

## MASSACRE IN SOUTH AFRICA

MASS violence is always only a stone's throw away in South Africa. Last Monday it broke out on a scale which shocked hard-bitten South African newsmen and even, they say, shocked the police who had opened fire on a crowd, killing in all fifty-six Africans—men, women and children—and injuring 162.

This "incident" took place at Sharpeville, a township near Vereeniging and arose out of a demonstration called for by the Pan-African Congress in protest against the pass laws.

The Pan-Africanist Congress described as an extremist break-away of the African National Congress, had called on their 31,000 members in the Union to come out without their passes (identity cards which all Africans are required by law to carry) and surrender themselves for arrest at the nearest police station.

At Sharpeville the crowd grew to 20,000 strong and surrounded the police station, shouting. One African was shot dead and four injured after the police had been stoned (according to Reuter). The Africans retaliated and then the police opened fire.

This followed attempts to intimidate and disperse the Africans by the use of aircraft diving low over the area, and Saracen armoured cars (supplied to the S.A. Government by the British armament industry) forcing their way through the crowd to take up defensive positions by the police station. But these provocative actions only angered the crowd still further.

The local area police commander, Colonel J. Pienaar, is reported as saying: "I don't know how many we shot. It all started when hordes of natives surrounded the police station. My car was struck by a stone. If they do these things they must learn their lesson the hard way."

But what are the things the Africans did? The trigger-happy, *baaskap*-minded policemen obviously think they are justified in shooting down Africans who throw stones at cars, but behind the Africans' demonstration is a serious demand for alleviation from their slavery to the pass-laws.

These laws bind Africans to employees, govern their relationships with their families, limit their freedom of movement, and render them liable to immediate arrest and summary imprisonment if they are not carrying their various passes. They make the whole of the Union of South Africa one vast prison and are one of the primary causes of racial tension.

As long as the pass laws exist the resentment of the Africans will exist, but apartheid cannot be operated without the strict control of the non-Europeans and so some such apparatus as the pass laws must remain as long as apartheid is the policy of the Government.

The pass laws are the points which continually prod the Africans' dignity. The more massive aspects of apartheid may achieve particular attention when a township is being destroyed, but on the whole the African masses no more expect to

mix with the white bosses than the working class of this country expect to mix with the upper crust.

But the pass laws and apartheid goes beyond the class barriers of our society—which individuals breach by education and financial success, after all. Apartheid seeks to fix for ever the status of the slave upon the majority of the citizens of South Africa—and to do it at a time when national independence is being achieved by Africans, Asians and Arabs elsewhere.

This is what makes the Nationalist Government's policy not only vicious but pathetic. Like Canute ordering back the tide, Dr. Verwoerd and his colleagues attempt to stem the inevitable political advance of the Africans.

With their show of force at Sharpeville they turned what could have been a peaceful demonstration into a battlefield. Their policies make such incidents inevitable, and their blind fury—born of fear—slaughters Africans and puts more nails in their own coffin.

Each repressive step they take, each hateful reaction which is provoked by either side, leads inexorably to the day when the Africans begin to organise themselves as the Algerians have done. Once that begins, hopes for a peaceful transition to a multi-racial South Africa will disappear and so will the place of the white man in the Union. The racial fanatics in the South African Government will have destroyed the very thing they set out to protect.

## German Unions Urge S.A. Boycott

The West German Trades Union Federation today called for a boycott of South African goods from April 1 to 30 "in protest against the improper treatment of a great part of the African people."

"For years," it stated, "the Government of South Africa has followed a policy of racial discrimination, and though placing the coloured citizens of South Africa in a special position, contradicts the declaration of human rights." "We Germans who have experienced in the immediate past the results of demoted racial hate and the limitation of democratic freedom—we, who must still struggle even today with the remnants of that struggle—must stand in the front line of those fighting against injustice, wherever it raises its ugly head."

Guardian 10.3.60.

## The Pill and the Adolescent

THE contraceptive pill is already (metaphorically speaking) on everybody's lips, for two reasons. Firstly because of the appeal for volunteers for tests to be carried out by the Birmingham Family Planning Association using the American pill, (fully reported in FREEDOM for Feb. 20th), and secondly because of a statement by the Chairman of British Drug Houses Ltd., in connection with the prospective take-over bids for the shares of his firm, that the firm had developed a British pill, expected to sell at a penny each, of which pilot tests in London are expected to begin in three months time under the auspices of the Family Planning Association.

There is no need for us to emphasise how useful to mankind the development of a means of contraception which is safe, foolproof and aesthetically inoffensive can be, but characteristically, the first thing to be awakened by these announcements is opposition.

In his Lenten Pastoral Letter, read in all Catholic churches in his diocese on March 6th, Dr. Edward Ellis, Roman Catholic Bishop of Nottingham says,

"New methods have been proposed to thwart God's purpose in marriage.

"The matter is so grave and at the same time so openly and frequently discussed in the Press, on the radio and on television that I must also speak openly to you on subjects which Christian modesty and delicacy would normally shun.

"The Church does not demand that parents should have the largest family possible. There are circumstances when it is right and proper that the size of the family should be restricted.

"But such restriction should never be brought about by artificial means, including the latest invention of contraceptive pills."

We do not know how faithfully Roman Catholics actually follow the advice or demands of their church's celibate hierarchy in these personal matters. More serious perhaps is a report in the *News of the World* on the same date that

"Social workers, alarmed by the prospect of a penny pill, are pressing for immediate legislation to ban the sale of the pills to unmarried girls under a certain age. While they recognise that the discovery of a cheap and harmless pill is desirable for properly controlled family planning, they feel there would be grave moral danger if it were freely available to teenage girls. They fear that one day soon the pills may be sold

from slot machines."

Now you have only to be a reader of the newspaper in which this report appeared to appreciate what a blessing the pill would be to the very social group to which the unnamed "social workers" seek to have it denied. Let us however turn to the Crowther Report (15 to 18: Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education) which was debated in the House of Commons on Monday. Paragraph 58 of the report reads:

"The problem of sexual ethics is, of course, far wider than marriage. Indeed in the years from 15 to 18 it is not mainly a marriage problem. It seems beyond question that behaviour which would have been rejected a generation ago as improper and anti-social—most people would simply have said wrong—is today tolerated or endorsed by adult public opinion. Young people enjoy a much greater freedom to live their own lives without adult supervision, and to meet and spend their time together as they like without censure and without restraints other than those which their own individual taste or conviction imposes. In this change there has been both gain and loss. It is surely gain that boys and girls, young men and young women, should have the opportunity, which earlier generations often

lacked, to get to know one another really well before committing themselves to the choice of a mate. It is surely loss that new guiding rules of behaviour in the changed situation have not been sufficiently developed to replace the old customs which nearly everybody has to some extent abandoned and which some have altogether thrown overboard. . . . Education can only function within the broad directives of right and wrong which society gives. Teachers and youth leaders are however, well placed to bring to attention the personal bewilderment and disaster to which this public indecision over moral issues often leads the young. There can be no doubt of the disaster. On 1956 figures, one girl in fifty might expect to give birth to a child conceived before she was 17. . . ."

In the last sentence we learn what all this cautious verbiage is about. All it says, in effect is "Changing attitudes to sexual relations outside marriage are reflected in adolescent behaviour. This leads to unwanted pregnancies among teen-age girls". At long last we are on the brink of contraceptive improvements which could avoid these "disasters". But before they are even on the market, so-called "social workers" are pressing for "immediate legislation to ban the sale of the pills to unmarried

Continued on p. 3

## After Twenty Years of Franco

(1)

A COUNTRY where ownership of a car is an exterior sign of corruption. Where Sagan, Descartes, Bardot and Kant are on the Index. Where the peasant cannot read but goes to the cinema every week. Where 70% of machine tools are 70 years old; where crypts worth millions are built for the dead, yet where the living feed themselves on chickpeas. Where there is half the number of newspapers that there was in 1936. Where some citizens still do not know the name of the capital city. Where the member of the armed police, defenders of Western Christian civilisation, is a gas collector in the afternoon and a watchman during the night. Where the Barcelona-Madrid express takes three hours more than it did in 1935. Where football players are the highest-paid in Europe, but people go to the shops to buy a peseta's worth of sugar or coffee at a time.

Where, on the death of Pope Pius XII, mourning was prolonged three times longer than in Italy, but where the Pope's speeches are censored if he speaks of freedom. Where a Minister of Commerce becomes a multi-millionaire in a few months. Where engaged couples have to wait ten years to be able to marry. Where the sports newspaper has a bigger circulation than any national daily. Where the military act as cinema ushers and one cannot find a single wage-earner who knows the name of the Minister of Labour or the leader of the trade unions. Where one in five of the population says he is going abroad when he goes to Madrid. Where there is officially a shortage of 80,000 primary schools. Where the universities intended for the workers are so luxurious that American visitors confess that they couldn't afford anything like them, yet

where the level of literacy is the lowest in Europe.

Where the workers spend their annual holiday working, and the Generals are company directors. Where there are more maids than cars. Where the price of meat is equivalent to three days' work. Where the townswomen take their husbands' Sunday trousers to the pawnshop on Mondays, to be retrieved on Saturdays. Where cigarettes are sold in two's on street corners. Where 300 names control the boards of all companies and five banks dominate industry and trade. Where they make the most expensive cars in the world, and the worst and most expensive steel in the world, and where the annual income per person is the lowest in Europe.

In other words, the country where half the working class is sacrificed and the other half is patronised, and the remainder of the population oscillates between a middle-class worried about the future and an oligarchy of millionaires whose outlook dates back to the Golden Age of the 16th Century. This is the picture of Spain that emerges after twenty years of the Franco régime.

—DOMINIQUE HUNNEBELLE  
 in *Realités*, May 1959.

(2)

WHEN, for instance, in 1953 the U.S. negotiated an agreement with the Spanish Government, whereby it paid dollars in exchange for military bases, the agreement described the two signatories as "recognising . . . individual liberty, free institutions . . . a free economy." That this was hypocrisy is less to be deplored than that it was cynical hypocrisy.

—IRVING KRISTOL  
 in *Encounter*, April 1960.

## Film on Apartheid & the Boycott

A GROUP of people has come together to make a film about the boycott of South African goods which has been in progress all this month, and to protest against apartheid in South Africa.

The Apartheid Film Committee has as sponsors Lord Altrincham, James Callaghan, Tom Driberg, the film director Lindsay Anderson and the playwright Arnold Wesker, while its chairman is Tennyson Makiwane, the member of the African National Congress who smuggled himself out of South Africa in order to come here and direct the boycott movement.

About their proposal to make the film, the committee says:

The South African Boycott Movement has gathered wide support throughout Africa, and the intensive campaign in this country during March has been a powerful demonstration of protest. But the demonstration will lose its force, unless it leads to a sustained pressure of international opinion against the apartheid policies of the South African government. A group led by Derrick

Knight, with John Krish as director, has therefore been formed to make a film, which will be a permanent record of the strength of feeling in this country, and which will show at the same time the conditions in South Africa against which we are protesting. Shooting has already begun, and the film should be ready in June. It will be on 35 mm., is assured of commercial distribution internationally and will be made available to organisations campaigning on South Africa.

Much technical help and material have been offered, and a script has been prepared, but £2,000 is needed to make a really effective film. Besides the boycott itself, this is one of the few practical expressions of sympathy with the people of South Africa open to us, and we believe that many people will want to contribute to realising this film and thus to identify themselves with the protest it is making.

Donations should be sent as soon as possible before the end of March either to the Treasurer of the Apartheid Film Committee, 61 Gloucester Crescent, London, N.W.1., or to me, c/o Freedom Press.

PHILIP SANSOM.

# A Constructive Libertarian Movement

(This article by the French anarchist Gaston Leval is reproduced from a translation in the Sydney Anarchist Review, January, 1959.)

ANYONE who, like myself, has been a long time militant in the international libertarian movement and who has studied its history without partisan blinders, cannot ignore the fact that, with the exception of pre-Franco Spain and of South Korea before the war, the movement has been stagnating in every sense of the word. And anyone who is not blinded by unintelligent fanaticism, is faced with this dilemma: Either the libertarian ideas are in contradiction with nature and human possibilities, or these ideas have not been able to penetrate the consciousness of the revolutionary minorities who influence, and often determine, social evolution.

Were I not convinced that the second of these two hypotheses is the correct one, I would have ceased to struggle for the dissemination and triumph of our ideas a long time ago. But I am too convinced of the social truth in socialist anarchism (using the word "socialist" in its original sense) to take this attitude. Certainly there are things that must be re-examined in the light of new experience, as there are in all systems that are the synthesis of long experience, if the doctrines of liberation are not to become dogmas, stultifying thought and action. But the essentials remain. Unfortunately, the mass, and in this case the anarchist mass, has too often not understood these essentials. I consider it a grave error for us to have defined ourselves with a negation. Anarchy—the negation of 'archies', of hierarchies, of diverse social strata, of rich and of poor, of masters and slaves, of government and governed; from which follows equality in law and in fact, in the political and economic spheres, in the pursuit of liberty and in the possibilities of material, intellectual and moral satisfactions.

Such is the theory. The point of departure remains a negation. And, unfortunately, this negation is what has been spiritually, intellectually and practically imprinted on the minds of everyone from the illiterate to the intellectual. It does not make any difference who declares himself to be an enemy of authority and of all responsibility. It suffices to deny in order to be an anarchist. Consequently these negators have often distorted the profound ideas of our thinkers worthy of the name anarchist—Proudhon, Bakunin, Rocker, Kropotkin—or most often have ignored them.

Internationally then, aside from several exceptions as in the case of Spain, anarchism has appeared as a collection of negations. It can be said, citing Proudhon, that "all negation implies a subsequent affirmation." In fact, no such implication need exist in the minds of those who would make such a statement. One can theoretically or instinctively deny authority without conceiving of a non-authoritarian society, feeling the need of such a society, or struggling for its realization. One can condemn economic inequality and the exploitation of man by man without considering the ways by which equalitarian society could be brought into being.

The consequence of negation, or of initial negations as they have emanated from certain thinkers, have not been and are not compensating affirmations. These affirmations can be found in accidental polemics, but they are absent from the permanent attitudes of many anarchists.

This is why the present anarchist propaganda and recruiting techniques are essentially the same as those of fifty years ago. They are anti-authoritarian, anti-militarist, anti-capitalist, anti-God, etc. Most of the time there is a repetition of superficial arguments that tire the intelligent listener and discourage the observer. A serious, profound and documented critique can have a constructive character in as much as it suggests new solutions. But that which has been done by thinkers and sociologists has been too often scorned by their disciples.

The presentation of anarchist ideas has been reduced to a common denominator of negative mediocrity by the law of least intellectual effort, the lack of mental discipline and the confusion between political authority and the necessary influence of knowledge. If we do not know how to leave these swamps in which we are mired, it is useless to hope for the future of our movement or even for the influence of our ideas on human evolution.

★

KROPOTKIN wrote a book entitled *Mutual Aid*. Up until World War II, this book was very well known to anarchists entering our movement. It was translated into most of the languages of the culturally developed countries and even published by bourgeois publishers who did not wait for the anarchists to give them a sales guarantee.

*Mutual Aid* is rightly considered to be the fundamental writing of socialist anarchism. Certainly, Darwin had already suggested in passing some ideas which showed the way. Certainly, Proudhon, with brilliant clarity, had indicated the importance of the solidarity of the species, in his first writings on the subject of property. And it is likewise true that the very observant Bakunin did not fail to notice the often preponderant character of this factor in the life of all society.

But it was necessary for Kropotkin—a true scientist, a geologist and geographer, who at the age of twenty-five had gathered all the necessary material for the revelation to the scientific world of the true orographic structure of eastern Asia, and who, at the age of thirty, was offered the presidency of the Russian Physical Geographic Society for his discoveries regarding the importance of the glacial period in Europe, and who later replaced Huxley in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*—it was necessary, I say, to incorporate the factor of sociability and acquired progress into the thought of socialist anarchism and to give to it an importance that is recognized, alas, by too few of us.

Kropotkin shows mutual aid to be a biological law of progress. Starting with the insect, and climbing the zoologic ladder up to man and modern civilization, mutual aid is both a need and a necessary condition for evolution. Those species and those segments of humanity who can best practise mutual aid have the best chance of surviving and progressing in this terrible struggle for life, imposed by blind fate.

Such, in essence, was the refutation that was used against social Darwinism, in the name of which the apologists for a *laissez-faire* economy had set up the struggle of all versus all as the fundamental law of progress, and thus justified their privileges. This was understood by the anarchists who read this book. Those of them who had not been able to study natural history, went into ecstasies over the revelations of the concerts of the birds, the amusements of colonies of monkeys and of cranes, the beaver villages, and the civilization of the termites.

They did not always understand that this book went much farther, that it established a new philosophy of life, that it created new basic theories of socialist anarchism and of socialism itself, and that it was the biological synthesis of a new humanism.

But, essentially, *Mutual Aid* gave to anarchism the basis of a constructive character. No longer was a dominating negation the sole result of the analysis of history. To the authoritarian interpretation of human evolution and the development of societies, Kropotkin opposed an anti- or an a-authoritarian interpretation; to the belief in the necessity of chiefs and of political frameworks, he opposed the creative effort of man and the self-organization of collectivities. The general sense of his book led to the systematization of a pre-existing social conception which he expected us to enlarge and cause to triumph.

In other writings, Kropotkin insists on the historic importance, for the past and the future, of these practices of mutual aid and of anti-authoritarian organization. In his pamphlet *The State—Its Historic Role*, he is not content with giving the anarchist view of the state

and proving that far from its being merely the instrument of dominant economic forces, as Marx and his followers assert, it is a force that above all, obeys the dictates of its own institutional and caste interests. As examples of non-statist structures and institutions, he cites the corporations and guild associations of the middle ages, the communes and federations of communes—subjects already amply developed in *Mutual Aid*. And in *The Conquest of Bread* he gives as examples of "free alliance", organizations among the savages, cultural, scientific and artistic societies, the Red Cross, the boatmen's associations of the Scandinavian countries and even the great international railway companies which had been able to organize themselves without the State, and which showed that such organization was possible.

If one remembers only the bird concerts of *Mutual Aid* and, if after reading *The Conquest of Bread*, one retains only a few ideas which are poorly expressed when taken literally, such as "the citizens of good will" who will come forward to organize things in the midst of the revolution, one is bound to be greatly mistaken. For, in all his writings, Kropotkin insisted on the responsibility, the essential role and the pre-revolutionary preparation of minorities. But to work in this largely constructive direction does not appeal to the negating spirit of the majority of his self-proclaimed disciples.

Bakunin has suffered the same fate as Kropotkin. Most anarchists who speak of him are ignorant of his constructive thought and work, seeing in him only the Muscovite Satan that too many biographers have stupidly portrayed. From Proudhon, they retain only the slogan "property is theft". They do not know that, throughout his works, he has denied this sentence in unmistakable terms, that he defended the individual's possession

## FREEDOM

of property, and that his constructive ideas (even where they are contradictory) far outweigh his destructive verbiage.

★

IT is obvious that a social movement cannot live on negation. Life is an affirmation, and that which destroys more than it can build only leads to annihilation. That is what so many people whom we approach honestly and sincerely tell us. And that is what we must take into consideration. When one thinks of the spirit and the constructive efforts of our predecessors in the First International, and the emptiness of the generations that have followed them, the contrast is as painful as it is glaring.

Today there are many tens of thousands, especially among those having a certain degree of culture, who, confronted by facts, have arrived at conclusions as negative as our own. They consider the *laissez-faire* economy with its capitalist organization and exploitation to be justly doomed. They have been convinced by depressions (particularly the one of 1929-1934), by the general disorder and by the wars for commercial gain or raw materials. Alarmed by the increasing interference of the state in every aspect of social life, and faced by the menace of fascist, bolshevik or pseudo-socialist totalitarianism, they too are forced to the conclusion that man must protest against the universal "governmentalization".

It is useless to talk to these people about the taxes they pay, about the bureaucracy which they see growing before their very eyes, or about their shrinking liberties. If one does this at all, one must show them that all these things are in the very nature of the state as proven by history from the days of the Pharaohs down to Hitler and Stalin. We must enlarge their vision of society. We must give to their observations of the moment a permanent significance.

They must be given an overall picture of our system if they are to learn its mechanism and truly understand its evil

Continued on p. 4

## FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

[Open 10 a.m.—6.30 p.m., 5 p.m. Sets:]

- New Books . . .**  
Cyprus Guerilla: Grivas, Makarios and the British D. Alastos 21/-  
The Life and Times of Ernest Bevin, Vol. I Alan Bullock 50/-  
Anatomy of Prison Hugh Klare 18/-  
The Flight of the Dalai Lama Noel Barber 16/-  
Socialism and Religion Archibald Robertson 3/6
- Cheap Editions . . .**  
We of Nagasaki Takashi Nagai 2/6  
For Esme—with Love and Squalor J. D. Salinger 2/6  
City of Spades Colin MacInnes 2/6  
Lady Sings the Blues Billie Holiday 2/6
- Second-Hand . . .**  
Life and Letters of Sir Leslie Stephen Frederick W. Maitland 5/-  
The Fall of Robespierre, etc. Albert Mathiez 3/6
- The Free Family**  
Paul and Jean Ritter 10/-  
I Will not Rest Romain Rolland 4/6  
Letters from Prison Ernst Toller 5/-  
Blanket Boy's Moon Peter Lanham 3/6  
Wall Street Under Oath (slightly soiled) Ferdinand Pecora 2/6  
Tolstoy and his Problems Aylmer Maude 4/6  
Conflicts L. B. Namier 4/6  
The Roman Spring of Mrs. Stone Tennessee Williams 3/6  
The Dram Shop Emile Zola 3/-  
The Brothers Karamazov Fyodor Dostoevsky 5/6  
The Living Past F. S. Marvin 3/-
- Periodicals . . .**  
New Left Review, March-April 3/6  
University Libertarian, January 1/-  
World Labour News, No. 2, March-April 4d.

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!

We distribute:  
Peace News, Socialist Leader, Freethinker, Industrial Worker, World Labour News, University Libertarian, Dis-sent, etc.

Postage free on all items

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

## Progressive Education Today

IMMEDIATELY after World War II the future for progressive education seemed fairly hopeful. Work in the 1920's and '30's by pioneers such as the Russell's, Neill, Curry and a number of less well-known figures, had demonstrated that there were serious fallacies in the assumptions underlying the practice in most conventional schools. Progressive education had passed through the period of sponsorship by the Communist Party. At the beginning of the Bolshevik régime in Russia there had been a period of experimentation in education as in other fields, and for a time progressive ideas made headway in some educational circles in Russia. In Britain, the Communists followed suit, and were in fact supporting progressive schools long after the reaction had set in in Russia, with abolition of co-education and re-imposition of authoritarian ideology.

By 1945 the Communists in Britain, with the exception of a small intellectual minority, had begun to follow Russia's reaction in the field of education. The progressive schools gained thereby. The latter part of World War II had shown up the Communist Party as being completely narrow-minded and authoritarian, a fact which, strangely enough, had not been generally apparent in the pre-war era. In the aftermath of the war there was a fairly strong libertarian current of opinion in the country, and this found expression in progressive education, among other things.

Neill's books had been tremendously influential. Even though he, with the huge enthusiasm of a pioneer, was often overstating his case, his positive ideas were in the main so sane compared with the dreary humbug which passed for education in so many conventional schools. His lively, readable books inspired teachers and parents to have the courage to dispense with the age-old conventional nonsense and start progressive schools. His ideas also acted as a yeast within the minds of those condemned to work in conventional schools. Many who now talk patronizingly of such "cranks" as Russell, Neill and Curry, have nevertheless been strongly influenced by them for the better in their work in education.

To some extent the success of the libertarian idea was the undoing of the progressive schools. Liberalization of the régimes of many State schools made them just acceptable to parents of libertarian outlook, and therefore the progressive schools were less well attended than they should have been had they existed a decade previously. Many

people hold the view that the value of progressive schools has been to bring about saner régimes in conventional schools.

The overwhelming drawback to the progressive schools has been economic. In the post-war era of rising prices the budget of small, independent schools became more and more difficult to manage. One of the results was that some schools were forced to be more and more parsimonious with their staffs, buildings and equipment and thus a vicious circle of decline set in. Shabbier schools meant that fewer "borderline progressive" parents would send their children there; fewer children meant fewer well-qualified staff. Many small progressive schools went into liquidation in the early 1950's; others changed radically into havens for maladjusted children and maladjusted staff whom no other schools would tolerate.

The schools which did not go under were those with more financial resources. But they had to raise their fees and hence draw children from an even smaller social stratum. Also, there has been a tendency to have larger classes, to become more examination conscious, and to curtail some measure of the children's traditional freedom for fear of scandal with its economically-damaging consequences. In spite of these retrenchments there is still a very great difference indeed between a moderate progressive school and its opposite number on the conventional side of the fence.

### Progressive Parents

Progressive schools have existed only because some parents have had the courage to break with conventional ideas. Such parents may be divided into three categories:

1. Those with genuinely libertarian ideals and an intelligent appreciation of the issues involved.
2. Those who are principally influenced by the current fashion among their set. The Communists of the 1930's were mainly in this category.
3. Parents who have made a hash of their children by foolish and inconsistent treatment and look to a progressive school to mend the child.

There has been a libertarian current of ideas affecting child management in general. The ideas of Freud, diffused through Susan Isaacs, Neill, Ethel Mannin, Anna Freud, John Bowlby, Wilhelm Reich, Dr. Spock, etc., etc. (some strange bedfellows here, but all from the same stable) in theory and often in practice have affected child-parent relations in the home. It is of great interest to

study how theory and practice have in fact interacted.

It has been remarked that we deal with our adult relationships largely with our "egos", but when we deal with children it is our "super-egos" which come into play. A sort of Jekell and Hyde seems to afflict the personality of many "progressive" parents. With their friends they are permissive, agnostic, sexually tolerant, easy-going and polite. With children, particularly their own, another personality pops out. The views of this other personality make it evident why they do not support the idea of progressive schools in practice, even if they have the books of Neill, etc., in the bookcase.

There are a number of reasons why progressive schools have had so little support from "progressive" parents. One is social snobbery. Another is reluctance to pay fees. But perhaps the most powerful reason is that "progressive" parents frequently want to send their children to a school where the régime is a good deal more authoritarian than the home. The socialization of the child will then be accomplished with the minimum of hostility being projected against the parents. Or so they hope.

In actual fact this is a shortsighted policy. If parents were to consider the future of harmony in the home they should pick a school where the environment is most like that of the home. Few orthodox Jewish parents would wittingly send their children to a school where Jews are regarded with ridicule and contempt, or Catholic parents send their children to a school where their faith is mocked at. Yet many "progressive" parents do precisely this. Atheists send their children to schools where the Holy Ghost is dished out as the diet for all right-thinking people; parents who are unconventional sexually send their children where they imbibe a sexual taboo by which their own mother must be thought of as a whore; pacifists and anti-monarchists send their children to schools where they must blush and blush again for the shame of having such awful, cranky parents. The children make some sort of compromise in their own minds; they are too young to face the complex double-think of the adult world. With protective hypocrisy they hide the conflict from both parents and schoolmasters.

Is it to be wondered at that so many of the children of "progressives" seem to react strongly in the direction of conservatism once they grow to independence? G.

## The Pill and the Adolescent

Continued from p. 1

girls under a certain age". Sickening, isn't it?

★

ADDITIONAL irony is provided by two contemporary phenomena. The first of these is that young people stay at school longer than ever before. The principle feature of the Crowther report is its recommendation that the proposal of the raising of the minimum school leaving age to 16 which was made in the Act of 1944 should at last be put into effect some time in the late nineteen-sixties. (The Minister announced on Monday that the age would not be raised before 1970). Commenting on this aspect of the report in anticipation of the Parliamentary debate, last Sunday's *Observer* remarked

"At present there are over 2,550,000 boys and girls in maintained secondary schools in England and Wales. Of these only 320,000 are aged fifteen or over: the rest are pushed out into the world of adults after their fifteenth birthday—half-educated and half-literate, at the most insecure and suggestible stage of adolescence, at an age when no self-respecting middle-class parent would dream of allowing his own children to leave school. This is not only the worst social injustice left in our community; it is the most scandalous waste of human resources."

However you view this, the fact remains that the tendency is for the postponement of any degree of economic independence until later and later in adolescence.

At the same time the age of puberty is becoming earlier and earlier. It is very hard to get accurate information about this. Some people say that the widespread belief that this is so has no statistical foundation. However, the Albemarle Report on *The Youth Service in England and Wales*, (yet another document on youth which manages to evade the question of adolescent sexuality), notes in Para. 54 that "it appears certain that puberty is occurring earlier, and that the large majority of young people now reach adolescence, as determined by physical changes, before the age of 15". Prof. P. B. Medawar, in the second of last year's Reith Lectures said that "In the Scandinavian countries the average age of onset of first menstruation has declined between four and six months per decade for the last seventy years . . . These changes have been brought about by better nurture and nourishment, particularly in the first five years of life." Alex Comfort made a most thought-provoking comment on this topic in a broadcast on "The Seven Ages of Man" (*The Listener*, 5/11/59):

"Human beings do not normally become able to breed until at least their teens. And sexual behaviour—that is behaviour associated with breeding—appears in most mammals about the time that breeding itself becomes possible. We used to think that the same was true of ourselves, and when Freud began to draw attention to the existence of elaborate sexual impulses in early infancy he met with much scepticism. But today these impulses are generally recognised, and they are believed to play an important part in forming the adult character. It looks, then, very much as if, with the development of this marking-time period in humans, a whole section of what, in lower animals, was a purely reproductive impulse, has become isolated, as it were, pushed back into childhood, a long time before the human breeding age, and given a new function, connected this time with family behaviour and character structure. . . .

"To some extent early or late maturing, we know, depends on body build . . . One confusing thing is that the rate of development in all the privileged countries seems to be getting quicker. In England and Northern Europe the age

of sexual maturity in girls has come down by five years over the last century, and it is harder and harder to get choir-boys with treble voices. This probably means, I think, that in the last century puberty was delayed by bad social hygiene, and that it is now coming back to normal."

Thus we can say that sexual maturity and economic independence are getting further and further apart. In these circumstances it would be surprising not to find that "Men and women marry earlier . . . Today half the women in the country (and a quarter of the men) are married before they are 25. Over 4 per cent. of the girls with whom this report is concerned are married women" (*Crowther Report*, Para. 43). And it is also not surprising to hear from Mrs. E. L. Herbert the view that "in one aspect education is a conspiracy for preventing children from growing up".

★

YET where is this issue publicly discussed? The *Daily Mirror*, in

its self-appointed role of spokesman for the young, recently published a series of articles on "The Bean-Stalk Generation" in which every aspect of the earlier maturing of adolescents was discussed except the one that matters most. The attitude of the law itself was never more rigid. As somebody pointed out, if Romeo and Juliet were alive today, she would be in a Juvenile Court as "in need of care and protection", and he would be in jail.

We may claim to have played our part in campaigning for changed public attitudes to juvenile sexuality, and for breaking the taboo on discussion of the issue. Three of our publications during the last twelve years have dealt with this topic: Alex Comfort's *Barbarism and Sexual Freedom*, Tony Gibson's *Youth for Freedom* and John Hewetson's *Sexual Freedom for the Young*. When the first of these was published, both the other authors criticised Dr. Comfort's recommendations for "not going far enough".

He replied (FREEDOM 11/12/48) that "My reason for extending such types of conduct as I advocated to those who have no wish to found a family, is that their wishes, in the present state of contraceptive knowledge, are unlikely to be fulfilled".

But to-day we are on the eve of the first real advance in contraceptive practice for over thirty years. If the contraceptive pill is proved to meet the technical requirements of the "ideal contraceptive" as set out by Dr. A. S. Parkes (see FREEDOM 20/2/60) his reservations are no longer applicable. To some people no doubt it seems comical that, as advocates of human freedom, we should concern ourselves so earnestly about a mere chemical gadget. Well, quite apart from the question of over-population (on which we would recommend them to read the contributions by C. H. Rolph, Bertrand Russell and Julian Huxley to the volume *The Human Sum*, we are thinking of some remarks in Alex Comfort's book which

we cordially endorse:

"The pattern of individual relationships in the free society envisaged by anarchism will not be simple or uniform, but it will be integral: freedom from fear and pressure, consciousness of the nature and requirements of the family and of the relation of free individuals to one another, a coherent pattern of custom and belief based on reasonable principles, and an environment based upon an equilibrium between the relations of persons to each other and to the group in which the development of sexuality from childhood to adulthood can be a steady and a pleasurable development instead of a succession of emotional shocks and repulses this is the biological and social pattern of the free society. If it is unattainable, then health is unattainable."

The new freedom which the development of a foolproof and safe contraceptive offers to the young, is worth the struggle against those who in the name of "morality" seek to deny them access to it.

## Readership Survey: Fifth Interim Report

(Previous reports appeared in our issues for Jan. 16 and 30, and Feb. 13 and 27).

THE total number of replies received by Sat. March 19th was 440. (The Australian replies are coming in now, and since those Australian readers who sent them by air mail did so at a cost of 2s. 3d., we must say we are grateful to them).

### ANARCHIST ACTIVITIES

Question 5 asked, "If you are carrying out any anarchist propaganda activities, indicate their nature". Three of four of the respondents indicated that they did not approve of propagandist activities. "Minding my own business and encouraging other people to mind theirs," says one, "Minding my own business—the best of all anarchist activities," say another. "No I am not capable of acting as a propagandist for anything or on behalf of any idea or party—I have not that kind of personality" says a third. "Cultivating my own garden," says a fourth (who is in fact a Direct Action Committee propagandist—his is a large garden).

231 of the 440 respondents indicated that they were carrying out some kind of propagandist activity, even though in many cases it might be "Nothing beyond ordinary conversation". To several, the way they live is their method of propaganda: "By living and refusing"; "The way I try to live and express my beliefs, and public defence of principles from an anti-authoritarian point of view"; "Trying to live as I think an anarchist should live"; "By trying to free in myself my natural goodness I hope to influence others to do the same."

The personal and conversational propaganda which very many of the respondents mentioned ranged from "subtle conversational overtones" to "ranting about my views to whoever will listen". Some typical answers from this group are:—

"Personal subversion".  
"Discussion and insidious suggestions in personal and work relationships".  
"Introducing anarchist ideas in the usual discussion at teabreaks".  
"Talking to some promising types about the way they think".  
"Libertarian sentiments sandwiched between sentiments about the weather".  
"Talking to people in the course of business".  
"By way of conversation with acquaintances on early morning train".

Other people who are able to introduce an anarchist approach in their work, include a trade union chapel convenor, a shop steward, a child welfare worker, a teacher whose activity consists of "introducing anarchist ideas as far as possible into lessons", another who "explains to students what anarchism is", and an agricultural extension worker in Mexico who writes that he is "educating people to do for themselves and not look for government help". "Only indirectly as implied in my work" writes a psychiatrist, while a Unitarian minister writes, "My whole approach in address, talks, etc., is based upon an anarchist philosophy."

Several readers mention selling FREEDOM to friends, at meetings, "outside underground stations", others mention writing for FREEDOM and for other anarchist papers, and writing in the trade union press, articles and letters in local papers, seven are concerned with anar-

chist publishing abroad, one in "translating articles for the anarchist, working-class and co-operative press in Argentina", speaking in informal and formal discussion groups, speaking at anarchist and other meetings, lending anarchist literature to others, passing round anarchist papers and trying to get subscribers, doing administrative work for the anarchist press, organising anarchist groups, participating in "peace marches" and in "Direct Action" demonstrations. Some other replies include:

"Leaving copies of FREEDOM in shops, telephone boxes and buses, and posting it to people who write to papers, particularly those who are nasty and ignorant."

"Trying to get friends interested, and selling Freedom Press literature at University Socialist Society meetings. Got an anarchist speaker and also gave a talk myself."

"Talking to individuals and occasional PPU groups and in Council committees."  
"Writing castigating letters to the Ministry of Pensions, Tax Office and Exchequer."

"Semi-humorous plugs at debating society, to make people aware of the existence of anarchism."

"I clip out of FREEDOM such information as would appeal to certain friends and send them by mail. (They would not listen or read otherwise)".

"Spirited abuse of candidates and canvassers at last election. Covered my own windows with anarchist slogans."  
"Sitting down during God Save the Queen!"

### ANARCHIST CONTACTS

Question 6 asked "Are you in personal contact with anarchists or anarchist groups?" Of the 440 respondents, 183 said that they are. Another 23 are occasionally or rarely, another 9 used to be, and a few more say that they would like to be. Three readers emphatically say that they do not wish to be:

"No, thank God—don't like groups."  
"No, prefer being a solitary."  
"No—and don't want to be! Why? Because I do not seek the society of any particular class, group, sect, etc., except that I have a preference for writers and artists."

### CONTRIBUTORS, LITERARY AND FINANCIAL

Question 19 asked "Have you ever written for FREEDOM?" and Question 20 asked "Have you had anything rejected?"

92 respondents indicated that they have written for the paper (20 of these mentioning that it was in the form of a letter to the editors), and 53 have had contributions rejected (10 mentioning that they were letters). Many of these respondents came into both categories.

Question 21 asked readers if they contributed to the Deficit Fund. 216 of the 440 respondents indicated that they do occasionally and 22 regularly.

### HOW MANY READERS PER COPY?

Question 22 asked "How many people besides you regularly read your copy of FREEDOM?" To this 220 answered that their paper was read regularly by other people. Of these 157 have one other reader, 67 have two, 16 have three, 6 have four, 2 have five, 2 have six, 1 has seven, 1 has nine, 1 has ten, 1 has twelve and 1 twenty. But some of these readers of course order several copies, or even bundles for this purpose, so it is hard to make assumptions about readers per copy from these figures. If we

assume that those who mention four additional readers or under, are referring to a single copy of the paper, the total number of readers for their 211 copies is 574. Thus in terms of all the respondents, we can say that the 440 copies are read by 803 people, plus those which are occasionally read by others, and those which 21 answerers to this question say they leave around on buses or in public places (in addition to those who mention this among their propagandist activities).

Question 23 asked "Have you induced any other people to take out a subscription?" 113 of the respondents say they have, while 55 more have tried and have either been unsuccessful or do not know the result.

### READERS' PREFERENCES AMONG TOPICS

In Question 16, readers were asked to indicate the order in which 13 topics in

FREEDOM interest them. This is a difficult task, and several readers warn us against taking their answers at their face value. One finds it "difficult and invidious", others say it depends on how well the topics are dealt with, others that it depends on their mood, while others point out that all are necessary to an anarchist paper.

It is also difficult to work out the results as some readers have 'marked' them from one to 13, others have awarded each a 1, 2 or 3, many others have given only the first three preferences. The necessary calculation to 'weight' each incomplete answer so as to rank all topics in order of preference will have to be done by machinery. Meanwhile, the table below sets out the topics in the order in which they appeared on the form, and the number of first, second and third preferences awarded to each, together with a 'flattened' total consisting of the sum of the preceding figures.

Topic	1st Pref.	2nd Pref.	3rd Pref.	Sum
Political Commentary	116	40	35	191
Readers' Letters	33	36	33	102
Anarchist Theory	73	53	32	168
Education	36	36	34	106
Book Reviews	27	41	38	106
Sex	31	40	30	101
Industry	15	14	23	52
Agriculture	6	11	17	34
Satirical Stuff	30	33	52	115
Sociology	66	53	36	115
Foreign Commentary	24	36	26	86
Anti-War Stuff	24	22	38	84
Anarchist History	24	40	29	93

Four readers add first preferences of their own, which are "Communities", "Non-violent Direct Action", "List of Secondhand Books" and "Joe Soap's Election Manifesto" (which was produced by the London Anarchist Group).

### CRITICISMS ENDORSED

In Question 17 readers were asked if they endorse any of the following criticisms of FREEDOM. "Too highbrow; Full of carping criticism; Lacking in any clear policy; too far from traditional anarchism; Too old-fashioned." Of the 440 respondents:

23 endorsed "Too highbrow", and one thought it was sometimes, two thought it was for their workmates but not for themselves, one thought it used to be but was no longer;

48 endorsed that it was full of carping criticism, and another ten thought it was sometimes or partly;

86 endorsed that it was lacking in any clear policy, two more thought it was sometimes. On the other hand one said "Yes, but this is a virtue", another said "This is an advantage" and another "Yes, thank God!"

4 endorsed that it was too far from traditional anarchism, and another thought it was sometimes;

21 endorsed "Too old-fashioned", four thought it was sometimes, one thought it old-fashioned "in matter, not ideas", another that it was too old-fashioned in presentation only, another thought it "not too old-fashioned, but sometimes too backward-looking."

Some other readers added critical categories of their own to this question: "Too gullible about science", "to divor-

ved from happenings of the moment", "too preoccupied with impracticable psychology", "too social-democratic", "too self-righteous", "too much tied to the Anglo-Saxon world", "too much lavatory sex", "too sensitive editors".

Other readers emphasised that they disagreed with all the critical categories: "The contrary of all these criticisms is true", "Perhaps all of these are the strength of the paper", "It is because it is not carping that I like it."

The next report will discuss the answers to the question "What constructive criticisms have you?"

## Interim Report on a Deficit!

### PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!

#### WEEK 12

Deficit on Freedom £240  
Contributions received £214  
DEFICIT £26

March 11 to March 17

Surrey: F.P.\* 5/-; Newry: J.O.H. £1/0/0;  
Wolverhampton: J.G.L.\* 2/6; Hitchin: L.A. 11/-; Berkeley: M.B. 14/-; London: Anon.\* 2/6; London: B.F. 2/6; London: P. & G.T. 5/-; London: J.S.\* 3/-; Gloucester: J.H. 1/-; Dublin: G.F. 5/-; Norwich: J.A.J. £2/1/0;

Total ... 5 12 6  
Previously acknowledged ... 208 16 11

1960 TOTAL TO DATE ... £214 9 5

GIFT OF BOOKS: Ilford: M.D.

\*Indicates regular contributor.

## The Protest Movement in U.S.A.

ONE should not be too enthusiastic about the permanent effects of protest movements which often appear like film stars on the "public scene" and just as suddenly disappear into yesterday's headlines, leaving nothing behind but a longing for the dead spirit.

Fortunately not all protests end with a whimper, and there is one going on at the moment throughout the Southern States of America features of which indicate that, even if there is no immediate success, the segregation monster will have been weakened further by a pacifist blow, and an important lesson will have been learned.

The movement, which began spontaneously when four Negro students from the Agricultural and Technological College, at Greensboro, North Carolina, sat down at a lunch counter in a large store, thus defying a law which decrees that Negroes can only be served standing up, has no central organisation but, ironically, the news of its beginnings and subsequent support by students in other states was spread by the Southern press.

To date there have been about 1,000 arrests, some carried out (as in Georgia, Mississippi and Virginia) in the name of "harsh, hastily passed" anti-trespassing laws. In Orangeburg, South Carolina, where 350 students were arrested after marching to the town centre, fire hoses and tear gas were used in an unsuccessful attempt to disperse them.

Writing from Atlanta, Georgia, Patrick O'Donovan (*Observer*, March 20th), says,

"The movement matters first because of its extraordinary extent, Negro action on this scale has never been seen in the South. There is also its impressive self-

discipline, which has so far survived minor violence and the ugliest sort of racial jeerings, of which the South has an effective list ready-made.

It is a massive assault on the rights of private enterprise. It has an undeniable moral strength. It is a rejection of the old, complacent Negro leadership that equated good race relations with an absence of tension. It puts progress before peace. It is extraordinary in its seriousness and fervour because not hard political enthusiasm but apathy or dispassionate curiosity is the present mark of the American student."

It is perhaps easier to stomach verbal insults than to passively put up with physical violence, but "turning the other cheek" is an important part of their tactics, supported now by "field workers" from the Congress of Racial Equality, founded in 1942 by disciples of Gandhi.

### Success of bus boycott

Four years ago, Negroes in Montgomery, Alabama, exercised extraordinary self-discipline when taking part in the boycott of segregated buses. For over a year they walked to work or organised alternative means of transport forcing the bus companies, economically dependent on Negro passengers, to dispense with their segregation rules.

From this experience a new move to boycott all chain stores whose Southern branches are refusing lunch-counter service to Negroes is under way. A newspaper report from America states that the boycott could "gravely effect the entire American economy, which depends upon Negroes for £7,200 million worth of business every year". Chain stores in the South particularly depend upon Negro patronage.

The curious insult to the Negro which permits him to stand in the presence of white men while eating but refuses him a seat is like so

many other racial laws, totally irrational.

Big business in the South dependent on Negro purchasing power goes along with local prejudice where necessary and has successfully exploited the Negro acceptance of his inferior position. For example, the 200 Woolworth stores in the South are glad of Negro custom in their stores but impose the rule at their lunch counters that Negroes must stand.

Now what? Will a boycott of goods in these stores force a change of policy? Certainly few business concerns will allow prejudices to interfere with profits. But equally it takes a strong group of people to seriously inconvenience themselves to the extent of perhaps trudging for miles to purchase necessities, or even going without where necessary, for the sake of a principle which may take years before it is put into practice.

But, was the small but important one year boycott of the Montgomery buses a guide to the success of the spirited revolt which seems to be sweeping the Southern States at this time?

It is also apparent that deep-rooted prejudices and a sense of fear can and do compel people to fight for privileges which they feel are being taken from them. The White man in the South will not give up without a struggle and, viewed as a fighting force, he is in the stronger position. The Negro population will need more than blessings in its fight; the Black man will be expected to behave like a saint surrounded by sinners, but he cannot be blamed if he gives way to the pressures of his environment, adopting the means of his violent and aggressive oppressor.

## A Constructive Libertarian Movement

Continued from p. 2

character. Above all, they must be told what the possible solutions are. Their negative conclusions concerning the state and the so-called free economy, logically lead them toward libertarian socialism. It is for us to show them in what manner libertarian socialism is feasible. We must search along with them but we must, also, guide them—for we have placed ourselves at the head of the task of demolition.

These people who are repelled by demagoguery—demagoguery attracts only imbeciles—must be given something better than a repetition of generalized criticisms which have lost their punch. They need constructive ideas, both at the theoretical and the practical levels.

I have often thought, for example, that we ought to widen and extend the road shown by Kropotkin. We ought to re-examine the history of civilization, and from this re-examination draw conclusions that would give to the libertarian ideas a value without equal. Elisee Reclus has done this in *Man and the Earth*, but more could be done, and better—more and better than Kropotkin, too. If we take the whole body of human activities that have assured the existence, the development and the progress of the species, we can derive the libertarian interpretation of history that I have already mentioned, and use it against the authoritarians.

Agriculture, animal husbandry and domestication—techniques which were at first primitive and later brought to perfection—the building of shelters and then of dwellings, handicrafts and trades, arts—all of the arts; sciences—all of the sciences, systems of philosophy, primitive methods of land transport, river and ocean transport—the vast majority of these activities and creations have been the work of men who were driven by need and by their inexhaustible desire to know the beyond. Such a study, with all that it entails, would give to libertarian thought an incomparable force. Orientating itself along positive lines, it would create a constructive psychology. It would enrich us with a better understanding of man's efforts.

We could take up the study of the great problems of social undertakings, and instead of repeating our little criticisms, we could propose to our fellow citizens a new organization of society, a conception based on a more profound knowledge of all the economic, human, psychological and, even, ethnic problems—a conception based upon the possession of all the facts concerning agricultural and industrial production, of knowledge of national and international relations, questions of energy and raw materials, transport, economic geography and distribution. In short, we must acquire a training and background which will convince those whom we wish to influence that they are dealing with capable, serious and responsible men—not with simple agitators or dilettantes of revolution.

It is by constructive rather than by negative propaganda that the libertarian movement will attract worthwhile members, without whom it can accomplish nothing. At a time when domination by the state is making such formidable progress, the literary defence of the rights of the individual is little more than a pleasant pastime. On the other hand, the great increase in human needs, the interdependence of men, and the resulting need for co-ordinated activity make it necessary to set forth social objectives in a way that will interest serious people.

There are in France perhaps 100,000 anarchists who don't know it—and they will not be attracted because only "working class" (French: *ouvrieriste*) propaganda is used. This, in substance, is what a comrade recently wrote. I agree with him. But I do not believe they can be attracted by propaganda which concentrates solely on the rights of the individual. We must offer constructive ideas which embrace society as a whole. For the individual is not independent of the group. Without it, he would be nothing—just as the comrade of whom I speak would not have acquired the culture necessary for the development of his individuality had it not been for the work of all of humanity.

First let there be constructive work. But it must be the work of true sociologists and economists (of specialists, if necessary)—not of abstract theoreticians, of literary dabblers in sociology or of fabricators of utopias. These things are not absolutely useless, but they are absolutely not enough. By taking the essential teachings of our great predecessors and re-adapting them to our time, we can create an intellectual movement, a sociological school that is attuned to the present evolution of the world, so that our efforts will not be doomed to failure.

GASTON LEVAL.

## MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

### LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP and MALATESTA DEBATING SOCIETY IMPORTANT

MEETINGS are now held at CAMBRIDGE CIRCUS "The Marquis of Granby" Public House, London, W.C.2.

(corner Charing Cross Road and Shaftesbury Avenue) at 7.30 p.m.

### ALL WELCOME

MAR. 27.—Jim Baker (Australia) on SYDNEY LIBERTARIANISM AND PERMANENT PROTEST.

APRIL 3.—S. E. Parker on THE FUTURE IS NOW

APRIL 10.—J. M. Pilgrim on ANARCHISM AND SCIENCE FICTION

APRIL 17.—No meeting

## For a while you had me worried

I AM a sucker for free literature. Whatever is going I take it avidly, whether it be "How a Teddy-Boy Found Christ" or "Seven Days' Trial of Colour Television Free!" After all, it's not very sociable to refuse the proffered leaflet, and one day you might be giving away leaflets yourself. The other day in the lobby of the local cinema I was given a leaflet by somebody in uniform. I stuffed it into my pocket and rushed in for my weekly dose of Soma. Later, waiting at Earl's Court for a train, I fished it out of my pocket and found it was a glossy leaflet in what I think is called puce. There is a picture of an intellectual sitting in a contemporary armchair two sizes too small and turning to peer over his glasses and away from his book and somebody is saying, "How many tons make a megaton?" Who, I don't know and don't care. You can tell this chap is an intellectual by two things: he wears glasses and he has a book. Glasses with horn rims are now a status-symbol classifying one as an intellectual. You will remember the immortal lines "Men who wear glasses, never made faux passes", and there is a whole technique of by-play with spectacles\* photographs, has two ploys. One, an adjustment of spectacles down his nose to take you into his vision. He switches

\*FREEDOM 3. 10. 59, "Party Piece", J.R. is referred to for some field work.

This character, in his series of five

with speed from the wide world of learning (the book) to the field of the minute particular (you). Not for him the long process of taking off his spectacles and looking at you, no, the world of learning is still there, within his reach.

Ploy number two is a glance over his spectacles at you whilst he still has the book in his hands. The field of learning is far away (almost at the end of his nose) and he comes back sharply with "A megaton? Wait a minute, I think I've read that in the newspapers."

You see, he is an intellectual but he has the common touch. The book clinches the intellectual part of it. It has a cloth cover too and no doubt there are words in it. But he does not get his facts from these dry, stuffy books which he reads in a rather uncomfortable chair. He is in touch with life, he reads newspapers and does remember the word 'megaton'.

However, his interlocutor, whoever he is, does know. He's probably read a book about it.

"A megaton is a million tons—and a 2-megaton H-Bomb, for instance, is equal in power to 2 million tons of high explosive."

Our interlocutor comes back, "The H-Bomb" (you can't keep anything from him), "Doesn't really bear thinking about, does it?" Probably that book hadn't got any words in.

Our interlocutor, nothing daunted, carries on:

"The H-Bomb is a fact—you've got to think about it. And however hard we work for peace, H-Bombs could be dropped. That's a fact too. There are 600,000 people in Civil Defence who've faced these facts, and they're doing something about it. For the sake of the survivors."

Does the man mean that "we" are the government and the government is working for peace or does he accuse the intellectual of working for peace? It's possible. In any case I thought the whole point of the deterrent policy was that no bombs would be dropped, that it was all an illusion.

The intellectual rises to his feet in amazement. Not to sock the C.D. man for that crack about peace but to say, "You mean there could be survivors after the H-Bomb?" (Calm down Buster, he's not asking for volunteers for survival).

The C.D. man says "Yes. Although many people would die, millions could survive. That's what Civil Defence is for—to help these millions of people to go on living. It would be the biggest rescue operation in history. That's why Civil Defence needs more trained volunteers—men and women—and if they're going to be properly trained we need them now. There wouldn't be time to train them on the day."

The C.D. man is a little vague about statistics, although he did come back smartly about the megaton. But the enemy doesn't help. If he told us what size bomb he'd drop we'd work out how many survivors there'd be. In America the Holfied Committee estimated that with an average nine-megaton bomb content, forty-three million people would be injured and one third would die. They estimated that about 1,500 megatons would be released in a one-day war and 23 million people would be killed. Of course, this is all working in the dark; the enemy may have improved since and hasn't told us, but in any case this is also what America could do to him.

I am glad to hear that C.D. has invented an antidote to radiation. The odds and ends of people dying off in Hiroshima and Nagasaki years afterwards was most untidy. But I think a little

humility on the part of C.D. is necessary. After all, Noah's Ark was surely the greatest rescue operation in history. Perhaps they think of it in the classification of miracles like the parting of the Red Sea and Joshua stopping the sun?

It's perfectly true that you couldn't train C.D. workers in a day—not even in the four minutes warning we'll get—but training there obviously must be to deal with compound injuries, deep radiation burns, typhus, starvation, firestorms, decontamination of soil, water and crops, and elimination of the strontium contamination, radiation sickness, lowered resistance to minor infections, blood transfusions, leukemia and bone cancer (these two will not develop till later so training for these can wait). On top of this C.D. must organise the obtaining and distribution of uncontaminated food. They must also be quite sure that none of their people are affected by any bomb incident. An American doctor has viewed his imaginary task after an imaginary raid on St. Louis as trying to bail out a lake with a teacup. Obviously C.D. aims to provide a bigger teacup.

Our intellectual is now on his feet. He still has one hand in his pocket which shows he's uncommitted. "I'd like to help of course, but . . ." Our C.D. man doesn't give him a chance to answer but says, "You'll need to give an hour or two a week. You'll learn things that are always useful—First Aid, for instance. At the same time you'll be doing a real service to the community where you live and you'll be doing it with a fine, friendly lot of people. Anyway, we're not asking you to make your mind up now."

I am reminded of the C.D. worker from Chelsea (doubtless an intellectual too) who leaked out the top-secret C.D. information that 'if the people in Hiroshima had known what we know now they would not have had so many casualties' (or words to that effect).

I am glad that C.D. workers are a fine friendly lot of people and I have no doubt that the basic training on getting foreign bodies out of the eye and treating nose-bleeds will be useful when they drop that 2-megaton-bomb. But don't think I'm worried—you see I always thought a megaton was four million tons of high explosive!

JACK SPRATT.

## FREEDOM "REPRINTS"

(VOLUME 9 READY SHORTLY)

### Still Available:

- 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

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

## 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