

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"All states are potentially totalitarian; what they lack to become so, is not the desire, but the power and the opportunity."

—K. J. KENAFICK.

Vol. 18, No. 47

November 23rd, 1957

Threepence

They Pose as the Apostles of Peace but are

ORGANISED FOR WAR

The efforts of the N.A.T.O. member countries are directed especially towards peace and a general and controlled disarmament...

N.A.T.O. RESOLUTION.

The prospects for peace are not bad thanks to a change in the balance of strength of Communist and neutral countries.

NIKITA KHRUSHCHEV.

GENERAL THOMAS S. POWER, Commander of the United States Strategic Air Command, recently stated that his force is N.A.T.O.'s "top deterrent" against Russia.

Thus we are supposed to believe that the efforts of N.A.T.O. countries are not only directed towards the possible destruction of Russia, but also to world peace.

During the course of an interview in Moscow he said that Russia could wipe out all the N.A.T.O. bases and the United States as well, and he gave reasons: the Soviet alone possesses the inter-continental ballistic missile and enjoys "absolute rocket superiority".

Thus we are also supposed to believe that Russia's efforts are entirely dedicated to world peace and at the same time to the destruction of America if war should break out.

POLICE CENSORSHIP

Why did a high-ranking police officer open a private letter addressed to Manchester P.C. Fred Roberts? That is what young Mrs. Barbara Roberts wants to know—and she isn't satisfied by the official answers.

The letter, containing news of a bequest to her husband, reached him four days after it was posted, and had been slit open, says Mrs. Roberts.

When he asked why, "He was told nothing—he didn't even get an apology." She wrote to Manchester Watch Committee without result, but the Chief Constable, Mr. J. Bell, gave her these reasons for the letter having been opened:

1.—There were four P.C. Roberts in the Platt Lane Division.

Mrs. Roberts comments: But only one Fred Roberts.

2.—The letter was opened to find where it came from.

The name and address of the sender were on the back of the envelope, says Mrs. Roberts.

3.—The letter was not marked "Personal" and could have contained police business.

Even if it had, if it was addressed to my husband personally, he should have been handed it unopened, says Mrs. Roberts.

Now I have written to the chief constable again because I am determined to get to the bottom of this.

Somebody has got to make a fight, if only for the sake of other policemen, she says.

(News Chronicle).

We are therefore expected to swallow the hypothesis that on both sides of the iron curtain stand the principal defenders of peace, whilst the political and military leaders simultaneously brag of their ability to destroy half the world in twenty-four hours.

Meanwhile the so-called statesmen gather together in the capitals of the world to discuss their differences, but they cannot do so in terms which are even partly realistic.

It is an infinitely depressing prospect that as the years slip unasily away the balance of total power moves steadily into the grasp of one or other of the great Powers, and as the process takes place it becomes less and less possible for any other state to maintain any freedom of action.

The theory of co-existence is hard put to maintain its peaceful prefix for the semi-war of encirclement and satellite-expansion continues *ad infinitum*.

propagate them, are bent upon proving that Russia and America as at present constituted are mutually exclusive.

Aneurin Bevan has put forward his view to President Eisenhower, that since both sides have the capacity to destroy one another an understanding can now be reached "on a basis of mutual fear".

Now, more than ever before, does it become imperative to escape from the ghastly possibilities which face us every day with the existence of weapons which can destroy us at the press of a button, or the issue of an order—possibly from an over-anxious politician or over-zealous general, or more probably from an over-ambitious government.

For some reason the human race seems incapable of recognising the trouble it is in; if it survives another fifty years perhaps it will come to its senses, perhaps the crises will be less dramatic, perhaps...

Anglo-American Arms for Tunisia & a Snub for France The Entente Cordiale that Was!

THE "crisis" which has blown up in the past week between France and her Anglo-American allies over their decision to send "token" supplies of arms to Tunisia, simply underlines the political schizophrenia which growingly manifests itself in the nations of the West.

In power politics there are no rules, no referees, no loyalties, whatever may exist on paper or be said at State banquets. Every aspirant to power is fighting a lone battle against every other aspirant to power.

ONLY a year ago, when Britain and France in concert with Mr. Ben Gurion and his friends in Israel

were preparing the *coup* in Egypt, the top-level comings and goings between Downing Street and the Quai d'Orsay, had they been fully publicised (which they were not, of course and for obvious reasons), would have convinced everybody that the Entente Cordiale had never been stronger.

That was just a year ago. Last week, however, Britain and the United States, against French wishes, sold a shipment of arms to Tunisia. This action has set loose a flood of abuse among even the most responsible of our French cousins.

Naturally la belle France feels that she is the offended party, and M. Gaillard clutching at every straw to divert public attention from his inability to find the formula which will keep his dubious coalition on its feet, and M. Gaillard in power,

Some Aspects of Colour Prejudice

THE vote-catching tactics of Southern Senator Faubus was frowned on in this country by commentators of all political shades as much for his illegal action in ordering out the National Guard, ostensibly to stop rioting, as for the immoral position held by him and the pro-segregationists over the issue on the Supreme Court's ruling on segregated schools.

The sound of voices raised in defence of democratic principles rings sweet in our ears. But we are old fashioned enough to believe if principles are to mean more than high sounding words they should apply on a universal scale.

Take for example the existing laws instituted by "our" Government relating to the black population in Rhodesia. Racial discrimination is not merely practised by some

20,000 FINNISH RAILWAY WORKERS ON STRIKE

HELSINKI, NOVEMBER 15.

About twenty thousand state-employed maintenance workers on the Finnish railways went on strike to-day for higher wages and improved social benefits.—Reuter.

pathological whites it is in effect written into the constitution.

A few weeks ago we discussed one case which happened to get publicity of a white woman who was discovered to be "co-habiting" with a black man which resulted in her expulsion from the territory. She cited in her defence the case of another white woman who was living in holy wedlock with a man who was actually of a different colour.

Ian Civil is a school teacher full of silly democratic notions that all men are equal. He loves and wants to marry an African girl. For this bourgeois crime he has been ordered to leave for violating Section 51A of the Immigration Act which, among other things we can be sure, states:

"Any person deemed by the Minister, or class of person deemed by the Governor-General on economic grounds, or on account of standard or habits of life, to be undesirable inhabitants, or to be unsuited to the requirements of the federation, are declared prohibited immigrants."

Why is Ian Civil considered an undesirable inhabitant? He is not just an ordinary chap, a victim of the unpredictable emotion of love and likely to settle down in obscurity, he is a teacher responsible for moulding the tender minds of the young. His curious ideas of equality, which he has made no attempt to hide, might help to undermine the principles of racial supremacy in a country which he has described as "a hotbed of colour prejudice".

Continued on p. 4

MINUS £303!

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!

WEEK 46	
Deficit on Freedom	£920
Contributions received	£617
DEFICIT	£303

November 8 to November 14

Brentwood, Miss.: N.M. 14/-; Denver: R.B. £1/18/0; Ulverston: V.M. 6/6; Frankfurt: H.B. 16/6; London: Anon.* 2/3; London: S.B.* 1/9; London: Anon.* 1/7; Coleman's Hatch: O.M. £2.

Total	6 0 7
Previously acknowledged	611 5 4
1957 TOTAL TO DATE	£617 5 11

Fire Fund

TOTAL TO DATE	£382 19 6
---------------	-----------

*See FREEDOM Selections, Vol. 6 for American Press comments in the article "Was it Collusion?" pp. 279-281.

Continued on p. 3

PEOPLE AND IDEAS

A Million Private Dreams - 5

"Freed from physical necessity, what are the new conditions? What form of technology and what standard of living are desirable? Partly just because they have a surplus, produced under the profit system and with a cash morality, people have not only not gone on to formulate their deeper needs but their attitude toward the old problems has an unheard-of superficiality. It has become customary to take polls on 'What kind of town do you want to live in?'—'What do you want in a post-war house?' The answers to these questions reveal neither rational thought nor depth of sentiment; they are the products of routine and inertia rather than memory or local-patriotism, of prejudice rather than practical experience, of advertising rather than desire."

—PAUL & PERCIVAL GOODMAN:
"Communitas".

THERE are certain theories or hypotheses, for instance those of Marx (who said he was not a Marxist) or Freud (who said he was not a Freudian), which while they may not be provable as 'true', or while they may illumine only one aspect of the truth, are nevertheless of the greatest value as yardsticks of reality, as a means of understanding. In this light, David Riesman's *The Lonely Crowd: A Study of the Changing American Character* is of considerable use in interpreting the changing trends of our own society. His thesis is that each of the stages of population growth "appears to be occupied by a society that enforced conformity and moulds social character in a definably different way." The society of 'high growth potential' (the first and second stages described in the second article in this series) develops in its typical members a social character "whose conformity is ensured by their tendency to follow tradition". These he calls *tradition-directed*. The society of 'transitional population growth' (the third stage) develops in its typical members a social character "whose conformity is ensured by their tendency to acquire early in life an internalised set of goals". These he calls *inner-directed*. The society of 'incipient population decline' (the fourth stage) develops in its typical members a social character whose conformity is ensured by their tendency to be sensi-

tized to the expectations and preferences of others". These he calls *other-directed*. The theme of Riesman's book, which he develops with great detail and subtlety, is that the dominant American character has changed from inner-direction to other-direction. The tradition-directed person,

"hardly thinks of himself as an individual. Still less does it occur to him that he might shape his own destiny in terms of personal, lifelong goals or that the destiny of his children might be separate from that of the family group".

The inner-directed person, on the other hand, seen pre-eminently in those Protestant archetypes, the pioneer, the rugged individualist, the self-made man,

"has incorporated a psychic gyroscope which is set going by his parents and can receive signals later on from other authorities who resemble his parents. He goes through life less independent than he seems, obeying this internal piloting. Getting off course, whether in response to inner impulses or to the fluctuating voices of contemporaries, may lead to the feeling of guilt".

The other-directed person, by contrast, "learns to respond to signals from a far wider circle than is constituted by his parents. The family is no longer a closely knit unit to which he belongs but merely part of a wider social environment to which he early becomes attentive. In these respects the other-directed person resembles the tradition-directed: both live in a group milieu and lack the inner-directed person's capacity to go it alone... What is common to all the other-directed people is that their contemporaries are the source of direction for the individual—either those known to him or those with whom he is indirectly acquainted, through friends and through the mass media."

APPLYING Riesman's categories (remembering that they are only 'ideal' types and not people) to the social studies discussed in this series, we can interpret the move from Bethnal Green to Greenleigh or from St. Ebbe's to Barton, as a move from a tradition-directed culture to an other-directed one. (The subsidiary study made in Messrs. Young and Willmott's book of the subsequent history of

pre-war grammar-school scholarship winners from Bethnal Green, can be seen as a change from tradition-direction to inner-direction, but their new environment—a middle-class Greenleigh—as one of other-direction, and the same can be said of the increased parental concern in post-war Bethnal Green, in Greenleigh and in Barton over children's associates and careers). The 'status-dissenters' of St. Ebbe's or the 'deviant individuals and groups' at Pentreidiwaith can be seen as inner-directed types in a tradition-directed environment.

The change in South Wales on the other hand could be regarded as one from inner-direction (the Protestant individualism of craft, chapel and union militancy) to other-direction, as can some of the changes in familial and sexual habits described in *The Human Sum*, while others (improved status of women, etc.) are a change from the tradition-directed attitudes of Pentreidiwaith or Barton or 'Ashton', the Yorkshire mining village discussed in "Coal is our Life" (see FREEDOM 9/2/57). Using Riesman's catchwords in this way is not just a labelling game, they are valuable not only as a yardstick, but as a way of discussing changes without using words loaded with qualitative comparison or disapproval. A tradition-directed society can be narrow and compulsive, or tolerant and permissive. An inner-directed person can be a Galileo or a Beethoven, or he can be a Gradgrind or one of those cold, hard and aloof members of the English upper-classes who are a byword abroad. Other-direction may be another word for conformity and mediocrity, but sensitivity to the opinions of others, willingness to co-operate with them, consideration of their feelings, are virtues that it is silly to sneer at.

If, however, we are enquiring into people's private dreams (into the 'ideal environment' which they dream up for themselves, seeking in adult life a 'real' scenery as much like it as possible), we must make comparative judgments. The tradition-directed person has few private dreams. It does not occur to him "that he might shape his own destiny in terms

of personal, lifelong goals". Mr. Mogy in his Oxford enquiry was surprised that many tenants at Barton were dissatisfied with their houses and had suddenly got the urge to seek better ones. He need not have been surprised. For they had through the move from the tradition-directed milieu of St. Ebbe's, become aware of the possibility of a different environment. They need not accept Barton as they accepted St. Ebbe's. Carlo Doglio, describing a town-planning survey in an Italian town, makes this point, that the very fact of the survey "served to open their eyes, perhaps for the first time, to the nature of their individual identity, and to a personal consideration of how they live and how they might live".

The inner-directed person has his dreams all right, though they may be less his than those which have been built into him early by parental or other authorities, and if he is tough enough or ruthless enough they may come true, at the expense of other people's. His private dreams accompanied by guilt at having any, maybe something quite different—to throw it all over in fact. *Gone fishing/Instead of just a-wishing.*

And the other-directed? Riesman, touching on this point says:

"Whereas the inner-directed middle-class boy often had to learn after twenty to adjust, to surrender his adolescent dreams, learning to conform to the group almost as soon as he learns anything, he does not face, at adolescence, the need to choose between his family's world and that of his own generation or between his dreams and a world he never made. Since, moreover, his adjustment to this group reality begins earlier, it becomes more a matter of conforming character and less a matter of conforming behaviour".

If the new freedoms brought about by family planning and the redistribution of income have in fact made possible the realisation of private dreams, the terrifying thing is that they are *all the same!* The 'ideal landscape' is identical from Swansea to Durham. The same little four-square nuclear family of Mummy, Daddy, Maureen and Anthony, in the same little semi-detached 'home' in Attlee Avenue or Churchill Close all the way from Southampton to Carlisle. It isn't anybody's private dream, except that of the municipal bureaucrat, the advertising men, the *Express* on the right and the

Mirror on the left and Wilfred Pickles in the middle.

BUT if this is all we can say of it, we ally ourselves with the attitude of the disgruntled middle-class shaking their heads over all those television aerials, with those ex-socialists who for years demanded a redistribution of income, and when it came despised it because its recipients didn't spend it on the works of Harold Laski, or with what T. R. Fyvel calls the "new attitude among the literati": a striking move back to the coterie, titles, Eton, and anti-Americanism, and a defiant indifference to the age of the common man as something at best to be deployed". Mr. Fyvel, and I am sure he is right, sees the new conditions as a starting-point:

"England is a seventy-per-cent, working-class country; and for the majority of people who enjoy them for the first time, acquisitions like the council house, refrigerators, and television, the little car and the cheap fashion magazine, the first tour abroad and the new secondary modern schools, have opened the way to a wider, varied life previously out of reach—and they like it! Whether it leads to Subtopia or not, the rush to mass participation is thus irresistible. The only way to effect the evolution of Subtopia lies through acceptance of this social revolution."

Having said all this, one may express the strongest doubt as to whether the redistribution of income can be equated with a social revolution. If a revolution is a change in power relations, and if we conceive of power as something which we all have, but which most of us surrender to, or lose to, or invest in others, there has been no change. David Riesman notes this as a characteristic of other-direction: "The chiefs have lost the power, but the followers have not gained it... the other-directed person, far from gaining, only becomes weaker from the weakness of his fellows... If the leaders have lost the power, why have the led not gained it? In terms of character, the other-directed man simply does not seek power; perhaps, rather, he avoids and evades it."

We think it a good thing not to seek power, for power is always gained at the expense of other people's surrender of theirs. But if you don't seek it, it is imperative not to surrender your own. And the changes we have described have just this tendency. "We have no doubt", wrote the authors of *Social Change in South-West Wales*,

"that the effects of the changes which we have described have been undesirable, in that they have been associated with a reduction in the power of the individual to shape the life of his community".

In the conflict between efficiency or social organisation and the standard of living on the one hand, and personal autonomy and long-term aims on the other, they observe that "the individual has consistently preferred the higher standard of living".

In the *Observer* (14/7/57) we read that "the past six years have witnessed a 50 per cent. expansion in retail sales in Britain", and in the same paper (28/7/57) that, "If national income grows at the rate being forecast by Whitehall, the average standard of living of the community will rise by about 50 per cent. by 1970 and will double by 1984." Everything is on the up and up, and then we might come across an agonised cry of

Continued on p. 3

BOOK REVIEW

The First Labour Government

THE FIRST LABOUR GOVERNMENT 1924 by Richard W. Lyman. Chapman & Hall, 25s.

IN January 1924 some worthy members of the British ruling class were in a state of near panic. "We stand now," wrote one of them in the *English Review*, "at a moment when the sun of England seems menaced with final collapse. For the first time in her history the party of revolution approach their hands to the realm of state, not only, as in the 17th Century, for the purpose of overthrowing the Crown, or of altering the Constitution, but with the design of destroying the very basis of our civilised life." Baldwin, the Tory Prime Minister, had, it seemed to them, made a fatal error of political judgment. By precipitating a General Election in the previous month over the issue of protective tariffs, he had unwittingly prepared the way for the red revolution in the shape of a Government of wild men led by Ramsay Macdonald.

The picture seems comic in 1957 and it must have seemed hardly less comic to the more perceptive observer in 1924. True, the Conservative Party had lost its majority in the Commons but it was still the largest party. The Labour Government would be a minority government which at any time could be overturned by the combined vote of the Conservatives and Liberals. If there had to be a Labour Government, said Asquith, "it could hardly be tried under safer conditions." Indeed not. But it was not only that the conditions were safe. The character of the Labour Party and its leaders was itself a sufficient guarantee against any attempt to subvert the established social order.

It was in 1922 that the Labour Party emerged as the second party in the state. The publicists of the day at once began to amuse themselves with the question: Is Labour fit to govern? By that they really meant, not whether the Labour Party had leaders capable of taking charge of the offices of state but whether it was safe to allow a Labour Government to exist. What better way could there be for resolving any doubts on this score within the Establishment than by organising a "controlled experiment"?

In the political situation of January 1924, three choices were open to the

Labour Party: it could refuse to take office and leave the Conservatives to muddle on as best they could; it could accept office on condition that it did nothing to lead to positive withdrawal of support by the Liberals; or it could accept office with the idea of putting forward its socialist programme. The latter choice was the obvious one for a radical party that really meant business. It would, of course, have involved immediate defeat in the House of Commons, another dissolution and an election which could have been fought squarely on the issue of socialism versus capitalism. There was no guarantee, and perhaps little possibility, that such an issue would have been decided in favour of the Labour Party. But at least it would have signified to all the world that the Labour Party meant what it said about building a new society on the basis of the common ownership of the means of production. Within the Labour leadership, however, this choice was not seriously considered and plenty of rationalisations were produced against it: it would be irresponsible; it would be misrepresented; it would confirm suspicions that they were not fit to govern, etc., etc. Eager for the sweets of office and a chance to prove their capacity and moderation, they opted therefore for the second alternative.

Professor Lyman's book is a detailed, scholarly and relatively detached account of the events that followed this choice. Its main theme is the part that the First Labour Government played in the growth towards "political maturity" of the party. He himself has no doubt that the choice made was the right one. It marked he concludes, "a stage in the process of converting a band of missionary zealots into a responsible political party, bidding for the difficult and compromising job of governing the country." Such a judgment reflects, of course, the political predilections of its author. Translated into more radical language, it means that 1924 showed that the real object of the Labour Party was not to overthrow the Establishment but to win a place for itself within it.

The policies pursued by the Government confirm this view. From the start Macdonald set out to placate the ruling class. For the first time a British Cabinet contained a majority of men of proletarian origin; but it was a bare

majority—11 out of 20. The rest consisted of elements of the traditional ruling class, including the Conservative-Imperialist, Lord Chelmsford, and the ex-Liberal Imperialist, Lord Haldane. "A workers' Government, yet ca' it!" cried some nameless shipyard worker at an I.L.P. propagandist meeting. "It's a bloody lum hat Government like a' the rest!"

In only two important respects did the Labour Government modify the policy of its predecessors: Wheatley's Housing Act which encouraged the building of houses by local authorities for renting and not for sale; and the recognition of the Soviet Union, followed by negotiations for a general settlement between the two States. In other respects, it was largely the mixture as before. Snowden's Budget was essentially a free trade Liberal affair which would have warmed the heart of Gladstone, while the Government's defence and imperial policies were such as to win the ecstatic support of *The Times*. On defence, the voice of the Establishment declared: "The Cabinet have shown a real largeness of view in rising above the deep-rooted prejudices of many of their adherents about the 'unproductive expenditure' upon armaments"; and in J. H. Thomas, the Colonial Secretary, it found "an Imperial spirit which was at once earnest, cordial, and instinct with a deep sense of responsibility." Governments, like men, may be judged by the friends they make and on this criterion the First Labour Government certainly succeeded in making friends with the "top people".

But, by the end of nine months, even the Government's new friends had had enough. The Liberals joined forces with the Conservatives in opposing the Government's proposal to back a British loan to Russia and in censuring its handling of the "Campbell Case". (Campbell had published an article which the Law Officers of the Crown deemed seditious. A prosecution was started and then withdrawn in the face of left-wing protest. This gave the Opposition parties a chance to accuse the Government of putting political interests above those of the State and of catching out Macdonald in a downright lie about his not having been consulted over the proposal to prosecute). The election which followed the Government's defeat was distinguish-

ed by the notorious "Red Letter" scare. Professor Lyman is too cautious to declare roundly that the Zinoviev letter was a fake but he leaves the impression that the whole business was carefully engineered between the Foreign Office and the bourgeois press.

In Labour mythology the party's electoral defeat in October 1924, is attributed largely to the effect of the scare in stampeding the cautious British electorate into the Conservative fold. Professor Lyman's analysis of the election results suggests otherwise: "it did no more than sharpen the outline of the election results." The Labour Party, in fact, increased its popular vote in the country, although it lost 40 seats. The real victims of the election were the Liberals who were reduced in number from 118 to a mere 40 M.P.s. It was the beginning of the end for the Liberal Party. They had hoped, at the start of the year, that, after a period of Labour ineptitude in office, they would be called upon to retrieve the situation. Instead, the electorate had finally dismissed them as the source of a possible alternative government.

In that respect, as in others, the First Labour Government had served its purpose. It had shown that there was a safe alternative to the Liberal Party: henceforth the Establishment could look forward to the restoration of the traditional two-party system of politics, secure in the knowledge that, which ever party held office, its own dominance would remain unchallenged. G.O.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

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

New Books . . .

- Paul Klee G. Di San Lazzaro 28/-
Picasso: a Study of his Works, etc. Elgar and Mailland 32/6
The First Labour Government 1924 R. W. Lyman 25/-
Glory Reflected: Sigmund Freud Martin Freud 21/-
Albert Camus: a Study of his Work P. Thody 18/-
Letters to Vernon Watkins Dylan Thomas 15/-
The Next Hundred Years Harrison Browne, etc. 18/-
The Main Chance Peter Wildeblood 13/6

Reprints and

Cheap Editions . . .

- Selected Writings Martin Buber 11/-
Pragmatism William James 10/-
Nietzsche W. Kalfman 12/-
New Directions, No. 15 11/-
Social Classes J. Schumpeter 10/-
Almyer's Folly and Last Essays Joseph Conrad 6/-
Passage to India E. M. Forster 7/-
Life Under the Pharaohs Leonard Cottrell 2/6
The Greek Myths Robert Graves (2 vols.) each 4/6

Second-Hand . . .

- Saint-Just J. B. Morton 5/-
'48 The Year of Revolutions James Eastwood & Paul Tabori 6/-
Pnin Vladimir Nabokov 6/-
Lectures and Essays R. W. Ingersoll 6/6
People of the Deer Farley Mowat 4/6
The Necessity of Pacifism John Middleton Murry 3/-
Science of Power Benjamin Kidd 3/6

Periodicals . . .

- University Libertarian, Autumn 1957 1/-
Liberation, October 1957 1/9
Views and Comments, October 1957 3d.

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

The Entente Cordiale That Was!

Continued from p. 1

economic rôles such vast continents as China and India will play in years to come. The fact that Russia in 40 years has emerged as one of the two dominant powers in the world (incidentally this has nothing to do with socialism; after all America has done even more than Russia materially speaking without "socialist emulation", and without the millions of victims sacrificed at the altar of Leninism), is, if anything, a pointer to the potentialities of these, at present, industrially backward powers. Furthermore, there is no guarantee that any one "first-class" power could successfully dominate an alliance of "second-class" powers. France, it would seem, has given up the struggle but being a nation which is more prepared to make sacrifices for the satisfaction of the stomach rather than for power for its own sake, nevertheless seeks to retain its status as a colonial power, and the economic privileges that stem therefrom. (That the Algerian campaign is in fact making heavy demands on the French economy if anything tends to confirm our argument. Just as the material sacrifices to which the much more hungry Russian people are submitted in the development of such useless scientific toys as the Sputniks point to an obsession on the part of Russia's rulers for power for its own sake).

If France has given up the struggle, the British ruling class obviously has not stopped dreaming of again being one day the dominant power in the world. And this does not apply to the Tories. If Mr. Bevan's globe-trotting has any political significance, apart from the fact that the Labour Party is expecting to return to power and Mr. Bevan to occupy the Foreign Secretary's armchair, it surely lies in their belief that Britain can play a dominant rôle in world politics. In this game Bevan's meetings with Khrushchev and Eisenhower are of importance because they give him status in the eyes of the smaller powers.

But the real work of consolidation will be done among the uncommitted nations, mostly the "backward" nations of the world. And unless we are very much mistaken we cannot imagine Mr. Bevan criticising the government's action in Tunisia—unless it is for narrow party political advantage—for Africa and the Arab world are surely the stepping stones for world domination. America and Britain have declared that they supplied arms to Tunisia because if they did not Russia would. But equally, let us not overlook the fact that if America and Britain acted jointly, it was not because they have at last discovered a deep, common interest which joins them, but because Britain could not politically afford to let America pose once again as the friend of the Arab nations. Any more than America could let Britain steal a march on her in this vital area!

★

THERE is no honour among thieves (and politicians). When they make common cause, suspect the motives. When they appeal to Justice and the United Nations, harden your hearts and simply assume that blackmail and bluff have failed (from experience we know that any just cause is vetoed by the Big Three before it gets a hearing). When the large nations champion the small, assume that their intention is to swamp them. When a small nation praises a large nation, assume that the ruling clique know on which

THEY PAY THEM WELL IN RUSSIA—AT THE TOP

IN view of the fact that one of the most important functions of the Ministry of Works in the last few years has been the building of deep underground atom-proof shelters for the country's VIP's, it is most appropriate that the name of the Ministry's director-general is Sir Charles Mole.

Sir Charles has been burrowing away most assiduously on your behalf for a long time now, making sure that if the balloon goes up, all the right people will be able to go down—to safety. Also included among his many responsibilities is the equipping of atomic factories—Sir Charles presumably plays his part in ensuring that all the wrong people will go up—and all in all this architect directs the spending of £1 million a week through the Ministry of Works.

Well, now that Sir Charles Mole is 71, he has decided to go to earth and give up his onerous job, which of course, did not consist only of work of dubious social or moral usefulness, but included responsibility for all post office building and so on. It is clearly a job with plenty of burdens, not many thanks, and no glory—for how many of you had even heard of this man who spends £50 millions of your money every year?

The director-general of the M.O.W. is, of course, like all the professional heads of government departments, the chap who really takes the decisions of the ministry, while the Minister answers the questions in Parliament, opens the new atom stations, and gets moved around in Cabinet shuffles every six months, getting his photo in the papers and landing up in the House of Lords and on the boards of fifteen City Companies.

Well, now, as we've already said, Sir Charles Mole is going to retire. And his retirement has created a certain embarrassment for the Government, for it cannot find anyone to take his place, at the salary the Civil Service Commissioners have offered—a mere £4,500 a year.

Now for a lot of people that sounds a lot of money. But for a professional technician with the sort of qualifications, experience, and

knowledge necessary for a job of that weight and responsibility, it is, in to-day's terms, not a very high salary. And it is the top job of its kind in the Government service.

When you consider that a Member of Parliament, who may have been selected for a safe seat on no other qualifications than that his uncle was in the Cabinet, will earn—or rather, will be paid—nearly £2,000 a year for what could be next to nothing, the scale of money values among the Government's own circles seem somewhat askew.

And when you compare Sir Charles Mole's £4,500 for a year and what his job means in importance to the national life (whether one likes the national life or not), with the £16,000 that Tommy Steele has been offered for a 16-week foreign tour—well, any idea of social values, productivity, or even any sensible money values are clearly ludicrous.

One can wish Tommy Steele the best of luck for getting away with it, but when we realise that he will receive in a week about the same as one hundred miners, then we don't have to look any further for evidence of the corrupt lunacy of the money system.

It was this realisation which led the anarchists and the early socialists to their complete opposition to the wages and money systems. There is no means by which you can measure the social value of a man's or a woman's work in terms of money. And an anarchist or a socialist society would be one in which you gave according to your abilities, received according to your needs and in which the social usefulness or

RIOTING IN CAMEROONS

PARIS, NOVEMBER 10.

Rioting broke out in the French Cameroons, the West African trusteeship, in the last few days, resulting in the death of five people and the burning down of about fifty native dwellings. The trouble is said to have been stirred up by the Communist-led Union of Cameroonian People, which is agitating for full political independence for the Cameroons.—British United Press.

A Million Private Dreams - 5

Continued from p. 2

powerlessness, like this in *The Listener* (17/10/57):

"My husband and I have just read the review by Mr. J. G. Crowther of *Fall Out*... We are horrified. We have two children and we like living. Is there any organisation to stop this suicide? If not, can't one be started? I don't know how such a thing is started, but nothing, repeat nothing, is more important!"

The only answer she got was the suggestion that she should write to her M.P.

★
WE are powerless because we have surrendered our power, because we are not autonomous. But where shall autonomy be found? Riesman, in addition to his three character-types, categorises three other universal types: the adjusted, the anomic, and the autonomous. The adjusted are the typical tradition-directed, inner-directed, or other-directed people, "those who respond in their character structure to the demands of their society or social class... such people fit the culture as though they were made for it, as in fact they are". The anomic are those who try to conform but cannot (the term, Riesman says,

side their bread is buttered and that they are after something for nothing—and let the people pay!

And if you assume these things you won't have sleepless nights over the Tunisian "crisis" nor over what M. Gaillard, *Le Monde*, *Figaro* and *L'Aurore* think of perfidious Albion. You will understand that it's all part of the political game. Which doesn't mean to say you should give up the struggle for a sane world. In our opinion there is little to choose between an honest-to-goodness political sucker and someone who sees through the political racket but says nothing!

"is virtually synonymous with maladjusted, a term I refrain from using because of its negative connotations; for there are some cultures where I would place a higher value on the maladjusted or anomic than on the adjusted"). The autonomous are those who "are capable of conforming to the behavioral norms of their society but are free to choose whether to conform or not". In the earlier despotic periods "since the despots were inefficient, corrupt and limited in their aims" there were always loopholes for autonomy, he says. "Modern totalitarianism is also more inefficient and corrupt than it is often given credit for being, but its aims are unlimited and for this reason it must wage total war on autonomy". But also, "the diffuse and anonymous authority of the modern democracies is less favourable to autonomy than one might assume".

"... the coercions upon those seeking autonomy are not the visible and palpable barriers of family and authority that typically restricted people in the past... Are they enemies, those friends who stand by, not to block but to be amused, to understand and pardon everything? An autonomous person of to-day must work constantly to detach himself from shadowy entanglements with this top level of other-direction—so difficult to break with because its demands appear to be so reasonable, even trivial".

He cites as of vital importance for those seeking autonomy, John Stuart Mill's dictum, "In this age the mere example of nonconformity, the mere refusal to bend the knee to custom, is itself a service. But his discussion of the obstacles to, and the possibilities of, autonomy are disappointing. More intelligent use of the mass media, more imaginative leisure, more competent and discriminating 'consumership'—all true and all desirable, but are they an answer to the powerlessness of the individual, his inability to control his destiny?"

C.W.

(This series will be concluded in next week's FREEDOM).

pleasure your work gave to others was the yardstick for social approval and personal satisfaction.

In capitalist countries it was and still is money and property values all the time, and we can expect nothing but amoral, commercial, values to dominate all the relationships and set the pace and the pressures. In socialist countries we would expect to find, after forty years of different sets of values from the capitalists, a trend away from differentials, from money as the bait, the goal and the motive.

Well, perhaps it's there, really, but it's very hard to tell. Back in 1936 when Sidney & Beatrice Webb wrote *Soviet Communism—a New Civilization* they were constrained to say:

"... The effect of these devices [socialist competition, Stakhanovism, etc.] is to make the maximum divergence of incomes in the USSR taking the extreme instances, probably as great as the corresponding divergence in income paid for actual participation in work, in Great Britain if not in the United States."

The answer then was always that it was too early in the great socialist experiment to see the ideals of equality emerging. The Russian people had to be taught gradually under the hand of the great genius, Stalin, the true beauty of socialist equality, and the true, dialectical, way to do that was to first use inequality to fulfil the five year plans and then... oh well.

Anyway after another couple of decades—forty years of socialism in all—surely some discernable trends towards equality should be visible by now? Yes there are, but not within Soviet society, but between Soviet society and the capitalist states. And approval for the internal monetary arrangements of the Soviet economy come to-day not from the Fabian apologists of the 'thirties, but from the realistic, admiring capitalists of the 'fifties.

In imperialist Lord Beaverbrook's *Sunday Express* (17/11/57), City Editor Bernard Harris wrote with approval:

The Russians now admit that if you want to progress scientifically and industrially at unmatched speed there is nothing to beat that old capitalist device—hard cash. Money jingling in the pocket is the greatest incentive of all.

Because of the artificial rouble-pound exchange rate it is difficult to make a straight comparison between pay rates in Russia and here.

But British steelmen who have visited Russia calculate that the manager of an averaged-sized steel plant receives a reward equal to £12,000 a year in Britain. And if output goes up he gets an old-fashioned capitalist bonus on top.

It is pretty safe to say that no manager of such a steel plant in Britain has a pay packet of that size. Indeed, there are managing directors who draw much less.

In the coal industry the story is much the same. Management of a group of pits—a job rated at about £3,000 a year

here—is worth nearly £10,000 in Russia. Why, even our own Sir James Bowman, who as boss of the Coal Board is responsible for all the pits in Britain, is paid only £7,500 a year.

And when you turn to science the contrasts are even more startling.

Dr. Kurt Mendelssohn, of Oxford University, has revealed that a top-class physicist is paid up to 30,000 roubles a month. That is nominally equal to £32,000 a year in our money.

But a more accurate picture is given by Mendelssohn's calculation that in Britain a good physicist receives seven times as much as an unskilled labourer. In Russia he gets 25 times as much.

So can there be any doubt about the reasons for Russia's triumphs?

Brains are treated like any other commodity. By paying a high price for them an abundant supply is assured where they can be used to greatest advantage.

In Russia to-day the old egalitarian ideas have been buried. In their place are pay differentials wider probably than in any country in the world.

We have been saying for many years that Russia has all the essential features of a capitalist state—plus a few unpleasant ones of her own. It has taken Mr. Harris a long time to catch up. And now what does he say of Britain?

But in Britain? Here the differentials between the highest-paid and the lowest-paid have been steadily closing.

It is beyond dispute that most of the men at the top of industry and the professionals are worse off than before the war. But the wage-earners and many of the lower-paid salary workers have improved their position.

It is therefore in capitalist Britain where greater progress towards egalitarianism has taken place than in 'socialist' Russia. This distresses Mr. Bernard Harris. It should also distress, for different reasons, those who look to the Soviet Union to show the world a new way of living. Or are there any left?

Direct Action at Markyate

The inhabitants of Markyate, in Hertfordshire, had a complaint. For thirty years their village had been subjected to a grave toll of damage by the heavy traffic which passed through it. Then one day a little boy lost a leg in an accident and the villagers abandoned complaining and resorted to direct action.

"The villagers formed a by-pass committee," writes George Mell in a recent issue of *Revielle*, and paraded up and down the road, bringing traffic to a standstill for miles.

"The Government acted quickly. The mile-long by-pass that left Markyate in peace was started almost at once and was completed in record time. It was opened recently.

"So Markyate, the village where few people dared peep out of their front doors, has come to life again. Villagers can sleep at night. Even old folks dare cross the street to shop or talk to neighbours, and children can now walk to school unescorted."

FREEDOM PRESS

SELECTIONS FROM 'FREEDOM'

Vol. 1, 1951, *Mankind is One*
Vol. 2, 1952, *Postscript to Posterity*
Vol. 3, 1953, *Colonialism on Trial*
Vol. 4, 1954, *Living on a Volcano*
Vol. 5, 1955, *The Immoral Moralists*
Volume 6, 1956, *Oil and Troubled Waters*

each volume paper 7s. 6d.
cloth 10s. 6d.

The paper edition of the Selections is available to readers of *FREEDOM* at 5/- a copy

VOLINE :

Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed) cloth 12s. 6d.
The Unknown Revolution (Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21) cloth 12s. 6d.

V. RICHARDS :

Lessons of the Spanish Revolution 6s.

M. BAKUNIN :

Marxism, Freedom and the State. cloth 5s.

MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI :

Neither East nor West paper 7s. 6d.; cloth 10s. 6d.
Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute cloth 5s.
Journey Through Utopia cloth 18s. (U.S.A. \$3)

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. 2d.

F. A. RIDLEY :

The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age 2d.

K. J. KENAFICK :

Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx paper 6s.

★
27, Red Lion Street, London, W.C.1.

Colour Prejudice

Continued
from p. 1

him in the "whites only" Salisbury suburb of Mabelreign to develop into a noisy outcry. His view is that little or no attempts are being made to improve race relations and for this reason, coupled with his natural sympathy, he went out of his way to make African friends.

It will be argued by the apologists that these legal checks are temporary safeguards which in no way preclude the inevitable if slow move towards improved race relations, and are a far cry from the violence which we witnessed recently at Little Rock. Such arguments have only some validity if there were concrete signs indicating that a change is genuinely desired and definitely aimed at. Evidence from the Federation points in the opposite direction. Take for example only two of the paragraphs quoted in *The Observer* (17/11/57) from the Natives Registration and Identification Act 1957 (note the recent date) passed in the Southern Rhodesian Legislative Assembly last August:

"Any native who... is found in any district without a certificate, book, identity card or permit... shall be guilty of an offence and liable to... imprisonment for a period not exceeding three months."

"Any native male or female suspected or charged with any offence in contravention of the provisions of this Act may be arrested with or without warrant..."

Unfortunately we have not the full text of the provisions laid down in the Act, but we have enough information to give us a clear picture of the limitations placed on the Africans. Even the "safeguards" which are included in the Federal Constitution are now subject to an Amendment Bill due to be debated in the British Parliament this month and which if adopted will in effect "reduce the representation of African interests, with no compensation safeguards".

Apart from the mental attitude

which makes of every racist a candidate for the psychiatrist's couch there are strong economic reasons why the African population has to be controlled. Discussing this the author of the article from which we have already quoted points to the economic invasion of Central Africa from overseas with the accompanying demands "in the interest of security, overwhelming political power, and control of the African population". This well-meaning writer poses the question and answers in the affirmative: can economic initiative from overseas and African self-determination go hand in hand?

Our own view is that they cannot unless the owners of capital are prepared to concede to the Africans much more of the benefits which come from economic development. Not just a meagre handout pre-arranged by the investors, or a little political freedom well controlled by the white population but, to use a hackneyed and practically meaningless expression, an "equal partnership".

But any partnership based on economic necessity or reluctant political concessions can only lead to covert resentment or open strife. At best perhaps an uneasy semi-relationship enabling the participants to "rub along" for a time.

As far as we can judge the Africans in Southern Rhodesia have a long way to go before they even reach the latter stage of "emancipation".

The *Observer* writer while realising the need for change says that the people who pass these laws and "we who elect them" are not "bad" men but just ordinary people subject to economic force. This is a view of events with which we do not hold because it precludes the possibility of choice. Too many excuses have been made in the name of economic necessity for repressive measures and exploitation.

These ordinary people may not be bad in the sense that they do not starve or beat their native servants. They may go to Church every Sunday and contribute sums of money to charity. But how do we describe people who accept the Christian principle of equality before God for every man but do not accept it in human relationships when the humans happen to be black? What are we to think of people who uphold the democratic system and in practise operate the principles of rule by a racial élite? How are we to regard people who do not recognise freedom of choice is meaningless unless applicable on an individual level whether the person is black or white?

Are people who make and support laws which demand imprisonment for "any native who is found in any district without a permit" to be treated respectfully as good decent human beings? Our ideas of goodness differ. We see the herrenvolk as opportunistic and very inhuman in their treatment of their fellows, and cannot excuse their behaviour on the doubtful argument that they are really only victims of economic force.

NO-FARES TRAVEL?

Mr. Harry Knight, general secretary of the Association of Supervisory Staffs, Executives and Technicians, put forward on Saturday a no-fares travel plan for workers, housewives, schoolchildren and old-age pensioners. They would be supplied with national transport passes to enable them to travel anywhere by road or rail.

For this workers would have 2s. 6d. deducted from their weekly wage packets. This, Mr. Knight claims would provide £300 millions a year, which, added to freight charges, would not leave the Government with a very large deficit.

Mr. Knight, speaking in Sunderland, said that this would, in many instances, lead to considerable saving in wasteful labour. It would do away with booking offices and the necessity of printed tickets.

(Manchester Guardian).
[The idea is interesting though we cannot follow his arithmetic.—EDITORS.]

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

Power Complexes or Mutual Aid?

DEAR COMRADES,

In your issue of 9/11/57 Peter Lee produces some old chestnuts and rakes up some misconstrued Darwinian theories that are now reckoned to be inadequate. Anthropologists and biologists tend to encompass Kropotkin's contentions that the ability to co-operate and apply mutual aid has been an important factor in the development of human and animal societies.

Inevitably history is an account of the antics of those holding power, those that have wielded the sword rather than the spade tend to dominate the pages of our history books. Yet without a doubt it is the spade wielders that have made civilised life possible in spite of the difficulties imposed by the sword wielders.

We can only conjecture as to the type of society that existed prior to written history, although recent archeological discoveries tend to show that civilised life existed at a far earlier date than was once thought possible. Malinovsky and other anthropologists have made studies of existing societies that are matriarchal and where coercive power does not play such a large part in the social structure. Eskimo society was fairly libertarian and there is a possibility that these societies are survivals of a culture that was more widely spread.

The physical circumstances and the fears that encouraged the growth of coercive power in human society can well be imagined but the problems and circumstances that face mankind to-day are of a different order. Anarchists contend that these problems, lie in the coercive structure of society. Some people contend that there is a moral struggle between good and evil rather than accepting the idea that man is basically a social animal, whose anti-social behaviour is conditioned by a society that conflicts with his nature.

That branch of scientific work that is studying the mind of man can be the most fruitful sources of knowledge to those who seek to replace existing society with something better. It is in the field of

sociology and psychology that the anarchist contention that coercive power is a major source of individual and social conflict and is contrary to man's inner nature is finding support.

Coercive power has at its elbow such powerful weapons that human society like Peter Lee's beloved dinosaur will become extinct. Leaving Lee's jungle red in tooth and claw may I point out that Neill does not state that he can produce free adults from half free children in a half free school where he is forced to deny a very essential freedom, but his

The Purpose of Art

DEAR COMRADES,

D.R. and I appear to agree that art has a purpose, but not I think, on what that purpose is. I am most wary of his criterion of usefulness. To put one statement in reverse—is the most 'useful' work the product of the most 'capable' artist? I doubt it, for too many contradictions spring to mind (even if I agreed, which I do not, that the most capable artist is the greatest).—One being the Poster—hardly a work of creative art, yet an article of great usefulness.

What happens when we turn to music, we have "God Save the Queen" played at the end of cinema shows. It clears the crowd quicker than a March by Souza, by god! and what could be more useful to the staff.

From the pebble on the beach there are hundreds of articles in this world that we like to possess for their beauty of form and texture alone and, by so doing, satisfy some need in us that this implies. This of course doesn't make them works of art, but if they are present in such works then they must satisfy the same needs. Some painters and their public say that this is sufficient—so be it. I, personally, look for more—are we in agreement here?

steps in the right direction have had influence apart from the children that go there.

In society there are always some more aware, more articulate than their fellows, who express more volubly the inner desires and needs of their fellow men. Though anarchists are but a small section of society the influence of the ideas are spreading and they are receiving daily confirmation.

Fraternally,
Uckfield, Nov. 15. ALAN ALBON.

The Purpose of Art

Is there any significance in the fact that poetry was omitted from the second paragraph? It would be a pity if it had also to fulfil some bill of usefulness. Surely there has been poetry written which has tried to be more than just entertaining.

The sentence "a Musical composition is meant to be performed often in particular circumstances" seems to be just a little ambiguous. Surely it has to be performed in particular circumstances to become a musical composition, otherwise it remains a sheet of paper covered with those black things. It fulfils its purpose on becoming sound—it doesn't necessarily have to accompany anything—it stands complete in itself.

My complaint with most present-day work is the fact that it contains so little of the essential emotions, longings and fears of humanity; there are far too many pebbles. Anger, pity, sadness, joy, a sense of justice, a refusal to conform—these and more seem to me to be missing, certainly from the gallery walls. Who is to blame for this state of things? The painter or the dealers? I have yet to discover.

Yours,
Newport, Nov. 12. MILWARD CASEY.

FANTASY - I

You Gotta Dig Deep

ONLY the other day a character drops into the office and offers to do an M.R. job on our consumers. Keeping our feet on the desk and an eye on the typewriter we ask him to say it again in English.

Our consumers it seems are the readers of *FREEDOM* or any self-styled anarchist, depending on how you look at it. Taking the narrower commercial view our problem is plain, at least in principle.

"Let's suppose the circulation of *FREEDOM* is 10,000," says this character.

"Let's suppose again," says the Editor.

"Never mind the actual figure," snaps the character. He is a bit rattled at not getting the wavelength. The right echo is informative, enthusiastic and eager to hear more, but that's an idealistic way of looking at things. Not realistic, see.

Anyway, realism is this guy's middle name, because he ain't handicapped by preconceptions, misconceptions or any other kind of ideas about what human nature ought to be like. He's strictly commercial.

You want to sell soap? Right, he digs deep. Way down into the subterranean reaches of what passes for the consumer's mind. And what does he find? Guilt. That's what he finds. Every time you take a bath you wash away your sins. Conclusion: sell soap in the shape of a crucifix. We make a noise like we ain't impressed.

"O.K.," says this character, "So you're shrewd, eh?" and he drops us a wink that shows all his front teeth sparkling with brightness added to whiteness. "The fact remains that people don't act the way you think they ought to."

"You're really homing on the beam this time, Jackson," breathes the Editor.

"What I mean is, people ain't rational."

"Get any closer to the target and you'll go up in your own mushroom, Jackson." (The guy's name isn't Jackson, and the Editor is never nearer to anything that flies than a domestic saucer or the pigeons in Trafalgar Square, but he just reads American war books. A cryptoescapist).

"This ain't so obvious," says Jackson. (He gets me doing it now. What the hell. The guy's name might be Jackson for all I know).

"For instance, do you know that people don't buy cars as a means of transport?" He gets a chorus of raised eyebrows.

FANTASY - 2

Anything You Can Do...

SURELY the sensible thing would have been to send Marshal Zhukov up in Sputnik II? Not only would this have silenced those countless numbers of humane people who suffer from varying degrees of hysteria at the prospects of one small dog losing its life (naturally they keep a stiff upper lip when thousands of human beings are killed by a bomb), but it would also have "solved" the Marshal for ever, and indicated that sense of equality of endeavour which the Russian hierarchy have so long claimed for themselves.

The Marshal could even have made a last heroic speech, timed to a nicety so that his closing remarks would end with a triumphant explosion (as he neatly catapults towards the moon), clutching in one hand a copy of the Soviet Constitution and in the other a large red flag. This could have been the greatest-ever incentive to the Russian people to strive harder—yet for that Socialist utopia which, they are informed, is already in being.

Patently the reaction in America would be tremendous—colossal even. Without question the Pentagon people, ably assisted by the Democrats, would not rest until by superhuman effort and possibly \$500,000 million dollars, they had succeeded in placing a satellite in an orbit round the moon, containing President Eisenhower accompanied by Mamie and a skeleton staff from the White House. From the drawing-room suite aboard the 163-ton satellite "Way of Life", the President would broadcast a stirring message to the peoples of the world (carried on all networks by permission of "Tite-feel"—the girdle manufacturers). As the opening chords of "The Stars and Stripes" crash out the President would be catapulted downwards, to land 4½ minutes later in the centre of Madison Square Garden.

The Russians would never recover.

"No. They buy power symbols. They gotta buy something that'll express their unconscious need for power." We sigh sympathetically and look out of the window at our 1932 Austin 7. Jesus, he's so right!

"Look what happens to Chrysler when they assume that people are rational. Everyone tells them that a small car would be so handy. Easy to park. All that sorta crap. No heavy chrome and fancy trimmings like built-in stereo-TV. So they build a small car and pass the saving onto the consumer, and what do they get? They lose half their goddam customers because people just don't know what they want. Not at the conscious level, see?" We see.

It seems too that people buy hard-top convertibles because they really want to buy a fast (dig the innuendo, Buster) sports (dig again, Mac), model (keep digging, son), which is like a mistress, but feel impelled to buy a respectable sedan like a wife. We don't see. We go for a mistress every time. Jackson guesses we are atypical. At least we feel understood. Motivation Research is here to stay.

BOB GREEN.

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

NOV. 24 — F. A. Ridley on GUY FAWKES—THE MAN AND HIS TIMES
DEC. 1—Axel Hoch on AM I MY BROTHER'S EATER?
DEC. 8—Bob Green on SOME SHIBBOLETHS OF ANARCHISM.

Questions, Discussion and Admission all free.

HAMPSTEAD LIBERTARIAN GROUP

Fortnightly public discussions are held on alternate Mondays at 7.45 p.m. in the basement of 12, Oak Hill Park (off Frognal) N.W.3. Nearest tube station: Hampstead (Northern Line).

Dec. 2: ANARCHISM AS I SEE IT introduced by Philip Holgate.

★ Malatesta Club ★

SWARAJ HOUSE, 32 PERCY STREET, TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD, LONDON, W.1.

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

Every Wednesday at 8 p.m.
BONAR THOMPSON speaks

INTERNATIONAL ANARCHIST CENTRE MEETINGS

Discussion Meetings every Thursday at 8 p.m.

Every Friday and Saturday:
SOCIAL EVENINGS

Saturday Night is Skiffle Night
Admission and Coffee:
Members 1/6
Non-members 2/-

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