

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"If I had engaged in politics, O men of Athens, I should have perished long ago, and done no good either to you or to myself."
—SOCRATES.

After the Gushing and the Howls—Let's

PUT THAT REPORT IN PERSPECTIVE!

THE Wolfenden Report on Homosexual Offences and Prostitution has been variously received as a "human document" an "affront to decency", an invitation to "legalized degradation". Mrs. Jean Mann, M.P. who was both booed and praised when she publicly criticised Vivien Leigh for spending a holiday with her ex-husband, has now expressed herself on this new "danger" to Television's millions: "There's no knowing where it will end. We may even have husbands enticed away from wives"—by other men! But to our minds the Report can be considered a controversial document only in so far as one section of the Press and the public refuse to accept the factual, medical evidence presented in Part Two dealing with Homosexual Offences and in the "Note" (pp. 72-6) and "Reservations" (pp. 125-8) by the two medical members of the Committee. Indeed these Reservations expose the mildness of the Recommendations put forward by the Committee on the subject of homosexuality. And so far as prostitution is concerned the Report is not even mild. It is

reactionary and retrograde.

★
WE would suggest that the Report is just the kind of document the government expected, and will not, as has been suggested in some quarters, be embarrassed by the Recommendations for modifying existing laws. We think it quite clear that it was the Government's intention in appointing the Committee, to have the necessary "expert authority" to justify easing the laws regarding homosexuality and for stiffening those dealing with street walkers. What else can one conclude when: (i) the maximum penalty for buggery (sodomy to the Scots) is life imprisonment, which is also the maximum penalty for "attempted sodomy" in Scotland (as against ten years in England and Wales), and that all other homosexual "offences", with one exception*, carry maximum penalties of not less than two years imprisonment; (ii) the maximum penalty for

*And that exception is for "Offences against bye-laws (where the offences involve acts of indecency between persons of the same sex).

"common prostitutes or night walkers loitering, etc.", is a fine of 40/- (except in Edinburgh and Aberdeen where it is ten pounds or alternatively imprisonment for sixty days. (Incidentally the maximum penalties for male prostitutes is two years imprisonment!)

In the circumstances the Committee in dealing with homosexual offences could, it is true, suggest the introduction of the death penalty for buggery but as we shall show, everything pointed to the government's wish to "humanise" the laws affecting homosexuals rather than the contrary. It is equally obvious that there was no intention to reduce the almost non-existent penalties against female soliciting.

As the report puts it: "Whatever the law may be there will always be strong social forces opposed to homosexual behaviour" and it is almost certain that if the government were to be guided solely by existing "public opinion" in this matter it would not feel itself called upon to modify the law. But governments do give attention to "influential" minorities and other pressure groups. Homosexual behaviour, unlike most other indictable "crimes" is not limited to a "class".

"Homosexuality is not, in spite of widely held beliefs to the contrary, peculiar to members of particular professions or social classes: nor, as is sometimes supposed, is it peculiar to the *intelligentsia*. Our evidence shows that it exists among all callings and at all levels of society; and that among homosexuals will be found not only those possessing a

high degree of intelligence, but also the dullest oafs". (para. 36).

It is this universality of homosexual behaviour, coupled with a less discriminating class application of the Law† which puts Lord and labourer in the same boat and for this reason we believe there is significance in the fact that the Wolfenden Committee was set up shortly after a much publicized trial involving a member of the aristocracy.

★

PROSTITUTION—or rather street walking, soliciting by females, is limited to one class, and the "annoyance" they cause is not to the males they accost (some of whom are flattered while others are there to be accosted in any case), nor to "respectable" people out for a stroll in Soho and the back streets of Paddington (of all places!) but to those individuals and bodies whose financial interests may be adversely affected by their presence. (We notice that in the list of witnesses who gave evidence before the Committee are the Mayfair Association, the Paddington Borough Council and the Westminster Borough Council but no one from the Soho Association or Stepney Borough Council!) We can well imagine the strong moral arguments they used in support of a "cleaning-up" of their streets. But would they not

†Whilst we agree with the legal friend of ours who told us that you got as much "law" as you could afford to pay for, the possibility for an influential or wealthy person to be "above"—or buy himself out of—a prosecution is much less easy to-day than it was even two generations ago.

object as strongly, using different arguments of course, if the respectable citizens of Mayfair were to have hard-working West Indians as neighbours instead of the tarts? "Tone" and rents go hand in hand. Respectable "niggers" invariably lower the tone of a district; tarts may adversely affect Mayfair, the Bayswater Road or hamper the rehabilitation of the back streets of Paddington now that the Church Commissioners have sold out to the financiers; but they are as great an asset to Soho as are the canals to Amsterdam, which may explain the absence of the Soho Traders' Association from the list of witnesses!

Compared with the miles of streets and side streets in London and the industrial cities, those frequented by prostitutes are of little consequence, and any respectable family group anywhere can take an evening walk without offence to their moral susceptibilities simply by avoiding those few streets used by prostitutes. In any case the government is not worried about our morals—isn't prostitution legal? What *it* is worried about is "decency". And the Wolfenden Committee whilst implicitly recognising the absurdity of the situation

Prostitution in itself is not, in this country, an offence against the criminal law. Some of the activities of prostitutes are . . . But it is not illegal for a woman to "offer her body to indiscriminate lewdness for hire", provided that she does not, in the course of doing so, commit any one of the specific acts which would bring her within the ambit of the law. Nor, it seems to us, can any case be sustained for attempting to make prostitution in itself illegal. (para. 224).

Continued on p. 3

VIEWPOINT

THE PRESS & THE REPORT

IT was interesting to read in FREEDOM (13/9/57) of the *Evening Standard's* reaction to the Wolfenden Report on homosexual offences and prostitution. The recommendation to legalise private homosexual acts between consenting adult males would be certain, one would have thought, to rouse some splenic outbursts from the press. But an examination of our national dailies and their attitudes to this proposal offers some surprises.

If we look at the twelve major dailies for September 5—the day after the Report appeared—it would seem that opinion was very evenly divided. There were only two papers that did not make any editorial mention of the Report, the *Daily Worker* and the *Financial Times* (an odd omission since finance figures so largely in the question of prostitution). Of the other ten all commented on the recommendation regarding homosexuals, which has aroused more controversy than any other aspect of the Report.

Of these, three were definitely against—the *Daily Express*, the *Daily Mail* and the *Scotsman*. The *Mail* was the most indignant, under the heading "Report Full of Danger" it included a good range of the expected anti-sexual clichés, "if the law were to tolerate homosexual acts a great barrier against depravity would be swept aside", ". . . would certainly encourage an increase in perversion", ". . . perverts free to spread corruption", "legalised degradation", etc.

The *Express* went its own sweet idiotic way; the legend above its editorial column reads "The Newspaper for Lively Minds" and underneath we learn what the Lively Mind (Lord Beaverbrook?, John Gordon imported from the *Sunday Express*?) had to say about the Report. "Why did the Government ever sponsor this cumbersome nonsense? Anyone would think prostitution and perversion were a widespread problem. In fact the majority of British homes never come into contact with either. It is up to the Home Secretary to see that family life remains protected from these evils. If the law needs stiffening he should get on with stiffening it."

Ostriches of the world . . . etc. Oddly enough the extracts from the Report printed on another page were headed "A Social Document of Major Importance". A case of sabotage in the make-up room?

The *Scotsman*, then, was in rather low company when it said that "it can be

no solution to any public problem to legitimise a bestial offence".

But there were three papers that were definitely in favour of the recommendation—the *Times*, *Manchester Guardian*, and *News Chronicle*. The *Times'* editorial was written in the inimitable style of that paper which usually requires that every sentence be read at least twice to find the meaning behind the "good writing". Instead of saying that the Report's proposals on homosexuality were sound, the writer merely mentioned these proposals and then said that the Report was "equally sound" on prostitution! The *Guardian* and the *Chronicle* were unequivocal in their support.

Of the remaining four papers, the one for second class Top People, the *Daily Telegraph*, and the one for bottom people, the *Daily Mirror*, were both very careful not to commit themselves. The *Mirror* contented itself with commenting only on the prostitution proposals, while the *Telegraph* mentioned the recommendation on homosexuality in its editorial but expressed neither approval nor disapproval.

Finally there are the *Daily Herald* and the *Dail Sketch*. The *Herald*, that socialist paper, did not like to be too positive but their dislike of the recommendation was made fairly plain—no doubt the result of a compromise between the relics of its socialist principles and a desire not to antagonise its working-class readership where prejudice against homosexuality seems widespread.

The *Sketch*, whose readers—judging by the context of the paper—must be as reactionary and prejudiced as the readers of any paper anywhere, was, oddly enough, almost in favour of the recommendation. Like the *Herald*, it did not want to commit itself, but it came nearer to approval than seems possible.

To sum up, then, on the Press' attitude to the question of legalising certain homosexual acts: four (one doubtful) were against, four (one doubtful) were for, and two would not commit themselves. This is surely a remarkable state of affairs that would scarcely have seemed possible even a few years ago. Does the fact that so many newspapers were prepared to risk antagonising their readers on such an emotionally-charged subject indicate that our sexual attitudes are becoming more permissive? It would certainly seem so.

M.G.W.

The 'Little Rock' Issues

THE town of Little Rock Arkansas has by now succeeded in writing itself firmly into the history books of the United States, not only as one of the places where school integration has caused trouble, but because it has become the centre of a dispute which is quite radical within the U.S. Constitution, the relationship between State Law as represented by the governor of the State, and Federal Law as represented by the President.

Some observers have suggested that the situation, if mis-handled, could spark off an uprising in the South which might lead to a second

Civil War. This is a reminder of one of the causes of the first Civil War, and the desperate passions which were aroused at the prospect of abolishing negro slavery. The root cause is the same but there is little else which is comparable. When the South lost the War the status of the negro changed radically in law and to a great extent in fact. Although the white man was still master, the negro was no longer his property; he was still exploited and subjugated and treated as utterly inferior, but he had some rights in law and was recognised as a citizen—if only of second class status.

One aspect of the history of the South since the Civil War has been the negroes' fight to achieve first-class citizenship in the United States. They have made much progress over the years, against considerable odds, but there is at least as far to go again. Racial prejudice remains throughout the United States, with its stronghold in the deep South, where a comparatively few fanatical racists may easily stir the mob to violence and hatred. The traditional ideas, and many things much worse, remain with the vast majority of Southerners; most of them would not ordinarily defy the law but will tacitly support any issue directed against the negro and towards segregation.

Orval Faubus, governor of Arkansas, who in the past has found it convenient to take a middle view on integration, a fortnight ago decided to go for the publicity in-

involved in making a stand against the Federal Government. He knew however that he could count on the tacit (and in some cases vocal) support of the citizens of his State and the South generally. He not only failed to uphold the Supreme Court ruling on integration in schools, but deployed a unit of the National Guard around the Central High School in Little Rock with orders to keep negro students out. The unit, under the command of a major-general with the unlikely name of Sherman T. Cunger, was complete with trucks, halftracks, jeeps, tear-gas bombs and fixed bayonets.

Faubus went on the televised air and declared: "Now that a federal court has ruled that no further litigation is possible before the forcible integration of negroes and whites in Central High School to-morrow, the evidence of discord, anger and resentment has come to me from so many sources as to become a deluge!" He claimed that outraged white mothers were preparing to march on the school at 6 a.m., caravans of white citizens were converging on Little Rock from all over the State, the shops had almost sold out of knives—to negro youths—chaos and riots were, according to Faubus, imminent.

Curiously enough none of this outburst was borne out by the facts: Arkansas has a relatively good record of integration, with no violence; the only converging "caravans" belonged to Faubus' reinforcements of the National Guard; a

Continued on p. 4

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!

WEEK 37
Deficit on Freedom £740
Contributions received £516
DEFICIT £224

September 6 to September 12
London: Anon.* 2/3; Oxford: Anon.* 5/-;
London: Hyde Park Sympathisers, 3/3; Linslade: A.E.S. 6/-; Nottingham: K.N. £1;
New York I.R. £2/9/0.

*Indicates regular contributor.
Total ... 4 5 6
Previously acknowledged ... 517 8 4
Mis-applied last week ... 521 13 10
5 5 0

1957 TOTAL TO DATE ... £516 8 10
Fire Fund
Ronsseleer: G.T. £1/15/0; Bronx: J.M. £1/15/0.
Total ... 3 10 0
Previously acknowledged ... 368 3 3
TOTAL TO DATE ... £371 13 3

THEY REFUSED TO HIDE

... and so in the middle of the twentieth century it was decreed that men and women should run-like-frightened-rabbits into holes in the ground.

And it was further decreed that there should be practice in running-like-frightened-rabbits.

In New York there were twelve men and women who said: "We will refuse to run-like-frightened-rabbits. We still remember what it is to be a human being."

"We will make you run," they said. "Everybody will run-like-frightened-rabbits—judges, bankers, governors and generals. Even our Chief, our President, will fly-like-a-frightened-bird to a secret hideaway. No one will think it strange."

"We will think it strange," the twelve said. "We will stay behind to show that fear is still not total. When you come out you will find us here."

"You cannot in this way defend us," they said.

"This is the only way we can defend you," the twelve replied. "Otherwise there will be nothing to defend."

"We fear you too," they said. "For the law says that none shall refuse to hide. When our lawyers and our judges come out from the holes, they will make an accounting with you."

And so indeed it was.

R.F.

IT is doubtful if anyone, in or out of Civil Defence, thinks that there is any defence against the H-Bomb. Back when Civil Defence was young, the Director for New York City spilled the beans. He said, "The shelters are no good at all... The only answer must be total evacuation" (New York Herald Tribune, April 1, 1954). Since then the bombs have gotten considerably worse and the shelters no better. Official estimates are that nearly 50 million persons would have been killed in the United States within a few minutes if the mock attack of July 12 had been real, and another 50 million seriously wounded, even though all 100 million of them had followed Civil Defence orders to the letter.

Just as frightening as the possible future deaths of those 50 million is the present condition of people who can be told these things and be unmoved by them. Undoubtedly the drill and the ensuing headlines helped nudge a new batch of persons towards our already jammed mental institutions. But on the surface at least, it led to little mature action to stop the drift to war.

If the average person knew that his house or apartment would be blown up ten minutes from now, he would see to it that he and his wife and children got out at once. He might even leave his television set behind. But when the exact date is indefinite, and the whole affair is somehow considered to be in the province of the government, most persons just skip from the disaster headlines to the comics or the sports page with hardly a non-conformist thought.

Americans often stress the superiority of our "free, democratic" society and go on to draw the conclusion that we should therefore obey all its laws and directives. This predisposition to loyalty has helped create the present paradoxical situation in which most Americans congratulate themselves on being free even as they are being led to the slaughter. We have allowed our individual reasoning power, our self-reliance, and our consciences to atrophy to the point where we blindly obey war exercises in which we are told that, as soon as they become real, 50 million of us will be killed. We are so impressed with the fact that we can vote for some members of the government (from lists prepared by those who finance the campaigns and to whom the candidates are responsible) that we have failed to notice that we are preparing our own execution. As we allow ourselves to be increasingly "other-directed" in our daily activities—in the school, the factory and even our private lives—we find it hard to resist the outside agency of the State as it proceeds towards our mass destruction.

JUST how little freedom is being left to us these days can be seen by what happened to the handful of pacifists in New York who refused to take part in the mack raid, which they considered part of "a deliberate campaign of psychological preparation for war." Ten of them, including Dorothy Day and Ammon Hennacy of the *Catholic Worker*, sat calmly on a park bench while the sirens screamed. A young man and his wife walked through Times Square carrying signs reading: "You are Preparing for War" and "Why Not Prepare for Peace?" All 12 were seized and sentenced to thirty days in jail. Colonel Henry George Hearn of the New York State Civil Defence Auxiliary Police said that they would get 120 days next time. (If the United States has an independent judiciary, we wonder how he knows.)

In Europe, during the actual bombings of World War II, when shelters did protect the occupants, a little, no one was compelled to take shelter. (Later, even before the A-bomb, the United States introduced saturation bombing with fire-bombs, and the shelters became tombs in which hundreds of thousands were roasted to death.) But when the announced purpose of the drill has become a farce and the real purpose is not to protect physically but rather to destroy spiritually, individuals cannot be allowed to think or act for themselves. In a time of official madness, even a single individual who speaks the truth is a danger to the state.

Some of the pacifists said that they were doing penance for America's having dropped the A-bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. This infuriated the judge, who said: "You are a bunch of heartless individuals who breathe contempt for the law. Read the Bible... and see what our Lord Jesus Christ did for penance... You must be bound by rules and regulations." Two years ago, for the same offence, the defendants were called "murderers" by another judge. Just as no one believes that Civil Defence can protect us from the H-bomb, so no one really believes that these pacifists are murderers or that a judge can teach Dorothy Day how to do penance in the manner of Jesus Christ. But the Majesty of the Law and habits of acquiescence lead people to accept these absurdities almost without protest. The twelve believers in non-violence are sitting out their jail sentences and the pundits of America are busy proving that the "Free World" must be defended at all costs.

Fifteen or twenty New Yorkers have been picketing one of the jails every afternoon from twelve to two, but for the most part the newspapers, radio, and TV have not taken notice of this fact—let alone given editorial support. Apparently the sight of live men and women at the entrance to a real jail demanding freedom for their imprisoned

comrades is not considered as exciting for TV as the standardized adventures of a Grade C Hollywood hero. Perhaps the press would have been more interested if a similar protest and suppression had taken place in East Berlin or Moscow.

BEHIND the calloused acceptance of the drift toward mass suicide lies a challenge that Americans, for all their storied energy, inventiveness, and imagination, have not faced up to. The present society in the United States cannot be defended without war and yet is can no longer be defended by war. Faced with this dilemma, discussion has tended to be reduced to secondary issues, such as the possibility of manufacturing a "clean" H-bomb, and the exact extent of the harm from testing the present bomb.

The men who go right ahead pushing the manufacture and testing, not only of the H-bomb but of inter-continental guided missiles as well, see one aspect of the problem more realistically than many of those who oppose continued manufacture and testing. They see that the United States cannot possibly maintain its position of overwhelming world power and privilege without keeping a corresponding military advantage. Those who campaign against the H-bomb are calling for sanity in that one area, but for the most part have not looked realistically at the over-all implications. They have not faced the fact that to renounce the instruments of mass suicide means to renounce the military struggle means to abandon America's position of Empire and the special privileges we all derive from it.

Obvious as this should be, it is sometimes hard to see in the complexities of international relationships. But let us examine the same principles, writ small, in an area where they can be more easily grasped: the economic and power relationships of any American city. In New York, for instance, I shudder whenever I pass an armoured Brinks truck, with its machine guns and guards. I am also offended by the presence of police, with guns in holsters, at the entrance to the banks and many industrial plants. We should do away with this practice of defending property by willingness to destroy human life. But this would entail an end to banks and the collective injustice which they both protect and aggravate. We should protect the poor

from the banks, but instead we hire police to protect the banks from the poor.

If the police force in New York were done away with, the banks would be broken into within a matter of hours. Tiffany's, Abercrombie and Fitch, the Stork Club, and all the centres of wealth and privilege would be raided. Only those who are willing to do away with property rights can call for an end to violence. This is a hard price for people brought up in the myths of our present society. But as man's powers of destruction advance, the violence used to defend privilege and property becomes more and more offensive, on both the local and world levels. So far we have resisted the positive claims of brotherhood; now we may gradually back into a society of liberty and equality because of the suicidal requirements of defending any other way of life. The great need is not just to rail against fallout and the most sensational aspects of militarism. The need of the hour is to call for an end to the relationships that make militarism itself inevitable.

★

A Book for Rebels?

A FLOOD OF MUTINY by Valentine Dyal. Hutchinson. 15s.

WHEN Messrs. Hutchinson were deciding to whom they were going to send review copies of this book, they presumably included FREEDOM because they saw this paper as representing some sort of trade press for mutinous people. Perhaps they are right—at any rate it is difficult not to feel sympathy with most of the mutineers that are mentioned in these pages.

Mr. Dyal has retold the stories of eight well-known mutinies (oddly, six of them take place at sea) in a largely straightforward manner, but he does allow himself a little verbal embroidery. Most of the mutinies were the result of conditions becoming so unbearable for the underdogs that a revolt against authority was the only course left—the Indian mutiny of 1857, the mutiny on the battleship *Potemkin*, and the naval mutinies at Spithead and the Nore, are examples.

In India—as all schoolboys know—the introduction of new cartridges, which were greased with animal fat, to the Muslim and Hindu sepoys was only the

THE deed is always mightier than the word. The twelve pacifists who refused to take shelter brought out the ridiculousness of Civil Defence against H-bombs more forcefully than if they had confined their protest to letters, sermons, or articles. Those who know that the H-bomb is an instrument of world-wide destruction can speak and act against it with full logic only by giving up all claim to special privileges and property. It is not enough to call for an end to H-bombs while continuing to make, transport, or bear other arms. But it is not enough to refuse to make, transport, or bear arms if, at the same time, we refuse to share our income with the least of our brethren throughout the world. This is to renounce personal participation in violence while making it necessary for someone else to do the dirty deed for us. Publicizing the evils of fall-out and the destructiveness of the bomb is useful only if it stimulates ourselves and others to see why the bombs were made in the first place and why they are still being made.

D.D.
(from *Liberation* (New York), July-August 1957).

last straw (to mix a metaphor) which sparked off the mutiny. There were many other factors behind the furious massacres of Europeans by the Indian soldiers—not least the barbarous practice of punishing military offenders by blowing them from guns, a particularly grisly form of execution which few of our great grandparents objected to.

On the warship *Potemkin* the immediate cause of the mutiny was *borisch* (soup) made from putrid meat. When the sailors refused to eat it the captain commanded a group of about 30 men to be shot for refusing to obey orders. As the riflemen were about to shoot, one of the crew shouted to them to stop and appealed to them not to kill their comrades. He was successful, and so the mutiny began. But behind it were several years of revolutionary activity and many years of appalling living conditions in the Black Sea Fleet to which *Potemkin* belonged, which had culminated a few months earlier in the abortive rising at Sebastopol.

In addition to these two, Mr. Dyal writes about a number of mutinies at sea, including the now well-known *Bounty* incident, to make up this moderately interesting collection.

M.G.W.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

(Open 10 a.m.—6.30 p.m., 5 p.m. Sats.)

New Books . . .

Prin Vladimir Nabokov 13/6
The Maids Jean Genet 5/-
Man and Culture Bronislaw Malinowski 32/-

Reprints and

Cheap Editions . . .
Van Gogh R. Goldwater 4/-
The Story of our Civilization P. L. Ralph 2/6
The Turn of the Screw and The Aspern Papers Henry James 7/-
Leaves of Grass Walt Whitman 8/6
The Great Charlie Robert Payne 2/6
Restless House Emile Zola 18/-

Second-Hand . . .

Roads to Freedom Bertrand Russell 3/6
The Dissociation of a Personality Morton Prince 4/6
Angels' Wings Edward Carpenter 4/-
The Barricades Philip Toynbee 3/6
Poems, Essays and Fragments James Thomson 4/-
Living Henry Green 3/6
What is Man? Mark Twain 3/6
The Day of the Locust Nathaneal West 4/-
The Idiocy of Idealism Oscar Levy 4/-
The Tunnel of Love Peter de Vries 3/6
Scientific Research and Social Needs Julian Huxley 4/6
The Twilight of Parenthood Enid Charles 4/-
Listen Comrades El Compesino 3/6
The Spanish Tragedy Jef Last 4/-

Periodicals . . .

Views and Comments, Aug. 1957 (now multilithed) 6d.
We can supply ANY book required, including text-books. Please supply publisher's name if possible, but if not, we can find it. Scarce and out-of-print books searched for—and frequently found!

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

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

Thoughts on Prostitution

PROSTITUTION in our society is the result of two factors, the conventional moral code, and the present economic system. The first is responsible for the demand, the second encourages the supply.

Men use prostitutes when it is difficult for them to find an outlet for their physical sex urges outside of marriage. When a man is not prepared to spend the rest of his life with one woman, or is not financially in a position to do so; when his respect for the existing code of sexual morality, or fear of the consequences of not conforming to this code, prevent him from having free sexual relationships with women of his own choice, under these circumstances he will naturally turn to prostitutes to gratify his desires.

Thus the demand for prostitutes is a direct outcome of the moral code. Bertrand Russell, in "Marriage and Morals", states:

"Whenever the older morality has decayed, prostitution also has decayed. The young man who would formerly have been driven to occasional visits to prostitutes is now able to enter upon relations with girls of his own kind, relations which are on both sides free, which have a psychological element quite as important as the purely physical, and which involve often a considerable degree of passionate love on both sides. From the point of view of any genuine morality, this is an immense advance upon the older system."

Prostitution can be regarded as a necessary constituent of the marriage system. Havelock Ellis states:

"The history of the rise and development of prostitution enables us to see that prostitution is not an accident of constituent which appears concurrently with its other essential constituents. The gradual development of the family on a patriarchal and largely monogamic basis rendered it more and more difficult for a woman to dispose of her own person. She belonged in the first place to her own father, whose interest it was to guard her carefully until a husband ap-

peared who could afford to purchase her. In the enhancement of her value the new idea of the value of virginity gradually developed, and where a virgin had previously meant a woman who was free to do as she liked with her own body, its meaning was now reversed, and it came to mean a woman who was precluded from having intercourse with men. When she was transferred from her father to her husband she was still guarded with the same care; husband and father alike found their interest in preserving their women from unmarried men. The situation thus produced resulted in the existence of a large body of young men who were not rich enough to obtain wives, and a large number of young women, not yet chosen as wives, and many of them could never expect to become wives. At such a point in social evolution prostitution is clearly inevitable; it is not so much the indispensable concomitant of marriage as an essential part of the whole system. Some of the superfluous or neglected women, utilizing their money value and perhaps at the same time reviving traditions of an earlier freedom, find their social function in selling their favours to gratify the temporary desires of the men who have not yet been able to acquire wives. Thus every link in the chain of the marriage system is firmly welded and the complete circle formed."

This was also the view of C. E. M. Joad, who says in "The Future of Morals":

"The prostitute, indeed, is and always has been recognised as a social necessity. She guarantees the chastity of nice women by providing a necessary solace for men up to the comparatively late age at which modern economic conditions allow them to marry". He states that "it is felt instinctively that the free lover is a greater menace to society than the prostitute" because "the number of women a man can have for money is limited by the extent of his income; the number of women he can have for nothing is limited only by the extent of his ability to find them."

As regards the economic reasons for women becoming prostitutes, Kenneth Walker in his "The Physiology of Sex" writes:

"... the selling of services for profit is a condition of life in all civilized communities. The artist must sell his pictures, the writer his books, the labourer his labour, and, if she has not other marketable assets, the impoverished woman must sell her sex... Poverty and poor conditions of living, slums, unemployment, drunkenness, and mental deficiency all tend to swell the unhappy army of prostitution. It is not from any innate wish of their own, but from necessity that most women enter this profession." Dr. Walker concludes by stating that the modern prostitute is "the product of the industrial age, and he who would deal successfully with the problems that she raises will also have to deal successfully with the thousand and one problems propounded by the great god Mamman."

Prostitution, then, is inevitable in the present state of society, and the Wolfenden Committee realizes this. Sir Norman Birkett, in an article in the *Observer* 8/9/57, referring to the attitude of the Committee, writes:

"They make it clear that their purpose is not to try to abolish prostitution, or make it illegal. Their avowed purpose is to try to make the streets of London and the big cities free from what is offensive and injurious. They want to drive the prostitute from the places where they flaunt themselves and their trade."

It is a feature of the present system of society that while denouncing and persecuting the prostitute, it continues to maintain the conditions in which prostitution flourishes. For to get rid of the need for prostitution it is necessary to abolish the present economic system, and to revolutionize the conventional moral code. It is only in a free and rational society, with a moral code allowing complete freedom in sexual relationships, and a social system which gives an equal share of the material goods of life to all, that prostitution will cease to exist.

London.

P.M.

POWER, RESPONSIBILITY & FREEDOM-3

(Continued from previous issue)

FREEDOM, therefore, although it has its source in the depths of the human person, cannot be enjoyed by an isolated individual. It can only be realised in the company of one's fellows. Bakunin expressed this well in the following passage:

"... the isolated man cannot be conscious of his liberty. To be free for a man means to be recognized, considered and treated as free by another man, by all other men around him. Liberty, then, is not a matter of isolation, not of exclusion, but, on the contrary, of combination, since the liberty of each individual is nothing other than the reflection of his humanity or of his human right in the consciousness of all free men, his compeers.

"It is only in the presence of other

men, and with regard to other men, that I can call and feel myself free. In the presence of any inferior animal, I am neither free nor human, since such an animal is unable to conceive of and hence to recognise the freedom and humanity of all men around me. Only in respecting their human character do I respect my own."

This conception of freedom may be called 'integral' since it does not recognize the freedom of others as being in any way a restriction of one's own freedom. It is a conception of freedom, nonetheless, which is within the limitations of the human condition and which does not refer to the relationship of man to any non-, or extra-, human factor.

The libertarian is often told that if his conception of freedom were realized then there would be even more 'freedom' for the powerful to exploit and dominate the weak. This objection really seeks to transform the concept of integral freedom into its opposite. Since integral freedom is reciprocal in character it follows that any act which invades the freedom of another violates the principle upon which freedom is based and thereby negates freedom. This peculiar notion that an act of authority can be an act of freedom may have one of its origins in Herbert Spencer's conception of "equal freedom" which was advocated by many theorists of liberalism and also by the Benjamin Tucker tendency of anarchism. Spencer's formulation runs as follows: "... the general proposition, that every man may claim the fullest liberty to exercise his faculties compatible with the possession of like liberty by every other man".

At first sight this concept may seem quite acceptable to a libertarian. On closer examination, however, it will be found to contain a contradiction. This lies in that it assumes that freedom, when it is extended beyond a certain point, can become invasive and thus result in domination. In other words, what would in fact be an act of power-wielding is conceived of as an exercise of freedom. Hence, freedom must be 'equal' and the freedom of the person must be 'limited' by the freedom of his fellows. The grave danger of the concept of 'equal freedom' is that a door is left open for the authoritarian to step in and declare that, since freedom beyond a certain point can be oppressive, there is need for some

body or group to have the power to determine the amount of freedom each individual should have in order that his freedom may not become injurious to others. Power can thereby be smuggled back as a necessity for freedom.

When the freedom of the individual is conceived of as the complement of the freedom of others and not its restriction, this contradiction and danger are avoided. Any act of mine which interferes with the balance of reciprocal relationships which constitutes integral freedom would be an arbitrary force invading the sovereignty of other individuals, not an act of freedom.

Conclusion

It has been shown that power makes for division and privilege amongst men; that it is a product of, and-productive of, neurotic conflict; that it denies ethical choice which is the basis of responsibility; and that freedom and power are antithetical concepts. Only by the realisation of freedom, therefore, will power disappear from human relationships, and freedom is the creation of responsible persons. If men wish to live in dignity and peace they must choose freedom and responsibility, they must renounce the siren voices of power and irresponsibility.

Postscript

In view of the bleak prospect facing the libertarian, living as he does in the midst of an increasingly irresponsible and alienated mass, it is perhaps not sufficient to end on brave and (fairly) optimistic words about 'men must choose'. Apart from a few, the overwhelming majority of men throughout history have preferred siren voices to ethical choices. The golden dreams of triumphant insurrections for freedom have faded into the nightmares of H-bombs and concentration camps. Neither the 'historical process', nor the 'spontaneous uprising of the people', have fulfilled the prophecies of the Marxes and Kropotkins. What, then, are we to do? It would seem that the only sure way is for all who are concerned with freedom to abandon the mythology of nineteenth century revolutionism and to commence the 'here-and-now' revolution: the realisation on the part of each individual of that inner freedom and responsibility which is the awareness of choice, and its translation into responsibility towards

one's fellows and disobedience to any demand which violates one's conscience. By this means support can be withdrawn from coercive patterns of conduct and new relationships created which exclude power and privilege and affirm the uniqueness of the human person and the oneness of man in brotherhood. What this involves is expressed by Herbert Read in these words:

"The rebirth of tragic sense of life; the re-emergence of transcendental forces so long frustrated by the lawless expansion of competitive instincts, by crude materialism or by the elimination of human sympathy from the processes of thought; the restoration to life of significant play and ritual; a moral healthiness which is affirmative, and not an inhibition of all vitality; a sense of personal freedom and a consequent endowment of one's own fate with values; all these changes are involved as groundwork for a new civilization. But it is unlikely that these deep, subtle and intimate changes can be brought about by secretariats and committees, international conferences and polyglot organizations. They will be born in solitude, in meditation; in the factory; in the face of specific problems and by conscious discipline; in drama and in the building of cities; in dance and song; in moments of mutual understanding and love....

"... we must begin with small things, in diverse ways, helping one another, discovering one's own peace of mind, waiting for the understanding that flashes from one peaceful mind to another. In that way separate cells will take shape, will be joined to one another, will manifest new forms of social organization and new types of art. From that multiplicity and diversity, that dynamic interplay and emulation, a new culture may arise, and mankind be united as never before in the consciousness of human destiny".

"A new culture may arise". Amongst so many ways it is still necessary to say 'may'. But perhaps Herbert Read also is too hopeful for our times. Even if he is, even if all we can hope to do, in our own painfully limited way, is to make a few sincere gestures of responsibility and love which will oppose power and affirm freedom, then our efforts will not be entirely worthless.

S. E. PARKER.

Education for Peace (1950).

Put that Report in Perspective

Continued from p. 1

has nothing to add, other than approval, to what the Street Offences Committee wrote on the subject just thirty years ago:

"As a general proposition it will be universally accepted that the law is not concerned with private morals or with ethical sanctions. On the other hand, the law is plainly concerned with the outward conduct of citizens in so far as that conduct injuriously affects the rights of other citizens. Certain forms of conduct it has always been thought right to bring within the scope of the criminal law on account of the injury which they occasion to the public in general. It is within this category of offences, if anywhere, that public solicitation for immoral purposes finds an appropriate place."

What we are asked to accept is that the fact that women are available for "immoral purposes" is not injurious to the public in general but that the visible evidence that such women actually exist in the flesh is! This in our opinion is sheer hypocrisy.

★

ACTUALLY the Committee defined its formulation of the function of the criminal law as far as it concerned the subjects of the enquiry in these words:

to preserve public order and decency, to protect the citizen from what is offensive or injurious, and to provide sufficient safeguards against exploitation and corruption of others, particularly those who are specially vulnerable because they are young, weak in body or mind, inexperienced, or in a state of special physical, official or economic dependence.

It is not, in our view, the function of the law to intervene in the private lives of citizens or to seek to enforce any particular pattern of behaviour further than is necessary to carry out the purposes we have outlined.

The only "progressive" recommendation that emerges from this approach to the problem of homosexuality is that "homosexual behaviour between consenting adults in private be no longer a criminal offence". Otherwise, against the medical evidence to the effect that very little moral or physical damage results from homosexual experience in the young,§ or that there is any reason to make a distinction between buggery and other homosexual offences, the majority of the Committee retained the distinction and the existing maximum sentence of life imprisonment where the offence was committed with a boy under the age of sixteen. Further, whilst pointing out that the argument in favour of protecting the young and immature could be "pressed too far" and that

there comes a time when a young man can properly be expected to "stand on his own feet" in this as in other matters, we find it hard to believe that he needs to be protected from would-be seducers

§"It is a view widely held, and one which found favour among our police and legal witnesses, that seduction in youth is the decisive factor in the production of homosexuality as a condition, and we are aware that this view has done much to alarm parents and teachers. We have found no convincing evidence in support of this contention. Our medical witnesses unanimously hold that seduction has little effect in inducing a settled pattern of homosexual behaviour, and we have been given no grounds from other sources which contradict their judgment. Moreover, it has been suggested to us that the fact of being seduced often does less harm to the victim than the publicity which attends the criminal proceedings against the offender and the distress which undue alarm sometimes leads parents to show." (para. 98).

more carefully than a girl does. It could indeed be argued that in a simply physical sense he is better able to look after himself than she is.

The Committee nevertheless decided on 21 as the age of homosexual consent!

Their recommendations regarding prostitution make it easier for the police to secure convictions since they would no longer be required to establish "annoyance" (which they don't do anyway as anyone can see for himself any day of the week in Soho or Mayfair). Maximum penalties would be increased and a system of progressively higher penalties for repeated offences introduced, including prison sentences not exceeding three months for the third offence. And landlords letting premises to prostitutes at exorbitant rents should be deemed in law to be "living on the earnings of prostitution", but that it should not be considered an offence to knowingly let premises to a prostitute.

★

WHAT can we conclude from a reading of this Report, and the Press and public reactions it has aroused? Whilst agreeing with the opening paragraphs of P.J.H.'s "Comments on the Wolfenden Report" (FREEDOM 14/9/57) we cannot as he does "commend the Committee for coming out with an unmoralistic attitude" or agree with him that they have made no concession to public opinion over homosexuality between adults. On the latter question they have done so as we have already indicated by fixing the age of "adulthood" at 21 against the evidence which all points to 16 as the age when "the main sexual pattern is generally fixed" and boys can besides quite easily protect their own sexual interests, a view reiterated by the two doctors on the Committee in their Reservations to the Report.

But the Committee's moralistic attitude if not evidenced in the presentation of the facts is surely, with the exception of the two dissenting doctors, clearly revealed in their recommendations.

Whatever effect they may have in ensuring that the law functions more smoothly; that public decency will be respected by obliging the girls to withdraw from the doorways into their rent-controlled rooms and do their soliciting over the telephone; that buggery among consenting adults is no longer a crime—one thing is certain: *sexual freedom will never be a matter of legislation.* More oppressive than any Sex Laws are the prejudiced, closed minds of adult men and women whose incensed outbursts against homosexuals, prostitutes and adulterers has nothing to do with decency or dignity but is only part of a much greater hatred of sex itself.

Those who enjoy their love-making neither judge nor seek to impose any particular pattern of sex behaviour on their fellow beings. The busy-bodies, the nosey-parkers who are always trying to save us from the sexual snake-pit would be far happier if they feared God less and loved healthy, uninhibited Sex more!

IN BRIEF

Easing Pressure in Cyprus-Increasing in Russia

POLITICAL expedients are often attacked by us in relation to the general effects on a whole country. Of necessity we cannot deal with the effects on each individual and only the cases which manage to get into the newspapers for a brief moment hold our attention.

British rule in Cyprus has been easing for many months now which is maybe a sign of increased confidence in their strength rather than their weakness. But the result has been that Nicos Sampson (22), the Greek Cypriot journalist who was sentenced to death on June 1st for carrying a loaded sten gun has had his sentence commuted to life imprisonment. It is reported that he is the ninth Greek Cypriot to be reprieved by Sir John Harding.

A life sentence may sound a long time to those of us who have never been condemned to death, but when Sampson heard the news in the death cell "he threw his arms round his lawyer's neck and wept for joy."

This is only one of the many individual tragedies which is the result of the greed of power-seeking nations who impose their rule regardless of the wishes of the people.

EOKA is not our cause; its adherents do not seek to change society but merely to change the leaders. But far more guilty are those who talk hypocritically about democracy, freedom and justice but whose actions are dictatorial, brutal and unjust.

Maybe Sir John Harding and the Government he represents, hope that history will overlook the subjugation of Cyprus by the British. History will no doubt regard it as part of the struggle between "communism" and "democracy".

We doubt if the relatives of the Cypriot youths who have been killed will take such an objective view.

★

"Whatever you do we can do better" is the principle which governs competing nations.

One of the less serious threats which alternatively crop up between Britain and Russia is contained in a note sent to the Soviet Union:

"The note which points out that

there is at present little restriction on Soviet diplomatists, concludes with a warning that if the Soviet authorities continue to prevent journeys by members of the British Embassy within the areas which are not forbidden, the principle of reciprocity would fully justify corresponding action by H.M. Government with regard to travel by Soviet officials resident in the United Kingdom."

Since both spy systems are so efficient we wonder why they bother.

FREEDOM PRESS	
VOLINE : <i>Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed)</i> cloth 12s. 6d. <i>The Unknown Revolution</i> (Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21) cloth 12s. 6d.	HERBERT READ : <i>Art and the Evolution of Man</i> 4s. <i>Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism</i> 3s. 6d. <i>Poetry and Anarchism</i> cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d. <i>The Philosophy of Anarchism</i> boards 2s. 6d., paper 1s. <i>The Education of Free Men</i> 1s. 2d.
E. A. GUTKIND : <i>The Expanding Environment</i> 8s. 6d.	ALEX COMFORT : <i>Delinquency</i> 6d.
V. RICHARDS : <i>Lessons of the Spanish Revolution</i> 6s.	RUDOLF ROCKER : <i>Nationalism and Culture</i> cloth 21s.
JOHN HEWETSON : <i>Ill-Health, Poverty and the State</i> cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.	TONY GIBSON : <i>Youth for Freedom</i> paper 2s. <i>Food Production and Population</i> 6d. <i>Who will do the Dirty Work?</i> 2d.
ERRICO MALATESTA : <i>Anarchy</i> 6d. <i>Vote—What For?</i> 1d.	F. A. RIDLEY : <i>The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age</i> 2d.
M. BAKUNIN : <i>Marxism, Freedom and the State.</i> cloth 5s.	★ Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications : <i>Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute</i> cloth 5s. <i>Journey Through Utopia</i> cloth 16s. (U.S.A. \$2.50)
PETER KROPOTKIN : <i>The State: Its Historic Role</i> 1s. <i>The Wage System</i> 3d. <i>Revolutionary Government</i> 3d. <i>Organised Vengeance Called Justice</i>	★ K. J. KENAFICK : <i>Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx</i> paper 6s.
GEORGE WOODCOCK : <i>New Life to the Land</i> 6d. <i>Homes orhovels?</i> 6d. <i>Railways and Society</i> 3d. <i>What is Anarchism?</i> 1d. <i>The Basis of Communal Living</i> 1s.	27, Red Lion Street, London, W.C.1.
MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI : <i>Workers in Stalin's Russia</i> 1s.	

Bouquets, Brickbats and the Bus Strike

THANK you for P.S.'s reply to my letter. I half expected you to bludgeon me to the ground. Instead you have written a long, closely reasoned and most generous comment on my rather brief remarks. May I be allowed a little more space to make my position clear?

I had forgotten your controversy about the Warsaw uprising of 1942. On the point that an Editor can be wrong and admit it—you have disarmed me completely. My use in my letter of such terms as Simon Pure and papal edicts was not intended to apply to FREEDOM editorials, which I have always found to be the best things in the paper—well reasoned and direct and containing elements of magnanimity and humour not often to be discovered in the average propaganda article. If you will read my letter carefully you will find I spoke of papal edicts in connection with your answers to correspondents and not in criticism of your editorials.

Now I welcome positive statements, but there are two methods of making them. There is the bald, arrogant, 'I'm telling you' method, and in contrast there is the graceful and understanding method which in fact you have used in your answer to me.

In a letter to FREEDOM (24/11/56) under the title 'Fear of Politics' a lady named Frances Bellerby made some very interesting observations about the way in which politics limits the vision of the individual. I doubt if any reader of FREEDOM would seriously quarrel with the greater part of her letter, which was couched in the most reasoned terms and indicated an open and receptive mind. Did the Editors welcome this letter and express gratitude to its author for writing it? Did they rejoice that they had a new and interested reader? Not as far as could be judged from the editorial reply, which concentrated on the point that in the Editors' opinion Miss Bellerby had wrongly exempted certain politicians as honourable exceptions to the general rule. The Editors solemnly suggested that in time the lady would 'understand our position more clearly'.

'Little Rock' Issue Continued from p. 1

check on 21 shops in Little Rock revealed no run on weapons of any kind, and at 6 a.m. outside the school there were only 15 curious bystanders—and a dog.

Judge Ronald Davies was called upon to give the law's point of view. He said: "Integration must begin forthwith". When the time arrived a little girl of 15, Elizabeth Eckford, walked up to the line of militia-men who guarded the school. They raised their rifles to bar the way—she tried again with the same result. There were less than 100 sightseers, and only a few cat-calls. The little negro girl was protected from the crowd by a white woman, wife of a school-teacher, and caught a bus home.

Judge Davies ordered that the facts of Faubus' false manoeuvres should be collected, and confirmed his previous edict. Faubus sent a message to President Eisenhower saying his telephone was being tapped (probably his only correct statement till then) and that Federal authorities were plotting to arrest him. He surrounded his executive mansion with Guardsmen—"the situation grows more explosive by the hour" said he. For once the two rival newspapers of Little Rock agreed in denouncing Faubus' actions. The pupils of Central High School were tired of the whole affair having been pushed around by the National Guard.

Last week Eisenhower had a meeting with Faubus in Newport, Rhode Island to discuss the situation. Both issued a statement which shed little light upon what had been said. It is nevertheless quite obvious that Eisenhower has no intention to take strong action against Faubus, who if he refuses to remove his troops and permit integration to proceed can be held in contempt of the Federal Government and sent

See what I mean about Simon Pure? It is the attitude which affirms: 'We are in the right so why trouble to be gracious about it?' Need I pursue the obvious and point out that such methods are not likely to obtain new readers for FREEDOM or encourage letters from its subscribers except from the most intrepid of letter writers!

Now to return to the subject of the bus strike and the use of violence. I agree with you, P.S., that the man who is physically attacked has the right to defend himself. But the strikers were not being physically attacked—it was a minority of the strikers who were doing the attacking. You excuse them by saying that because they are organised by the Transport & General Workers' Union they are not responsible. 'No point in getting indignant,' you say, 'when they act irresponsibly.' Yet when another section of the busmen go on strike against coloured labour being introduced you do get indignant. You have no excuses for them and rightly so. It therefore appears that the busmen are irresponsible when they strike with their union and responsible when they strike against the employment of coloured labour. Where does that leave you, P.S.?

It would seem that you make excuses for the busmen when it suits your argument and forget all about the excuses when the busmen do something you don't like. In other words your excuses are 'one-way street' excuses. The Oxford English Dictionary says that something 'weak and insipid' may be described as 'wishy-washy'!

My position is very simple and you don't need any metaphysics or a knowledge of dialectics to understand it. I just don't think that breaking windows, assaulting the public and threatening schoolgirls were tactics worthy of employment by the strikers even though they were as you claim in your reply to G.G. 'conditioned, frustrated, inactive and dumb'. What a description! The poor fellows must have passed over in to the world of zombies and science fiction!

to prison. The much-publicised patience of the President will once more be demonstrated, as it was in the case of Senator McCarthy; he is no doubt nervous of the South's possible reactions to any show of strength. Although according to the Constitution it behoves Eisenhower to deal swiftly and firmly with Faubus' illegal actions, he has apparently decided that discretion is required—though it might be regarded as amounting to cowardice in some quarters.

If the Governor of Arkansas does not comply with the request to proceed with integration, a temporary injunction may be brought against him, followed by a hearing. If he maintains his position he can be tried without jury—he can appeal. A stay of execution may then be granted until the circuit court of appeal at St. Louis. The opinion of the Supreme Court can be sought. It adds up to delay, which is perhaps one of the purposes of the whole affair—or will be.

But Faubus will argue that he used his troops to prevent discord, anger and violence overtaking the citizens of Little Rock. He will claim once again, however absurdly, that it was not his prime intention to prevent the commencement of integration. He is due to appear in court on Friday, 20th September, and it remains to be seen what will result from the Law. Originally it all began as a civil action brought by a group of negro parents against the Little Rock school board—suing them in an attempt to force the start of integration. Whether it will all end in the same court or travel through many courts and political channels remains to be seen, but it will not cause a civil war, nor upset the President's golfing holiday. Little Rock High School will eventually be integrated.

To be serious again, I refuse to excuse, approve or condone what you call in inverted commas 'hooliganism'. (Why inverted commas? It's a perfectly good English word. It has long since ceased to be slang. In this respect you are as conservative as the *Times*. No wonder they say that extremes meet! If you don't like the word, if you feel it has been tainted by the Press, why use it?)

It may be true that violence is effective. Of course it is. Whoever doubted it? All the dictators in history have proved it so. But I hardly expected such an argument from an anarchist journal and especially from someone as reasonable as yourself. In fact I don't really think you approve of it. You huff and you puff and (to change the metaphor) you make like Tarzan but I cannot see you scaring schoolchildren in the sacred cause of strike solidarity. No, you may 'roar as gently as any sucking dove' but you deceive no one.

However, let me end by again thanking you for your patient and kindly reply and be assured that I fully sympathise with your task in getting out a paper under difficult circumstances and in the face of silent readers. Now I hand over my sword—at least for the present. I am not saying I have no other weapons

in my armoury. In fact, if you'll excuse me, I'll get along there and do some sharpening—just in case!

Salisbury. N.H.

★

I AM not satisfied with the reply of P.S. to the criticism of N.H.

P.S. admits to supporting some strikes because they are a form of direct action. But he should consider the fact that the majority of Union members are enrolled by coercive methods and that they are, largely, apathetic or opportunist. Very few of them think like P.S.—if they think at all!

It follows that no strikes have the backing of a responsible, principled majority. Nor can blacklegs be bloody! Hence, P.S. should have been quite frigid towards them all.

Apart from that P.S. contends that bashing blacklegs compares with defending oneself from a physical assault. In one case all the other bloke does is to get into a bus! Why shouldn't he decide to work the bus, anyway—he was probably (virtually) compelled to join the Union.

Slough. ERNIE CROSSWELL.

P.S. Replies:

REINFORCEMENTS are appearing, I see. I shall soon get the impression that I am being ganged up on and shall switch from the position of welcoming criticism and comment to a feeling of persecution.

G.G. and N.H. have now been joined by E.C., and, by a strange coincidence (or West Country telepathy), Frances Bellerby, whose earlier letter is referred to by N.H. has also chipped in with a most cryptic message. Her postcard, addressed from Devon to 'The Editor (Fallible), Freedom (Fallible)', read: 'Comment on "Editor's Reply" to N.H.: O dear, O dear! P.S.—Did you read it through?'

Exactly what that means I am not quite sure, but it makes me feel most uneasy. However, better not say anything...

Reverting back to a minor Editorial comment of last November is a little unfair on all those readers who will not have files of this paper to refer to, and I am not going to dwell on it anyway. Re-reading the offending two paragraphs I do think that N.H. has been a bit super-sensitive and unjust in what he has read into them. Perhaps it was his protective male instinct which made him bridle at what appeared a somewhat brusque reply to a lady. Well, I've no complaint about that. What with all our talk about equality of the sexes, an anarchist male with any feeling of gallantry towards the opposite sex is a refreshing novelty. (I can hear Miss Bellerby saying 'O dear, O dear' again as she reads this!) Not, of course, that N.H. has admitted to being an anarchist, anyway.

Just to make confusion worse confounded and to wind up what I have to say on this point, I should like N.H. to know that the same comrade of mine who pens the editorials which he agrees are well-reasoned, direct, and containing elements of magnanimity and humour was responsible for the reply to Miss Bellerby last November. Which just goes to show what a schizophrenic, Jekyll-and-Hyde bunch we really are.

However, N.H. is not taken in by my Mr. Hyde outfit. He can see behind my huffing and puffing to the gentle soul who wouldn't hurt a fly. And he just won't believe I would go around scaring schoolgirls—not even whilst 'making like Tarzan'.

Well, that's very nice of him, and I'll ask for a reference when I want a nursemaid's job—but I really wasn't aware that I was on trial. Although the way this correspondence is going it will soon look as though I am. Which is presumably my own fault for not being more positive in the first place.

But what has been really demanded by both G.G. and N.H. is a series of moral judgments—whereas what I have done is to present a moral, objective analysis of events. I have not put forward an argument to justify the effectiveness of violence in general or the tactics of the busmen in particular. What I have tried to do is explain them. I do

not, and never have done, approved of violence in itself, although I do admit to having approved of purposes for which violence has been used.

I approve of the constructive achievements of the anarcho-syndicalists in Spain—but they would have been impossible if Franco had not been held off with violence. In this connection I well remember an admission by Mr. Fenner Brockway (possibly one of Miss Bellerby's honourable politicians?), on the occasion when we shared a platform in protest against political trials in Spain, when he admitted that when he went to Spain in 1937, what he saw there made him take sides—made him want Franco to be beaten. And he recognised that that was the end of his pacifism, for he couldn't identify himself in sympathy with one side of two engaged in a violent struggle and retain his moral judgment on violence.

The point surely revolves around the values in which you are interested. If, for you, moral rectitude is more important than freedom or life; if you would rather die with clean hands than live with dirty ones, whatever the circumstances, then absolute pacifism is the true line to take. And from that position one can wholeheartedly condemn atom-bombing governments and window-breaking busmen alike. But if you are not sure that—sometime, somewhere—maybe you would break a window, deliberately or in anger, to protect what you think are your interests, be careful how you condemn others. As Christ might have said at Salisbury bus station: 'Let he who is without sin cast the first stone.'

On a small, personal, scale, I have had to do what the anarchists in Spain had to do. I have had to use violence to prevent myself being knocked off a platform on a street corner in order to be able to carry on with a meeting and explain the anarchist philosophy to the crowd. Usually I can keep order even in a hostile crowd through the use of reason and cunning, but—only once, fortunately—that has failed and I had to use my right arm. Does that make me an advocate of violence? Certainly not. But having recognised that in certain circumstances I have had to resort to it, or suffer consequences that would defeat my ends, how can I condemn others who do likewise? What I can say, however, is that institutionalised violence—the permanent institutions of coercion maintained by the state for the defence of an unjust society and the calculated withholding of freedom—this I wholeheartedly condemn as, in part, the root cause of all the other, relatively insignificant, violent explosions within society.

Now I have not left myself any room to deal with the details of why I condemn busmen on an anti-colour strike, but sit on the fence and say it's not their fault when they commit excesses whilst on official strike. I think I can talk my way out of that one and I will try and get round to it next week. Meanwhile, take a look at Ernie Crosswell's peculiar effusion and see what you can make of that.

COMRADES,

You will remember that in an endeavour to get you new readers I paid for six consecutive issues of FREEDOM to be sent to quite a number of different addresses. This without any known result.

It has occurred to me that there is another probable way of obtaining new readers—that of having FREEDOM mentioned in other papers. The extract given by you from a *Times* editorial gave me a chance for trying this out. The local Urban Council had had a debate about itself and the Press and it was decided by a majority that representatives of the Press should be ejected at such times as the Council declared itself to be "in Committee". My letter was printed without a comma altered and with my own caption, and I had been careful to point out that for the extract I was indebted to "a weekly called 'Freedom'." This cannot be done very often, but opportunities for it must crop up at intervals all over the kingdom.

Yours fraternally,
DAVID MACCONNELL.
Bakewell, Sept. 15.

**We need many more
NEW READERS
and your help to
reach them!**

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

Every Sunday at 7.30 at
THE MALATESTA CLUB,
32 Percy Street,
Tottenham Court Road, W.1.

LECTURE - DISCUSSIONS

SEPT. 22—Max Patrick on
FRANCOIS VILLON
with readings by Bonar Thompson
Questions, Discussion and Admission
all free.

OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting
HYDE PARK
Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

GLASGOW

OPEN AIR MEETINGS
Maxwell Street
Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.

★ Malatesta Club ★

SWARAJ HOUSE,
32 PERCY STREET,
TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD, LONDON, W.1.
(Tel.: MUSEUM 7277).

ACTIVITIES

Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.
London Anarchist Group Meetings
(see Announcements Column)

Every Wednesday at 8 p.m.
BONAR THOMSON speaks

Every Friday and Saturday:
SOCIAL EVENINGS

AFRICAN FORUM

Lecture on
AMERICAN INTEREST IN AFRICA
by the
First Secretary of the American Embassy
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 7.30 p.m.

FREEDOM
The Anarchist Weekly
Postal Subscription Rates:
12 months 19/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)
6 months 9/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)
3 months 5/- (U.S.A. \$0.75)
Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies
12 months 29/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)
6 months 14/6 (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