You did not get all this money by selling flowers, and if you come outside the station I will give you another one'."

Charlick said that when he got to London he called at Bow-street police station. An inspector saw his black eye, sent him to hospital where he was given sedatives and X-rayed.

Ipswich Police Inspector Harold Price agreed with the clerk, Mr. Leonard Sharp, that Ipswich police had no "power of search" where there was no arrest.

The two policemen were fined £3 and £2 respectively for assault, the chairman of the magistrates telling them "You used unnecessary force."

At Clerkenwell Court a painter of Notting Hill was discharged after pleading not guilty to obstructing a police sergeant. It was also alleged that he had refused to give his name and address.

The magistrate, Mr. Frank Powell, said it seemed to him that it was not conveyed to Laurence that the police had any lawful reason for asking for his name and address.

Generally speaking a policeman had no right to stop anyone and ask for those particulars unless he had reason.

His concluding remarks are both forceful and interesting.

"If a policeman stopped me in the street and said, 'Give me your name and address,' I should say, 'You mind your own business'—unless I had done something which justified it."

"I appreciate the difficulty of the police, but the police must understand they cannot question people unless they have reason for it."

"They must make clear to the person they are questioning why they are questioning him."

It may be that compared with the police of many European countries ours are "wonderful" but without continued vigilance of the public in exposing all abuses, large and small, there is no reason to suppose that our police be any less violent and corrupt than their colleagues on the continent.

THIS HAPPENED IN FRANCE

PARIS, Tuesday.

The French police are under fire again for the methods they are alleged to use in getting confessions from suspects.

This time a man died after questioning. And his widow has appealed against a magistrate's ruling that there was not sufficient evidence to prosecute two police officers.

Last January 53-year-old Rene Saulnier was taken to a police station at 7 a.m. to be interrogated about tools missing from his factory. At 3 p.m. the police hurried him to hospital. Nine days later he was dead.

According to his wife, Saulnier's face was swollen and his head bandaged when she saw him in hospital.

—News Chronicle.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

OF my work S. R. Parker writes (FREEDOM, 23/4/55): "In some respects it may even be reactionary." An intriguing statement indeed. I wish he would give these respects.

Summerhill School, A. S. NEILL.
Leiston, Suffolk.

S. R. PARKER writes:

MY references to the work of A. S. Neill were not as clearly expressive of my point of view as they should have been. I was not criticising his work in an endeavour to show that other educational methods were better, but in order to appreciate the difficulties that face anyone who tries to put ideals into practice.

Neill himself would no doubt be the first to admit that he has not yet worked out a satisfactory answer to many of the questions that crop up in the course of his work, such as those concerning property and the power of the teacher to impose his own standards upon the children. For example, it seems indisputable that children should not be introduced to theories and practices which are anti-life, yet the definition of what is anti-life must be a matter of deep and constant concern to those who have such influence in the development of immature minds.

When I wrote that in some respects A. S. Neill's work may even be reactionary this was intended to underline the view that no one person can be wholly forward-looking. This is one of the beliefs that has led those who are thinking

LONDON DEBATE

'THAT JOE SOAP WAS THE ONLY CANDIDATE WORTH VOTING FOR'

Proposer: Philip Sansom

Opposer: W. Hilliard

UNIVERSITY HOUSE,

VICTORIA PARK,

BETHNAL GREEN, E.2.

on Friday, May 27, at 8 p.m.

All Welcome. Visitors may speak.

IN the latest issue of *Organomic Functionalism*, the journal dealing with research on the basis of Reich's work, the editors, Paul and Jean Ritter, state that FREEDOM, over a period of some months, has consistently refused them the right to reply to a misleading and shallow interpretation of their series of articles on 'Self-Regulation' which appeared on Jan. 15 this year, in spite of the relevance of the articles to anarchism, and that this represents the suppression of an author's right to defend his work against misrepresentation.

Certainly, FREEDOM has every right to criticise and differ from the viewpoint put forward in the articles, but not by suppressing answers! Or is the case as the Ritters' seem to think, that there is a definite anti-Reich and anti-Ritter attitude on the part of the editors of FREEDOM, an attitude that is hard to understand in view of the often-admitted corroboration of anarchist theories that Reich's work has given.

I think it is of the utmost importance that FREEDOM answers these questions, because they reflect badly on its own standard of freedom.

London, May 16. KEN MILNE.

[Our correspondent is really making a mountain out of a mole-hill which is hardly surprising if he was able to take Mr. Ritter seriously in his extraordinary editorial in the May issue of *Organomic Functionalism* (The Ritter Press, 476 Woodborough Road, Nottingham).

The article on "Children and Freedom" printed in FREEDOM (Jan. 15) was neither a review nor an interpretation of the Ritters' articles on Self-Regulation but simply reflections on the practical aspects of self-regulation which were prompted partly by the experiences of a parent and partly by the articles in O.F.

Apart from the fact that we were not predisposed to publishing Mr. Ritter's lengthy communication because of its usual aggressive tone and the three final paragraphs of self-advertisement, we felt that points he made to "corroborate" his conclusions that our contributor's approach was "shallow" and his reasoning "suspect" were not convincing. Instead, we passed on his letter to our contributor so that he could send a personal reply to the Ritters—which he did, but has, so far, received no acknowledgment.

Comrade Milne echoes the Ritters' impression that FREEDOM is anti-Reich.

This impression is based on a Ritter theory that FREEDOM has had a change of editors. Now Mr. Ritter may know a great deal about self-regulation (at least, so far as children are concerned), but on matters concerning FREEDOM he is not so well informed. In fact he seems to have made two mistakes this month in the gossip column of O.F. For he also announces the "sad news that 'Communitas' [the community in Gloucestershire] only just founded, is dissolving". Yet we have just received a communication (dated May 19) signed by five members of *Communitas* which reads: "In view of an assertion, published in a journal, *Organomic Functionalism*, to the effect that *Communitas* is dissolving, may we state that this is untrue and reassure all our friends that *Communitas* continues to flourish."

Are we anti-Ritter? Well, really, we cannot say we have asked ourselves that question, for unlike Mr. Ritter, our minds are engaged on other thoughts and problems. But when he complains that his letters (or some of them) are not published in FREEDOM he may find the reason in the fifth paragraph of his editorial in the current issue of O.F. where he writes:

"When criticism arrives which arouses anxiety in us, and so the wish to sit down and relieve our emotions in vitriolic language... we wait to write it... But if we have written and have allowed the vitriol to flow, oozing our pussy poison onto the purple pages, we don't regard those letters as fit to be sent."

Nor we to publish!—EDITORS.]

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)
MAY 29—No Meeting
JUNE 5—Mani Obahiágbon on
THE ROLE OF THE INDIVIDUAL
IN HISTORY

June 12—Tony Turner on
WHAT MAKES MAN—
HEREDITY OR ENVIRONMENT?

INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS

Every Thursday at 8.15.

OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting
HYDE PARK
Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

MANETTE STREET
(Charing X Road)
Saturdays at 5.30 p.m.

GLASGOW

INDOORS

at 200 Buchanan Street
Every Friday at 7 p.m.

OUTDOORS

At Maxwell Street
Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.

The Malatesta Club

155 HIGH HOLBORN,
LONDON, W.C.1.



LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

Informal Discussions Every Thursday,
at 8.15 p.m.

Lecture-Discussions Every Sunday
at 7.45 p.m.

(See Announcements Column)

ALL WELCOME

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