

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"I had rather record a thousand errors on the side of mercy than be obliged to tell one act of severe justice."  
—THOMAS PAINE

## WASN'T KELSO COCHRANE A MAN?

LAST Saturday Kelso Cochrane was buried. He was the young West Indian who was stabbed to death in a Street in Notting Hill on Whit Sunday by a gang of about six white youths.

The direct motive for the murder is not clear. Cochrane's wallet was missing and he was thought to have been stopped with a demand for money and on refusal a rough-house started which ended in the wicked flash of the flick-knife. But it is easy to jump to racial conclusions, and to argue that Cochrane was picked upon by the white boys because he was coloured or that they would not have gone so far had he been white.

Probably a mixture of motives and chance circumstances are nearer the truth. The pathetic youths who carry knives must all have their secret 'Walter Mitty' fantasies in which they deal a hated enemy a mortal blow; in their frustrated, mean and restricted lives violence represents almost the only outlet which is acceptable in their social (or does break out—and any excuse will do—the opportunity comes to use the secret weapon, to prove themselves to be tough, ruthless characters like those in nine movies out of ten.

Perhaps Cochrane was the first person to come along after the gang decided to raise the taxi-fare home by a hold up. Or perhaps the young assassin had bought his nice new shiny knife only that very evening and was itching to use it. Anyone would do, and a lonely coloured man in a darkened street at two in the morning was a perfect opportunity.

### Stabbings between Whites

The fact that Cochrane was coloured may have been an added temptation. It seems to us unlikely that it was the prime motive—even for the attack. After all, stabbings are the fashion just now. Marwood was hanged last month for killing a policeman with a knife during an affray in the street. Terence Cooney, a Dagenham boy, was jailed for life this week for stabbing another lad from Canning Town in a dance-hall brawl in Barking—because he came from Canning Town. An imagined

### LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP ANNUAL SUMMER SCHOOL. AUGUST BANK HOLIDAY

We regret that owing to the loss of club premises we are unable to hold our Summer School in London this year.

It may be possible, however, to arrange for a week-end "School" outside London but it might be necessary to camp out. So far we have only made tentative enquiries about sleeping, cooking and discussion room facilities, but we can investigate thoroughly if sufficient people are interested.

Please contact the above group c/o Freedom Press within a week/ten days if interested, with details of 'possessions'; how many tents, sleeping bags, etc?

slight between one gang and another is enough to start trouble—it is very dangerous to laugh at a Teddy Boy's hair style, for instance—and once the trouble starts, defeat must be prevented at all costs.

The case of Kelso Cochrane has been given added significance, though, because of his colour and because it came after a period of time when the Press had been warning us to expect new outbreaks of racialism in Notting Hill. Almost as though they wanted more riots, the London papers have been spotlighting this seedy area and prophesying that more riots were on the way. In this (a fine circulation boost) they have been disappointed. But they have had a murder, so that's something to be going on with.

For the coloured peoples' organisations, Cochrane's murder has provided a rallying point. Understandably, they are alarmed; understandably they are building Cochrane into a martyr in an attempt to stir the consciences of the whites.

But, alas, the taint of racialism and nationalism which is the slimy veneer of white prejudice has touched them too. Behind the appeals for unity one hears the assertion of nationhood, not manhood, of national sovereignty, of African nationalism, not personal sovereignty or internationalism.

### Do they Seek a Martyr?

Kelso Cochrane's funeral was an impressive and dignified affair. A large crowd followed the carriages to Kensal Green cemetery and many hundreds of whites and coloureds lined the route, paying their respects

to a victim of stupid and unreasoning violence. The spirit there was one of mourning and shame.

But the next day at Trafalgar Square it was rather a different story. A demonstration had marched from Hyde Park, organised by the Afro-Asian Congress to 'make this Sunday a day of remembrance for a dear brother who was murdered because of the colour of his skin.'

The members of this Congress are determined (in spite of lack of evidence) to make Cochrane's a racial murder. As though they feel they need one, they are determined to make him a martyr. Most unfortunate of all, they launched an emotional appeal to raise funds to send his body back to Antigua, where he came from, back to 'his own people', and throughout the speeches were references to the fact that he was of African descent. The chairman (an African) went so far as to say 'He was not English, he did not belong here, so his body should go back where it belongs.'

This seems to us to be a colossal error, a sad and stupid mistake. To say such things is playing straight into the hands of the fascists who say exactly the same thing themselves—though they would probably add: 'Why wait till they're dead—send 'em back now!' To think in such terms is to think in terms of division, not of unity, of withdrawal, even in death, not of coming together in life.

If the Afro-Asian Congress want to put up a monument to Cochrane (as they announce they will do in Antigua) surely the place to do it is in London, where he was killed. If they want to rub London's nose in its shame, an annual pilgrimage to a

monument in London will be an everlasting reminder.

But if they shift the body to the West Indies, only the West Indians will remember. It is the English who should not be allowed to forget.

But what is it we should remember? That Kelso Cochrane was a

West Indian 'of African descent'? No: we should remember that Kelso was a man and a victim of other victims. The 'poor white trash' who murdered Cochrane are equally the victims of ignorance and poverty—and nationalism.

To think in the national terms is to court defeat and further disaster. The West Indians, the Africans, the Asians and the Europeans are all human beings. The aim should be to unite them in life, not to divide them, even in death.

## The I.C.F.T.U. Reports on S. African Slave Labour

THE report from two officials of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions on "appalling labour conditions in South Africa" seems to add little to the findings of a United Nations Commission a few years ago on slave labour in South Africa and other countries, including areas under British jurisdiction.

The intention of the I.C.F.T.U., which is to submit a report "to the International Labour Organisation's forced Labour committee on the low cost prison labour being exploited by some sections of the South African Community, and on other instances of harsh treatment of African workers" may focus world attention on their plight, but this has been done before to little effect.

It is a good thing nevertheless that there has been sufficient interest aroused by the Secretariat of the Free Trade Unions to the extent of sending a mission to South Africa, but it is difficult to see how changes can be made unless members of the I.C.F.T.U. are prepared to take measures on an international scale which may help to improve conditions for African labourers. As far

as we know no such proposals have as yet been made.

It is generally our view that workers "on the spot" are best fitted to organise themselves for revolt, but even with our second-hand knowledge of the circumstances under which many Africans have to work, it seems obvious that cowed and deprived men need help from fellow workers who are relatively fit, well fed and free.

We are terribly aware of the limitations of constitutional protest against a totalitarian country by people from outside, and yet few other means are possible. All that can be done, therefore, is to use every means available to harass dictatorships. This need not stop at written protests through the United Nations or other channels but, and here the International Confederations of Free Trade Unions are really in a position to act, a general strike in countries where labour is relatively free against the treatment of black South Africans.

IT is obvious from the feeble whimpers of most white South Africans who "do not like" what their government is doing that help for the Africans cannot be expected from that quarter. Most of them enjoy a standard of living which is sustained by cheap labour comparable only to a tiny privileged minority in this country, it is, therefore unlikely that the majority of whites, even the ones who claim to have "sympathy" with the Africans, are going to "stick out their necks" too far. The South African government is well aware of the type of white people (the majority) they are dealing with. That, and the apathy of the blacks, make it possible for the government to pass the kind of Bill such as the recent one which will set in motion the establishment of separate 'black states' with the illusion of self government.

There are 3,000,000 whites and 9,600,000 blacks in South Africa. Under the new Bill the latter will be given 13% of the poorest land. The partition of the country into black and white states, even with the ostensible aim of self government for the blacks means little change in reality as the following report shows:

"Except for the territory of Transkei, the Bantus' councillors will be appointed by the government (elected officials, the Prime Minister blandly explained, are interested mainly in getting re-elected). White officials are empowered to veto anything the native authorities do, and each Bantustan treasury will be under strict government control. The major immediate effect of the bill, in fact, will be to remove a voice from Parliament that can be a nuisance, but never a threat, to the government—that of the seven white Senators and Assemblymen who are there specifically to represent the rights of the Bantus."

## Reflections on Double-Think and the Law

### ... But Some are More Innocent than Others

SECTION 44 of the Criminal Justice Act, 1948 (now incorporated in the Costs in Criminal Cases Act, 1952) provided generally that the Courts could order the payment out of local funds of the accused's costs on an acquittal. In 1952 the High Court judges approved a circular sent out to the assize, sessions and magistrates' courts by the Home Office to the effect that costs should be awarded under this provision "only in exceptional circumstances". Lord Goddard, then Lord Chief Justice, added that while Parliament had clearly not imposed any limit on the discretion of the Courts,

"it was never intended, and it would be quite wrong, that costs should be awarded as of course to every defendant who is acquitted. Its use should be reserved for exceptional cases, and every case should be considered on its merits."

Mr. R. E. Seaton, Chairman of London Sessions in replying to criticisms of the refusal of himself and a fellow-judge to grant costs to accused persons who had recently been acquitted and discharged in those courts, referred to Lord Goddard's ruling which, he declared, "could not be a clearer direction".

All that is clear, to our minds, in this "direction" is that judges and magistrates are given arbitrary powers to as it were "override" the verdicts of juries or, in the case of magistrates, their own verdicts by directing that acquitted persons should nevertheless pay their own

costs.\* For how can one remove from such terms as "Exceptional cases" or that "every case should be considered on its merits", the personal prejudices of the judge or magistrate?

A judge may well disagree with the verdict of a jury, just as a magistrate may be obliged to acquit a defendant (not because he is worried overmuch by the factual weakness of the prosecutor's case, but because he knows that if he convicts on his "hunch" of the defendant's guilt, his decision may well be reversed by a higher court—assuming, of course, that the defendant is in a position to pay for the services of a practitioner of the law who can pin-point the weaknesses of the prosecution's case and the magistrate's conclusions). But both the judge and magistrate can have the last word when it comes to the question of costs, with significant results so far as the defendant is concerned. By being refused costs not only is the defendant, in many cases, put to serious financial embarrassment but in the eyes of the public, doubt is cast on his innocence. And this important fact was

\*In his statement, Mr. Seaton pointed out that "This court has followed the practice of other courts of Quarter Sessions and Assizes in this country. The question as to the award of costs is governed by the Costs in Criminal Cases Act, and the discretion is entirely in the hands of the judge who tries the case." (Our italics).

underlined by Mr. Seaton in his statement when he declared

"There is a misconception as to the state of affairs in a criminal trial because it has been alleged that if they are innocent they are entitled to their costs. The innuendo is that the person acquitted is obviously an innocent person."

Though Mr. Seaton was replying to public and Press criticism he was obviously not using the term "innuendo" in a way which has meaning for the public ("an insinuation; usually spoken or written in derogation; as damaging "innuendos"). Nevertheless even in its legal connotation its use in the present legal context is worth noting. *Funk and Wagnell* give the legal definition as

In pleading, an explanatory phrase employed to make a previous phrase more explicit, as in saying "the perjured villain, meaning the plaintiff" in which case the phrase "meaning the plaintiff" is an innuendo.

To the layman the cynicism contained in this illustration of the definition surely takes a lot of beating! To the layman the acquitted man is an innocent man. If he isn't then neither is the man who is found guilty necessarily guilty of the crimes of which he has been accused.

BUT whereas Mr. Seaton in his statement makes no suggestion that a person found guilty either by

PEOPLE AND IDEAS:

# THE WALLS OF PREJUDICE

"As long as to-day's problems are stated in terms of 'mass politics' and 'mass organisation', it is clear that only States and mass parties can deal with them. But if the solutions that can be offered by States and parties are acknowledged to be either futile or wicked, or both, then we must look not only for different 'solutions' but especially for different ways of stating the problems themselves . . . There are men and women. As units in a 'mass' they submit to uniform rules of housing, eating, and dressing; go to the factory or to the movies; vote for a party or acclaim a Leader . . . Yet each one of them has been a child. Each one has made by himself and for himself, the discovery of the world and of his own consciousness . . . Even in the greyest existence there are traces of aspiration to a life less debased, to a real communion with ones' neighbours. One can hardly imagine a human life without some moments of carefree enjoyment and enthusiasm . . ."

"Friendships should be strengthened through some constructive enterprise carried out in common. The humblest aims from an association for mutual help to a club where people meet to spend time together, can eventually lead to an association whose unwritten norms will actually inspire both the private and the public life of its components."

—ANDREA CAFFI.

ON March 9th, 1959, the Oxford City Council demolished the walls which had been built across two streets twenty-five years earlier by an estate development company in order to segregate their private housing from the council house tenants on the other side. The City Council first demolished them in 1938 but had to build them again after losing the resultant legal battle. One of them was knocked down in 1943 by the army and re-erected by the War Office. Finally, this year the Council succeeded in buying the walls for about £1,000 in order to demolish them.

This story reminds us that prejudice is not the monopoly of the poor and ignorant, and that it is not confined to 'race relations'. The prejudiced person is almost invariably one who sees the members of the 'out-group' as "in some way or other constituting a threat to his own personal security and status". The work of

cure for the 'abolish capitalism' type is neither quick nor simple and is only tinkering with one facet of a much wider problem."

Should there be a law?

Nor did he put much faith in legislation, which "may reduce the symptoms, but leaves the disease unchecked." A slightly different view is taken by Prof. Allport, in an American context. Legislation, he says, if enforced

"may be a sharp tool in the battle against discrimination . . . Legal action however, has only an indirect bearing upon the reduction of personal prejudice. It cannot coerce thoughts or instil subjective tolerance . . . Law is intended only to control the outward expression of intolerance. But outward action, psychology knows, has an eventual effect upon inner habits of thought and feeling. And for this reason we list legislative action as one of the major methods of reducing, not only public discrimination, but private prejudice as well."

But in the different circumstances of this country, with no official tradition of discrimination (except the Coloured Alien Seamen Order of 1925, which would never have been enacted in the climate of to-day), the Labour Party's declared intention of introducing legislation against "discrimination in all places to which the public have access or are invited, with or without payment" seems to be more the result of a desire to 'do something' about prejudice, than of a hope of really diminishing it by this means. It would apply to hotels, shops and places of entertainment, but as Fenner Brockway admitted in

Adorno and his colleagues in America (*The Authoritarian Personality*, 1950) and of Eysenck in this country (*The Psychology of Politics*, 1954) suggests that the person who is hostile to Negroes as a group, is also anti-semitic, and has a whole range of other hierarchical, authoritarian, exploitive and anti-rational attitudes which do not at first sight seem related to each other. It is difficult however to find a dividing line between people whose prejudice is an aspect of their personality and those for whom it is merely an unthinking acceptance of popular stereotypes. No-one is born prejudiced, but, concludes Anthony Richmond,

"Severe prejudice is a product of basic personality traits. One of the most important functions of the home is to provide an atmosphere of love and security, in which the child can grow to view life experiences as rewarding rather than deprivational. The building up of such personalities begins at birth and continues throughout life. Radical changes may be necessary in traditional parent/child relationships if adults with balanced integrated personalities are to be created who can face difficulties without undue anxiety, and who do not need to resort to violent prejudices to maintain their own self-esteem. Clearly the development of a secure home background must be accompanied by a social system in which there is a minimum of avoidable occasions for fear: unemployment, war and all the other causes of fear in social life must be removed if a society free of prejudice is to be created."

No-one can doubt that this is so. The relation between insecurity and prejudice was succinctly illustrated in an American investigation by correlating the rise and fall of the price of cotton with the annual number of lynchings. The outbreaks of racial violence in Nottingham and Notting Hill last year coincided with the rise in unemployment. Mr. Richmond's study of prejudice against West Indians in Liverpool led him to the hypothesis that *prejudice* is a function of social and sexual status factors, but that discrimination tends to be governed more by economic considerations.

But we cannot, in practice, postpone attempts to reduce prejudice until all our other social and economic problems are solved, any more than we can refrain from attempting to wean the authoritarian character from his "ethnocentrism", however early in life he may have developed it. James Robb observed in his investigation of anti-semitism that, though its connection with social and economic upheavals is too well-attested for its importance to be denied, the connection is neither simple nor direct. Certainty of employment, better housing and other social reforms, can lower its incidence "by avoiding the activation of prejudice potential in individuals whose personalities are inclined towards this reaction," and Dr. Robb concluded that

"Considering how difficult it is to achieve these desirable states even when motivations far stronger than the wish to lessen anti-semitism are present, it does not seem advisable to place too much hope in social reform as a primary, short-term attack on prejudice. It is quite certain that the quick and simple

introducing his original Bill, "it is not possible, for example, to say that a woman who provides lodgings should necessarily include in her home a lodger against whom she feels a prejudice or who may arouse prejudice among other lodgers." Mr. Brockway's Bill also covers discriminatory clauses in leases whose legality and effectiveness is already doubtful: there has so far been no test case. As to discrimination in employment, Mr. Brockway admits that "it is always possible for an employer to say that work or promotion is refused on other grounds" and the same must also be true of refusal of admittance to hotels and places of public entertainment. However, as the law stands at present, Mr. Learie Constantine was awarded damages in court as a result of being refused accommodation at a well-known London hotel.

When we see how little it would affect the actual situation, the call for a law against discrimination, like that for a law against provocation appears to be an unconscious evasion of the idea of personal responsibility. The one thing that can really be said in favour of legislation is its effect on the morale of coloured people, who frequently point out that they have no means of appeal or redress against discrimination.

How prejudiced are we?

It used to be said that one-third of the population of Britain is extremely prejudiced towards coloured people, that one-third was mildly prejudiced and that one-third was tolerant. But an enquiry conducted by Dr. Michael Banton in 1956 indicated a much greater prevalence of benevolent attitudes. "The crux of the problem", says Mr. John Dar-

ragh after his investigation in Birmingham, "appears to be in the fact that most people think others more prejudiced than themselves. Their behaviour is determined by what they believe, or wish to believe, is the view of others". Dr. Kenneth Little, who first put forward the "class theory" of colour prejudice, points out that people's social "class" in this country is largely determined by the people with whom they associate, and that as a dark skin colour, because of its association with subject peoples, indicates a low "class" status, "some English persons believe that they will jeopardise, if not lose, their social status in the eyes of their friends and acquaintances by association with a coloured person". Thus, "people resist the entry of coloured workers to their occupations, or deplore their obtaining houses in white neighbourhoods, because their presence is thought to indicate that the job or neighbourhood is at the bottom of the social scale." One landlady, interviewed in A. T. Carey's study of the problems of colonial students, declared: "Of course, I don't take blacks; I'm sorry for the darkies, that I am, but I don't know what the neighbours would say: look at Mrs. So-and-so! She really has come down in the world."

Dr. Banton concluded from his investigations that

"When people attribute inter-group friction to prejudice they tend to regard prejudice as irrational, as something which, regrettably, will always be with us and which we cannot do anything about. But we reach a less pessimistic conclusion if, instead, we see social behaviour towards the immigrants less as an acting out of individual sentiment

Continued on p. 4

## FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

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

New Books . . .

The Comrade Caesar Pavese 15/-  
Social and Cultural Dynamics P. Sorokin 50/-

Reprints and Cheap Editions . . .

Master and Man Leo Tolstoy 8/6  
Waiting for Godot  
The Assassin Samuel Beckett 4/6  
Advocate for the Dead Liam O'Flaherty 2/6  
Alex Weissberg 2/6

Second-Hand . . .

The Sudden View Sybil Bedford 5/-  
Behind the Battle T. C. Worsley 4/-  
World Within World  
The Problem of Leisure Stephen Spender 5/-  
Henry Durant 5/-  
Teddy Boys' Picnic Elizabeth Stucley 8/-  
My Siberian Life M. A. Novomeysky 8/6  
Other Men's Graves Peter Neumann 10/-  
The Structure of Community George H. Gibson 2/6  
Assignment in Utopia Eugene Lyons 3/6  
Arrow in the Blue Arthur Koestler 5/6  
Memories and Studies William James 5/6  
Hermesprung Robert Bage 5/-  
The Censor Marches On Morris L. Ernst and Alexander Lindey 6/-  
Where We Came Out Granville Hicks 3/-  
The Development of the Monist View of History G. Plekanhov 6/-  
The Fields at Evening Ethel Mannin 4/-  
John Cornford: A Memoir (ed. Pat Sloan) 4/-  
Narrow Boat L. T. C. Rolt 5/6  
Socialism Inevitable Gaylord Wilshire 5/-  
The Revolution in the Baltic Provinces of Russia (1905) E. O. F. Ames 7/6

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**

## 'I think your Bedrooms are Wonderful!'

"BE you in the Park about midnight and you shall see wonders," said Shakespeare, and it is true that, although the climate isn't that of the Garden of Eden, the Park has played a fruitful role in our rough island story. From Falstaff, who, on being apprehended in Windsor Park, declared indignantly "This is enough to be the decay of lust and late walking through the realm," to Dylan Thomas, up to no good in Cwmdonkin Park, Swansea; the Park has been the Elysium of the urban British. Peter Shephard sees the *jardin anglais* as "fitting closely the permanent liberal and anti-authoritarian trends of English thought", and an admiring Dane, S. E. Rasmussen remarks that

"The London Park is the ideal place for an outdoor life. Formerly the park had been a purpose in itself: its only aim was to look beautiful. But in these last 100 years the English have taught the world that the town parks must be utilized more intensively. They might be regarded as some sort of supply service of hygienic importance just as water supply, common sewers, etc."

Rasmussen's splendid book on London was written many years ago, and it is good to learn that we English have taken the point. Another sympathetic foreign observer, Dr. Billy Graham, known to his friends as God's Public Relations Officer, dropped into London this week and told his Press Conference:

"Yesterday afternoon my wife and I took a walk through the parks—Hyde Park, Green Park and St. James's Park—just at about dusk and I could hardly believe it.

"They looked as if they had been turned into bedrooms, with people lying all over the place in all sorts of conditions."

"Your parks are like bedrooms"—what a delicious thought, especially these days when bedrooms are getting more and more like parks. Nothing new about it of course: 350 years ago another clergyman, John Donne wrote that poem that begins.

Where, like a pillow on a bed,  
A pregnant banke swel'd up, to rest  
The violet's reclining head,  
Sat we two, one another's best.

And Sir Philip Sidney, at about the same time pointed out that the park was the best place:

"In a grove most rich of shade  
Where birds wanton music made,  
Asthrope with Stella sweet  
Did for mutual comfort meet.  
Never season was more fit,  
Never room more apt for it.

When you look into the matter, it is hard to find an Elizabethan poem or madrigal that isn't about making love in parks. Perhaps the New Elizabethan Age is rediscovering what made Britain great. Certainly the admonition "Keep Off the Grass" is being replaced by the more appropriate request "Please Adjust Your Dress Before Leaving".

But I have an awful feeling that I misunderstood Dr. Graham. Because although he wanted to hear the birds' wanton music, it didn't provide any mutual comfort for him and his wife:

"Where once we could walk through the London parks and enjoy the birds and the ducks and the water, it was so embarrassing even to walk through that finally I took my wife out.

"We have made idols of people who put their emphasis on this point. I think the new generation coming along are far better acquainted with Jane Mansfield's statistics than they are with the seventh commandment.

"This is a danger to our culture. It is a terrible thing and one of the factors which destroyed Rome and other cities. "It is going to bring the Judgment of God on any city that goes the way of Sodom and Gomorrah."

At least that is what the *Evening News* (8/6/59) said he said. The *Star* said it was the second commandment. The *Evening Standard* agreed it was the seventh and obligingly inserted the text. It just shows how you ought to read all the evening papers, or best of all, none.

Dr. Graham added that over-emphasis on sex was one of the dangers faced by the Western world. And he's right of course. See how those Russians manage without it. And the Chinese, there's one born every minute, so they say. Sex has its proper place but the trouble is the place ain't big enough. And that brings us back to the park. This is what Lewis Mumford says about it in *The Culture of Cities*:

"For lack of such space in America, a whole generation of girls and boys has grown up, cramped in the vulgar promiscuities of the automobile, carrying into their erotic life the taint of something that is harried, esthetically embarrassing and emotionally disintegrating. The home, the garden, the park, must be planned for lovers and for love-making: that is an essential aspect of an environment designed for human growth."

Plan the park for lovers, says Mumford. A bed of roses all the way; which is just what God meant for Adam and Eve before that nosy-parker of a snake-in-the-grass felt embarrassed sneaking through. Dr. Graham also said:

"As I stood at the foot of Queen Victoria's statue in front of Buckingham Palace, I could not help but think that one of the things that made Britain great was her moral and spiritual power. If she ever loses her spiritual strength all is lost."

He must have meant our love of fresh air and outdoor bedrooms. They didn't have parks in Sodom and Gomorrah.

C.W.



'But we all worship God in our own humble way, my son.'

## ... But Some are More Innocent than Others

Continued from p. 1

jury or by magistrate may have been wrongfully condemned, he does question that acquittal is proof of innocence.

"That requires a little thought, because in this country—England there are only two verdicts that a jury can return, guilty or not guilty. In Scotland there are three verdicts, the two I have mentioned and a third of 'Not proven.' In many cases where an acquittal takes place it means in effect that the Crown have not satisfied the onus of proof and the jury have quite properly acquitted the accused person.

But however "properly" the jury may have acted,

"When the time comes, as it does occasionally, for the accused person to apply for costs, it is for the judge who tries the case to consider the facts he has heard. He is the best judge of what has occurred, together with the jury and counsel engaged in the case.

"The judge has to exercise his discretion on the facts as they emerged in the case."

Note that though Mr. Seaton cannot, without pouring scorn on the system, not assume that the "best judge of what has happened" in a trial is not only himself but also "the jury and counsel engaged in the case", when it comes to costs "it is for the judge who tries the case to consider the facts he has heard", for him to "exercise his discretion on the facts as they emerged in the case"! And by his ruling regarding the costs he can, so far as the public is concerned, virtually reverse the verdict of the jury.

This was the view taken by the couple who were recently acquitted at London Sessions of committing a "lewd, obscene and disgusting" act in a parked car, for, as their solicitor pointed out in a press statement last week:

Mr. Seaton [though he was not the judge of the trial and has no personal knowledge of the case] has nevertheless created an opportunity of commenting on the failure of another judge to award costs in their favour in terms which imply that they were not innocent of the offence against public decency with which they were charged.

Mr. Seaton has replied that in his statement he did not refer to their case. "I was merely laying down general principles.

It occurs to me, by way of example, we may have a case where a man is charged with receiving stolen property and one of the ingredients is that the Crown has to satisfy the jury that the person having the property knew when he got it that it was stolen.

"From time to time persons charged with this offence are acquitted, and they may apply for costs. It may transpire that where the jury were not satisfied it is abundantly clear that the person in the dock was grossly negligent, and that is the acid test as to whether the person in the dock is innocent. In that case no court would award costs. The second consideration is if the police have behaved improperly in bringing the prosecution and in their conduct of the case. If that has happened then a court might be disposed to award costs."

Where it is "abundantly clear" that the person in the dock was innocent but "grossly negligent", "no court would award costs" but where the police "have behaved improperly in bringing the prosecution and in their conduct of the case" then "a court might be disposed to award costs" (our italics). Note the emphatic "No court, etc." on the one hand and "a court might, etc." on the other. Mr. Seaton in his statement refers to

One organ of the press [which] went so far as to suggest that this court was

a prosecution court, an allegation which, I am happy to say, has now been withdrawn.

If that allegation has been withdrawn and Mr. Seaton now feels happy, we reiterate it on the basis of his own words (assuming that when a lawyer uses words they are measured, and that we are justified in drawing conclusions from the nuances as quoted above) and hope we can make him feel unhappy!

★

WE are continually reminded that under English law every man is deemed to be innocent until he is proved to be guilty.

In theory then, the role of the prosecution is to seek to establish the truth. In practise the police and prosecutors are just as concerned to secure a conviction as the defence lawyers are to secure an acquittal. For those involved it is all part of an elaborate game, in which questions of pride, of promotion and future Briefs play a large part in the conduct of cases. If the prosecution is only concerned with the truth then no policeman would ever manufacture evidence and no prosecution witness tell a lie. Yet the accused, far from feeling confident that justice will be done, engages as many legal experts as he can afford or can ill-afford, to prove that the prosecution witnesses are lying! The accused, far from being considered innocent until proved guilty, is assumed by Press and public to be probably guilty until he can prove that he is not.

Everything is loaded against the accused: judges and magistrates assume that police witnesses tell the truth whereas witnesses for the defence have been primed by wily solicitors; the accused is often held in custody at the request of the prosecution because he might obstruct their job of obtaining the evidence they require against him; he has to prepare his defence from his cell and meet his solicitor in a room in the prison, or perhaps not until the case comes up for trial.

The prosecution spares no expense in building up its case while the accused may either have to rely on the charity of the court or employ the services of lawyers (and, as one of our legal friends once put it, "you get as much law as you can pay for"). At the trial the accused has the right to refuse to go into the witness box to be grilled by the wiggled Inquisition. If he refuses then in exercising his right he has added to the suspicion of his guilt. The judge in addressing the jury will probably remind them that the law confers on the prisoner the right to refuse to give evidence and will add "but members of the jury, you may perhaps take the view that an innocent man has nothing to hide and would welcome an opportunity to take the stand, etc."

★

TRUTH, which every witness swears will be the basis of his evidence to the court is the last thing one expects in a court of law where neither the prosecution nor the defence are bent on establishing the truth but on successfully suppressing, distorting or exploiting it for their respective ends. Prosecuting counsel and Police want a conviction; defending counsel want an acquittal; neither side is particularly interested in the fate of the man in the dock; he is merely the justification for this lucrative battle of wits, umpired by a member of the legal fraternity.

It is not surprising that in the circumstances some who are guilty are acquitted and others who are innocent are found guilty. But if the acquittal is not proof of innocence neither is a verdict of guilty proof of guilt. And we suspect that for these reasons steps will now be taken by the Government to direct the courts to allow "reasonable" costs to defendants who have secured acquittal. After all it's better to make the rate-payers pay than that the Law should be made to look silly!

## BOOK REVIEWS

# TRIBUTES TO WILHELM REICH

WILHELM REICH edited by Paul Ritter. The Ritter Press, Nottingham, 10s.

"He has rendered to our knowledge and to our further development extremely important facts and experiences, which have helped to improve psychoanalytic technique and thinking, contributed to the field of sexology, to political evaluation and theory, to anthropological thinking, to psychomatic medicine, and maybe also valuable hypotheses to 'basic' research. He always stimulated the sincere search for truth. The tragedy of his death should remind people, belonging either to professional or political movements, that a human being, creative for the future, has a right to be well-treated."

—NIC WAAL.

"Reich always had the tendency to publish his new findings somewhat too early—long before his concepts could be understood theoretically or semantically. He was always thoroughly upset and disappointed when people did not understand or when they misunderstood him. He was frantically irritated when people were slow in understanding or when they were directly sabotaging or vicious. This may stem from two sources in his character. He had much of the true innocence and restless searching mind of the creator. But it also had to do with some lack of realism. Whereas he could understand fearfulness or hate in his patients, he forgot this in his collaborators and fellow men."

—NIC WAAL.

THE passages above are quoted from this memorial volume to Wilhelm Reich and they indicate what many people have thought about Reich. He

was a man who often aroused antagonism: that of his fellow-psychoanalysts in Austria and Germany, the University of Oslo and the press in Norway, 'orthodox' science and the Food and Drug Administration in the USA, but in spite of this hatred there were, and still are, many people with a great respect for the man and his work. Among them are Paul and Jean Ritter who are already known to readers of FREEDOM for their advocacy of Reich's work, mainly through the medium of their journal *Orgonomic Functionalism*.

In this volume Mr. Ritter has collected together articles by A. S. Neill, Nic Waal (a psychoanalyst), Myron Sharaf (on Reich's trial) and himself and his wife (on Reich's work). Of these, the article by Nic Waal is the most objective and so probably the most interesting to many readers. She was taught by Reich during her training at the Berlin Institute of Psychoanalysis and met him again in Norway when he was forced to leave Germany; she writes of Reich's controversies with the psychoanalytic movement and concludes with an assessment of his character.

Myron Sharaf's account of Reich's persecution by the Food and Drug Administration shows with what venom Reich was pursued by the officials of the U.S. government: but being the man he was and no doubt feeling harassed by friend and foe alike, after an initial approach to his trial-judge by letter, he did not make a straightforward issue of his defence. Instead, and no doubt to the detriment of the success of his case, he alleged that the Russians were attacking

him through the Food and Drug Administration, that there was a Moscow-directed conspiracy trying to prevent him from carrying on his orgonomic work so that the U.S. would be deprived of the benefits. This was an extraordinary defence against a charge that he was guilty of falsely pretending that the 'orgone energy accumulator' had therapeutic properties; it would seem a sure way to confirm a jury's first opinion that they were trying a crank and to suggest that he was paranoid as well. However, it is easy to be wise after the event and it is quite possible that Reich had some logical reason for pursuing the particular line of defence that he did.

A. S. Neill contributes some characteristic remarks on Reich. He says that he has "never seen so relaxed a person. If I touched his jaw it went up and down like a well-oiled box lid." His account shows that in personal relationships Reich could be warm, human and friendly; it was only when his work was involved that he became aggressive.

Finally there is the essay by Paul and Jean Ritter on Reich's work: this is undertaken at a brisk gallop with the main emphasis on 'orgonomy'. There is little attempt at an argument that might persuade the sceptic, and to the converted the facts are already known. Moreover the writing is often sloppy ('The basic tool of investigation is the basic sense perception of the investigator, basic to the five senses'), though to someone who knows little of Reich's work, but is sympathetic, this resumé might be found helpful.

M.G.W.

## The Objective Society

THE OBJECTIVE SOCIETY, by Everett Knight. Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1959, 136 pp. 16s.

'SOCIETIES' (fictional names for an elusive fact) are free, open, sane, organic, civilised, anarchist, and of course (blessed word) authoritarian. But objective is a new term. What does Everett Knight mean by the objective society? Here are his own words:

*If scientific law is no longer to be regarded as exhaustive and final, but simply as one of many ways in which matter has been and can be organized, then what is primordial in man is not intellect, but that 'intention' or 'orientation' which intellect helps him to exploit.*

In other words, the distinctive thing about man is what he decides to make of himself or the society to which he belongs. But social forms are not making anything of themselves; they have ceased to progress. *If philosophical, historical and political thought is to break out of the text-books, says Knight, it must begin to elaborate a programme, it must stop its tireless waiting for the facts to organize themselves into a decipherable pattern which, in any case, the objective society would be the first to find unacceptable.*

The objective society, then, believes

that only by knowing the whole of the facts can one know how to act. Two types dominate this society: the messiah, who thinks he has arrived at an Absolute, and the monk, who restrains himself from all action in order to keep an objective mind.

The definition of man in terms of purpose is to Knight the last word (since he, too, must have his Absolute!). I think this is extremely shaky. Although man created mathematics (2+2=4), there is a sense in which 2+2=4 is true independently of human volition; and this is the case also with the truths of entomology, aerodynamics, and social statistics (to name a few). True, the peculiar discipline of objective science is such as to circumscribe human freedom (the man who studies machines becomes machine-like), but it is still possible, as existentialism has shown, to discover within those laws the conditions under which freedom is still operative.

If Knight's basic formula be rejected, then objective society stands. But if it be accepted, his own thesis falls to the ground; since there is no reason why we should be politically conscious rather than stay in the ranks of the apathetic. The only reason for preferring one is that it may give us greater chance of survival; but it could at least be argued that survival is more likely to result from

arriving at sound beliefs, as from action for action's sake.

Might it not be better to see in the current unconcern of philosophers for the practical world a concrete, namely negative, reaction to the political situation? A piece of bad luck, perhaps, for those would-be Platos who are forced to spend the best years of their lives doing logical analysis; but not, in the long run, a deadly symptom. In any case, it is not true, as our 'Anglo-Saxon' philosophers do argue about political issues, both in writing and on television and radio.

Mr. Knight has gone to live in Ghana, where (presumably) the gospel of action and anti-European reaction will have a good sale. It was Spengler who first mooted the idea that the 'immutable' facts of Nature discovered in different ages and regions might be just so many attempts at the 'realisation' of man in different ways. So Knight may gain kudos in his emergent social order by saying "The virtue of me is that I believe in Marxist organisation!" (He does not, in fairness, actually say this, but he comes pretty close). But does that give him the right to present a biased view of history? His pronouncements on renaissance Order, empiricist Fact, etc. are at the most unproven, and a very great deal of this book consists of generalisations which immediately remind us of the great weight of evidence on the opposite side.

A.D.F.

## 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*  
Vol. 6, 1956, *Oil and Troubled Waters*  
Vol. 7, 1957, *Year One—Sputnik Era*  
Vol. 8, 1958, *Socialism in a Wheelchair*  
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.  
(Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21)  
*The Unknown Revolution* cloth 12s. 6d.

V. RICHARDS :  
*Lessons of the Spanish Revolution* 6s.

ERRICO MALATESTA :  
*Anarchy* 9d.

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.  
*The Education of Free Men* 1s.

PETER KROPOTKIN :  
*The State: Its Historic Role* 1s.  
*The Wage System* 3d.  
*Revolutionary Government* 3d.  
*Organised Vengeance* Called Justice 2d.

JOHN HEWETSON :  
*Ill-Health, Poverty and the State* cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.

MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI :  
*Neither East nor West* paper 7s. 6d.; cloth 10s. 6d.

★  
Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications :  
*Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute* cloth 5s.  
*Journey Through Utopia* cloth 18s. (U.S.A. \$3)

27, Red Lion Street, London, W.C.1.

# THE WALLS OF PREJUDICE

Continued from p. 2

than as a response to social situations, defined by considerations of social status and tinted by our history as an imperial power. When custom fails and people are in doubt as to the correct course of behaviour, the determined leader can achieve a great deal for tolerance or intolerance. He can create the conviction in others that it is wrong to be influenced by considerations of colour, whereas if he hesitates and starts sounding others' opinions he will almost inevitably permit the least liberal to call the tune.<sup>4</sup>

But who then is to call the tune? "Ultimately it is for the government to define this kind of position" says Dr. Little, and even Father Huddleston says, "The lead must come from the top—and that means the Government". But it is hard to see what kind of government action they have in mind, and what advantage it can have. To the deeply prejudiced people interviewed by John Beavan, who told him that the West London magistrate was President of the Negro League of London, a belief that he found to be "general but untrue," or the man who told him that "The rozzers always stick up for the bosses", leaving him to guess how the West Indians could possibly be identified with the bosses, it is obvious that any action by the government would simply confirm their feelings that a gigantic conspiracy surrounded them. To the people whose prejudice is conditioned by what they think their neighbours think, government action would be less important than the social climate of their street.

## Face-to-face

The lead must come, if it is to come at all, not from the top, but from the bottom: at the face-to-face personal level. When Basil Kift ran his discussion in West Bromwich on the theme *White Man and Coloured Neighbour* almost every coloured participant asked for the opportunity for personal contact between black and white, and it was generally agreed that one of the chief barriers to understanding was the tendency to lump people—whether coloured or white—into groups based on stereotypes. (The stereotypes which are applied to the coloured people of Notting Hill are not really worth discussing because they are the almost universal ingroup stereotype of the outgroup. The outgroup is dirty, wants to make money without working, is endowed with a special sexual prowess, and lives only for pleasure. It used to be said in the same area of the Irish, who have now been 'upgraded' just as the Negroes have been 'upgraded' in New York, with the arrival of the Puerto Ricans. The same stereotype has been used in this country for the Jews, the Poles and the Italians; no doubt it was the opinion held on one side of those walls in Oxford about the other. Its nature leads to the view that we attribute to the outgroup our own secret and guilty wishes.)

One thing that American experience teaches us is that propaganda has little or no effect. You can't sell tolerance like a soap powder. Moral persuasion is out too. As an American manual puts it "The brotherhood and do-good themes should be avoided. Most people abhor being uplifted." And John Rosselli observes that

"In some conversations in Notting Hill one can sense a desperate desire to be treated as a human being, not as a unit in a group, fit to be picked, hated, helped, or reformed."

One of the voluntary workers drawn to the area by last year's revelations said to him "We concentrated far too much on making the coloured people welcome. It was really on the level of "we absolutely love lepers". Certainly in stressing that the only effective work in curing inter-group tensions is on the level of individuals and face-to-face groups, we have to emphasise that patronising attempts from outside to "bring the races together" for social

activities are likely to be as ineffectual as propaganda.

"Experience has shown that the most effective way of changing attitudes and behaviour is not exhortation from a platform. Worse still is a condemning attitude which creates an undue feeling of guilt in the prejudiced person. This will tend, as likely as not, to intensify his dislike of the person or group in question. Rather, it is necessary to involve the individual in some active process in which his emotive as well as his cognitive faculties are enlisted. Attitudes are most easily changed when a group of people who are fairly closely identified with each other are influenced together. Each individual supports and reinforces the other. If long-held prejudices are to be altered, this will only occur when the pressure of primary group and public opinion is in favour of the change."<sup>5</sup>

Working together on a common undertaking is one of the few effective ways of overcoming prejudice. It was noted in a study of the coloured worker in *The Times* that "In Britain the coloured man's afflictions are domestic and social. So far no one has molested him at work, whatever might happen to him on the way home or later in the evening". The relatively good relations on London Transport are an example of this. The task is to carry over these good functional relations into social life. This is where the project to make an adventure playground in Notting Hill will be useful, and where activities like a group for carrying out housing repairs or conversions, may have an effect on the individual over and above the useful results. When he does something he becomes something.

A useful technique from America is the "neighbourhood festival" which functions "as an ice-breaker, and accelerates the process of acquaintance in a community where formerly only barriers may have existed". This is being applied in Notting Hill in the July Goodwill Week.

To people who are accustomed to thinking in terms of large-scale action, these small-scale techniques

on the personal level must seem pitifully inadequate. And they are inadequate: their only advantage is that they are known to work. And there is no evidence that techniques that do not operate on the personal face-to-face level are more successful. Anyone is free to try out other techniques, methods of influencing group decision, bold and exciting techniques involving psychodramas, the inducement of catharsis and of laughter, and the less exciting but necessary resolution of the individual to combat prejudice when he encounters it instead of maintaining a polite silence.

Experience shows that the attitudes of key individuals or "gatekeepers" in a street or neighbourhood is of great importance, and much more effective than the good intentions of outsiders. Fortunately the district that lies between Paddington, Holland Park and Shepherd's Bush is an immensely mixed neighbourhood where, only a street away from each other you can find the very rich and the very poor, the illiterate and the highly educated. There are enough people with every conceivable background and experience in the area to make enormous changes from within, if only they would think it worth their while. Nothing is more striking in the studies of prejudiced personalities than the fact that they are lonely, that they fear the future, that their social contacts are poor in quality and few in number, that they are unable to approach individuals as individuals. The unprejudiced, by discovering their neighbours, can help to liberate them, and may even release the springs of energy and aspiration for social change which prejudice has imprisoned.

C.W.

<sup>1</sup>A. H. Richmond: *Colour Prejudice in Britain* (1954).  
<sup>2</sup>J. Robb: *Working-Class Anti-semitism* (1954).  
<sup>3</sup>G. W. Allport: *The Nature of Prejudice* (1958).  
<sup>4</sup>*The Listener* 3/4/58.  
<sup>5</sup>Richmond *op. cit.*

## LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

### THE FORGOTTEN REFUGEES

The Editor, FREEDOM.

DEAR SIR,

We want to call the attention of your readers to the FORGOTTEN REFUGEES. A terrible silence surrounds them: there is never a mention of their continued plight, their right to be included in immigration proposals as displaced persons. People do not know that they are still alive and, in justice, should be among the first to be helped. I am referring to the Spaniards who fought through three terrible Civil War years to defend their Republic against Franco and the fascists, who fled to France and lived through five years of concentration camps, deportation, Nazi labour battalions, and have survived since then on the barest minimum income (often as little as \$10 a month).

During World Refugee Year which starts July 1st, we hope that this silence will be broken. There are some 115,000 Spanish Republicans living in France and among these there are 4,000 over the age of 65, 3,000 chronically ill, 3,500 survivors of German concentration camps and 5,000 disabled in World War II.

SPANISH REFUGEE AID AT 80 EAST 11th STREET, NEW YORK 3, N.Y., was set up in April 1953, with Pablo Casals and General Lazaro Cardenas as Honorary Chairmen, to help these refugees. It has just completed its sixth year and has collected \$256,000 in cash and clothing for these forgotten heroes and heroines of

our time. But this was not nearly enough to help the thousands of old, sick and disabled veterans of the first fight against fascism. They need and deserve your attention. Please let us hear from you.

MARY MCCARTHY,  
New York, May 15. *Chairman.*

### Direct Action Committee

The Editor, FREEDOM.

DEAR SIR,

The Direct Action Committee (344, Seven Sisters Road, London, N.4.) is planning two anti-rocket-base summer campaigns, and would like to hear as soon as possible from anyone who can take part in them. Both campaigns are scheduled to start on Saturday, June 13th, and will continue for about two months. Missile sites will be picketed, residents in the area canvassed, meetings held, and trade unions contacted. It is possible that non-violent action may at some stage be taken at one of the sites.

One campaign will be in Suffolk, and will be focussed on the rocket base being built at Rattlesden (near Stowmarket), and the bomb storage depot under construction at Sutton Heath (near Woodbridge).

The other campaign will be in the Peterborough-Northampton area. It will be focussed on five secret Thor rocket sites going up, or about to go up, at North Luffenham (near Stamford), Harrington (near Kettering), Langtoft (near Market Deeping), Great Dalby (near Melton Mowbray), and Polebrook (near Peterborough). Rocket bases (not Thor sites, but possibly control centres for them) are also being built in the area, at Woolfax (beside the Great North Road, just North of Stamford), and at Falkingham (near Sleaford, Lincs.).

As many volunteers as possible will be needed to make these campaigns a success. The Committee would also welcome donations towards the cost of planning this action.

Yours faithfully,  
MICHAEL RANDLE,  
*(Chairman)*  
APRIL CARTER,  
*(Secretary)*  
PAT ARROWSMITH,  
*(Field Organiser)*

London, June 3.

### MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

#### LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

Regular Sunday meetings now held at "Marquis of Granby" Public House, Rathbone Street (corner of Percy Street, Rathbone Place and Charlotte Street), 7.30 p.m.

JUNE 14.—To be arranged.  
JUNE 21.—Jack Robinson on "IS SPORT THE OPIATE OF THE PEOPLE?"  
JUNE 28.—Philip Holgate  
*Subject to be announced.*

#### CLEVELAND LIBERTARIAN LEAGUE GROUP

Monthly discussion meetings are held on the last Friday of each month at 8 o'clock at 3705 West Park Road, Cleveland (near Lorain-Triskett). Anyone interested is invited.

#### THE YOUNGSTOWN LIBERTARIANS

A Picnic, July 4th, at 1 p.m. at Frank Marino's Farm, 3825 Lauterman Road, Youngstown, Ohio.

## Self-Service

I WAS attending a London police court to morally support a friend of mine. As it happened, his appearance was postponed, but I had a fairly interesting time. The usual ebb and flow of the court is routine stuff and the forensic cut and thrust and the human interest sob-story is very rare.

Mornings at Bow Street are a layer of prostitutes, a wedge of "drunk and disorderlies", and a scattering of street bookies. This must be the usual grist in the mills of the law which, in these cases, grinds very quickly, like a conveyor belt.

However, I was not in court until later on this occasion and what seemed to be going on was a pre-Whitsun tidy-up. Cases came up from remand and for bail. People who didn't look worth twopence (in assets) calmly went bail for £200 and the magistrate accepted it. One is reminded of Shaw's reply to the stock "Are you worth £1,000?" "Well... I have that much money"...

Amongst the cases which it seemed were ready to be cleaned up was a seemingly simple one of a housewife accused of stealing fifty cigarettes from a self-service store.

In case you haven't been around lately, self-service stores are the shop proprietors' answer to the shortage of shop-assistants. They are a development of the cafeteria system applied to shopping. The proprietors claim that they tend to send up sales since 'consumer resistance' is lowered by removal of the barrier of the counter and the intermediary of the assistant. Also this increases impulse-buying, limits consumer's choice, and forces purchase in quantity pre-determined by the proprietor.

Additionally, this marketing system tends to increase the amount of thefts from such stores for, although the customer is supervised throughout the tour of the shop, wire baskets are provided for goods and exit is only possible past the cash-register, it is impossible to safeguard against every eventuality, since this would necessitate employing as many supervisors as there were previously, assistants!

This housewife was accused of having secured a bill for purchases in the morning and when questioned it was alleged she had produced this to account for the cigarettes which were discovered in her bag.

The prosecution's case was heard first and things looked very watertight. The main witness was a female store-detective who, in a birdlike way, seemed very alert. True, she deviated from the evidence-giving routine once when she said that the customer "took" her purchases instead of saying "selected" them which seems to be the supermarket's *mot juste*. The counsel for the defence rose to ask his questions.

"How far away were you from the defendant?"—"Just behind her."

"How could you see her taking the cigarettes if you were behind her?"—"I saw one hand go out to the shelf and take the cigarettes and the other

hand putting the package in the hold-all she had at her side."

"You said when she got outside you caught up with her two shops away and told her you thought she had some goods she hadn't paid for. How fast was she walking?"—"At an ordinary pace."

"Just now, you said when she was in the store you were 'just behind her', how could she get as far ahead in that short time?"—"I waited."

"Why?"—"I waited to see if she was coming back."

"Coming back?"—"Yes, she might have made a mistake."

"How long have you been employed as a store detective?" (She lowered her voice. All through this cross-questioning she had been getting more and more embarrassed)—"Ten days."

"And what were you before?"—She mumbled—"A packer."

The defending counsel sat down. The prosecuting counsel stood up and fought a small rearguard action but he could not recover the lost ground.

The magistrate intervened.

"How many packets of cigarettes were in stock?"

The prosecuting counsel made a sortie into his papers, and whispered to his clerk before replying.

"It is not a practice in self-service stores to take stock frequently."

"In this case it has been alleged that the defendant took fifty cigarettes. Somebody must have put them there, must have known how many were there, and how many there were after the defendant left."

The prosecuting counsel looked through more papers.

"I am sorry sir," he said humbly. "It is not possible to take stock in a store of this type."

The magistrate spoke to his clerk and then to the court.

"In that case I shall have to adjourn the hearing till next week." The counsel bowed. The prisoner was escorted from the dock back into custody, it is presumed.

J.R.

## Deficit!

### PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!

#### WEEK 23

Deficit on Freedom £460

Contributions received £449

DEFICIT £11

May 29 to June 4

London: J.H. 7/6; Norwich: W.H.B. 5/-;  
London: Anon.\* 2/3; London: J.O.H.\* 2/6;  
Brooklyn: O.A. 3/6; Slough: T. 9/6; London:  
J.S.\* 3/-; Oxford: Anon.\* 5/-; Chelsea,  
Mass., U.S.A. J.M. 14/-; Hartford, U.S.A.:  
McA. 18/3; Hong Kong: M.S. 5/-; Wolver-  
hampton: J.G.L.\* 2/6; Auckland, N.Z.:  
K.J.M. 2/4; Ermouth: A.B.H. 3/-; Coseley:  
G.C. 1/9; London: E.D. 1/-.

Total ... 4 6 1

Previously acknowledged ... 447 1 0

451 7 1

Error in April Statement ... 2 14 0

(Credited in error)

1959 TOTAL TO DATE ... £448 13 1

\*Indicates regular contributor.

## 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.I. England

Tel.: Chancery 8364