

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"If men were no better than their religions the world would be a hell indeed."

—W. K. CLIFFORD

On other pages:

The Apprentices-The Situation Today - p. 2

Van Gogh's 'Potato Eaters' - p. 3

Labour in Labour - p. 4

Vol. 21, No. 44

October 29th, 1960

Threepence

Prerequisites for A FREE PRESS

THE closure of the *News Chronicle* has been received with "Farewell" editorials, and crocodile tears; with extravagant headlines "Death in Fleet Street" (*Sunday Times*), "Poison in the Cocoa" (*The Observer*) and "The Murder of the *News Chronicle*" (*New Statesman*); with pathetic letters from loyal readers in the *Guardian* which opened its correspondence columns to the *News Chronicle* refugees who refuse the Tory handshake of Lord Rothermere and his *Daily Mail*; and finally, with an indecent haste by the surviving mass circulation press to cash-in before even the corpse was cold, let alone buried.

The bombshell which apparently hit the staff of the two "liberal" papers came as no surprise to the Stock Exchange where for more than a week before the shares of the Associated Newspapers which control the Mail group, "had attracted buying and had risen smartly in price"; and the fact that the *Daily Mail* appeared on the morning following the announcement in its new guise (but a poor disguise) and could also inform readers that the services of a number of *News Chronicle* journalists had been secured by the *Mail*, makes it clear that a large number of journalists and key men on both papers must have been fully aware for some time of the merger and the fate that awaited their fellow journalists and the printing and distributive workers employed by the Cadbury group. So while one may sympathise with those employees who deplore the underhanded way in which the Cadburys disposed of their papers, and the shoddy way

they treated their staff, the profession itself has little to learn where the Fleet Street rat race is concerned. They have for too long been an integral part of it for one to feel positively indignant when they are hurt by the monster they have so willingly served.

FLEET STREET and some of the public were shocked by the serious unemployment the merger had created. 300 editorial staff and 3,100 printers and other employees lost their jobs when the *News Chronicle* and *Star* folded up. No-one, however, was shocked to learn that so many people were needed to produce so little! No wonder Fleet Street, like Hollywood, is a preserve for millionaires! And this was certainly the case with the *News Chronicle-Star* group which had no shareholders' interest but was owned almost entirely by members of the Cadbury family.

In this rarified world of the millionaire Press, those employed by it enjoy far higher rates of pay than their colleagues in the different branches of the industry. In fact they operate their own wage negotiations with the employers, and operate like a freemasonry in keeping out all but their friends and relatives from the industry. With few outstanding exceptions journalism for them is a job, and who pays the piper calls the tune. When Bevan referred to the British capitalist press as "the most prostituted in the world" surely he was not referring to the proprietors of that Press who have always appeared to us blatantly honest in their purely financial interest in the industry, but to their employees who sell themselves so easily to the highest bidder.

Chronicle and the *Star*, has been a life-long reader of the former (he gave-up the latter years ago as unreadable!) But we must confess that we have not shed a tear, because the *News Chronicle* in its fight for mass-circulation, had become hardly distinguishable from the gutter press. The bigger its headlines became the more unreliable was its news; the more it struggled for circulation the more reactionary became its editorial comments and the more trivial its features. It lost the finest cartoonist in the country, Vicky, not over money, but because it wanted to control what he had to say. It lost

James Cameron, one of the few outstanding journalists of integrity for reasons not made public, though Cameron's "farewell" article in the *Chronicle* (June 28) implied that what he was expected to write about politics for the "liberal" paper was hardly more intelligent than what the gutter press demands from its hacks. (And Cameron, it should be added has not popped up in the *Express* nor the *Mail*!)

Undoubtedly the *News Chronicle* was not as nauseating as the *Daily Mail* appears to us from our brief encounter with it during the past week. (We have since changed to the *Daily Herald*, clearly a serious paper for racegoers, and we have discovered, a worse newspaper than the *Daily Mail*), but this did not make it into a good paper. We hope we shall not be misunderstood when we say that it might well turn out to

be a good thing that the only "popular" daily which had some kind of radical tradition should have sold-out in the way it did, without either consulting its staff or placing before its loyal readers the financial difficulties it was facing. The more or less thinking public need such shock treatment to be made aware of how little they count in the world they live in so long as they content themselves with being the spectators, the shouters of slogans which sound very fine, but which it is time they realised are meaningless without control from below.

"Freedom of the Press" is one such slogan which is now being loudly repeated by some of the million displaced *News Chronicle* readers, and by the unemployed Fleet Street journalists. But every

Continued on p. 3



Band and Banquets, Flags and Fireworks in the AMERICAN ELECTION CAMPAIGN

ALTHOUGH we are used to pre-election political antics in this country it is still possible to be surprised by the way in which American elections are conducted.

The bands and the banquets, the flags and the fireworks stimulate interest and excitement. Regretably they do not add to understanding nor encourage individual responsibility.

The competition raging in the United States between Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Nixon for the Presidency might persuade the American electorate that there are real differences between them, but in fact the Democrats and Republicans are closer in policy than even Labour and Tory in Britain.

The tempo of the Presidential campaign is characteristic of other aspects of American life which is impressively dynamic. The trouble is that this tremendous energy is misdirected, as can be seen in the present campaign.

We have already had in this country pictorial accounts of the primary elections—spectacular public shows. Now television has presented us with the two candidates engaged in face to face debate, in the austere atmosphere of a TV studio. Neither had anything to say which has not already been said over and over again so that the appearances really amounted to a personality contest.

Nixon submitted to the hands of the make-up team in an attempt to hide his less attractive facial features;

Kennedy spurned powder and paint relying on the looks endowed him by nature to attract.

The stated intention of both on the political level is to build a militarily strong America all the better to negotiate with the Russians.

Kennedy's election cry is that the present administration has lost America much prestige abroad by its inept foreign policy; Nixon naturally counters this by stating that American prestige has never been higher, and appeals to American pride by suggesting that Kennedy has no faith in the American people.

Kennedy strenuously denies this; he loves America and the Americans and because of this does not want to see them misled.

Nixon suggests that it may be necessary to increase taxation in the winter of 1961, Kennedy is opposed to this, although the Democrats are in favour of increasing armament expenditure and aid for "depressed areas" for which more money has to be found. Nixon does not deny the need for economic assistance to the under-developed countries, a policy which will not endear either of them to money-conscious Americans.

The affluent picture of American society is slightly shaken by Kennedy's claim that "17 million Americans go to bed hungry" and the Secretary of Agriculture's statement that 25 million Americans have inadequate diets. These are the kind of unpleasant facts that "good Americans" should not discuss in public!

A tactical mistake by Kennedy which, may nevertheless find support from economically depressed groups to balance the numbers of voters antagonised by his "revelations".

It seems that Nixon scored a point over Kennedy on the question of U.S. forces in Quemoy and Matsu. It is doubtful if the American voter understands the intricacies of military strategy, but they are well conditioned to react to any mention of Communism. Thus when Kennedy stated that experts maintain that Quemoy and Matsu are strategically indefensible and therefore, U.S. troops should be withdrawn, Nixon seized on the point to claim that it would be a surrender to the Communists.

We wonder how many Americans objected to his dismissal of the people who lived there as being "not too important" compared to the principle, when he fervently reiterated that he would never tolerate withdrawal as President of the U.S.:

"The question is not these two little pieces of real estate; they are unimportant; it isn't the few people who live on them—they are not too important. It is the principle involved."

It seems that Kennedy supporters felt that Nixon had "landed an emotional punch" in the exchange over Quemoy and Matsu, a measure perhaps of the immaturity of the American voter who can be persuaded that people are not too important (that is, other people) as compared with the fight against Communism, real or otherwise.

AFRICA

OVER 400 Africans in Southern Rhodesia are now held by the authorities in "reception centres" surrounded by barbed wire. These men are categorised as "spivs, loafers and hoodlums" arrested under the Vagrancy Act which provides for the detention of any person of sixteen or over who cannot prove that he is employed or with some form of subsistence.

We do not doubt that Africans have their share of spivs and hoodlums, but the 40,000 unemployed in Southern Rhodesia cannot all be detained under the Vagrancy Act or categorised as spivs.

Spivs are never really a threat to any government, but it is obvious that what worries the Rhodesian authorities is that discontented and unemployed Africans can become a political force which will threaten the interests of the white minority.

This cynical action to be followed by a bill empowering the Government to sentence anyone caught throwing stones to a minimum sentence of five years, is part of the Rhodesian Government's plan to stamp out African demands which go "too far" in the direction of equality.

The clause which calls on Africans to prove employment will allow the authorities "to deal" with some of the leaders of the National Democratic Party who are:

"convinced that the Vagrancy Act is intended to get rid of them since they are not employed and no European can afford to employ them because of the views they stand for."

THE writer of this column, like so many who have expressed their sorrow at the demise of the *News*

WE'RE ALL LIBERALS NOW!

The *Daily Mail* has always been independent of political parties, though in recent years it has consistently supported progressive Conservatism as the one anti-Socialist force able to form an alternative Government.

It has done so in what it believes to be the interests of the nation. It has tried to serve the people as a whole, and not any one section.

Nevertheless, its outlook is liberal in the true sense of the term, a claim which, we are certain, will be endorsed by those familiar with its policies and opinions.

Daily Mail (Oct. 18).

RENT RACKETEERS

A deputation told Mr. Henry Brooke, Minister of Housing, that some London landlords had demanded second rent increases of more than 60 per cent. after increases of at least 50 per cent. The Minister told the deputation, from the All-London Private Tenants' Co-ordinating Committee, that he would take note of their views.

Afterwards Mr. R. W. Rawlings, leader of the deputation, said the Minister had also been told of a house converted into flats which, within five years, sold at a price increased from £2,000 to £7,000. The rents of a single flat increased in the first place to more than 100 per cent, and then to a total increase of 120 per cent.

Guardian.

THE APPRENTICES

The Situation To-day

(Continued from previous issue)

TODAY apprenticeship is voluntary in the legal sense, but is governed not only by uncodified ancient tradition varying from industry to industry, but by the National Schemes for Apprenticeship agreed since the last war by the two sides of the industry concerned, and by the individual indentures which are the basic feature of the system, by which the apprentice binds himself to serve the employer for a specified number of years, and the employer undertakes to teach him a given trade and at the end of the period to give him a certificate which in turn earns him the "skilled ticket" of his union. The National Schemes have features of two kinds. The first, which are ancient and binding, fix the length of service, usually five years, and the rigid age limits for beginning and ending apprenticeship, usually 16 and 21 years of age respectively. The second which are new and discretionary, provide for a written agreement, for collaboration with the Youth Employment Service, and for day-release—the apprentice attending a technical college one day a week at the expense of the employer.

The old controversy about the number of apprentices has declined in importance. The unions, except

in printing, boilermaking and some ship-building trades, no longer insist on apprentice ratios, since, as a means of restricting entry into skilled occupations, this has become ineffective because of dilution agreements and because changed techniques have de-skilled many jobs. Employers on the other hand no longer seek (with exceptions again, as the Rochdale apprentices point out) to use apprentices as cheap labour, since it is no longer so cheap in view of the general proportional rise of juvenile wages and because of the cost of day-release where this is operated. The long period of service, and the rigid age limits, are however powerful factors in limiting the number of apprentices.

It is important to realise that apprenticeship only exists in certain industries. There are no apprentices, other than in maintenance trades, in textiles, the mining industry or on the railways. The boot and shoe industry has no apprentices, only learners, and has developed techniques for teaching skilled operatives in a very short time.

Within the trade union movement, the craft unions have a vested interest in apprenticeship, while the general unions are not well-disposed towards the institution, since the privileges of apprenticed craftsmen are maintained at their members' expense.

Does the Boss Get His Money's Worth?

Employers have an obvious interest in maintaining the supply of industrial skill. Why then is the number of apprenticeships not expanding? The answer you are usually given is the high cost of training, especially because of day-release. This is the reason why in the building industry the smaller firms do not accept the National Scheme. On the other hand employers get tax-relief on both the education and the wages of apprentices. Asked at what stage apprentices cease to be a hindrance and become a help, employers get cagy and answer anything from "six months" to "never". Dr. Liepmann concluded that "as a rule the service of craft apprentices was said to become profitable to the employer well within the first half of their term."

Does the Boy Get an Education?

Under conditions of day-release the apprentices attend courses leading to the City and Guilds examinations or the National Certificates. So far as practical training is concerned, the employer alone is responsible, minimum standards are not laid down and no test of proficiency is required at the end of the period. Some large firms, and some smaller ones, maintain excellent schools of their own and provide a first-rate technical education. Mather and Platt and Enfield Cables are famous in this respect, and the nationalised industries have a good record. So much so that when an Area Electricity Board offered six apprenticeships there were 450 applicants.

Other large firms are however, so departmentalised that they provide a very narrow range of training. "Lads are taught one branch of machining only; this is not our idea of being a machinist" complains a Bristol boy. In many small firms, where from the nature of the work, the boy is moved on from one job to another, apprentices often feel that "they have the freedom of their employer's shop and learn all there is to learn in the business". Dr. Liepmann comments that while this does not mean that the apprentices are right in their judgment "their contentment is in telling contrast to the dissatisfaction felt by many trade apprentices in larger firms." **The Shadow of the Bulge**

Concern over the low general quality of technical training in this



country as compared with that in its industrial rivals, and anxiety about the current big increase in the teenage population have given rise to a spate of investigations and recommendations about apprenticeship in the last few years. Between the end of the war and 1957 the number of school leavers each year varied between 600,000 and 650,000 boys and girls. By 1962 there will be 930,000, in 1963, 820,000 and in 1964, 725,000. But the proportion of school leavers entering apprenticeships is, if anything, tending to fall. The report of the Carr Committee (*Training for Skill* H.M.S.O. 1958) recommended the establishment of a National Apprenticeship Council to foster apprenticeships. What actually was set up was an Industrial Training Council, under the wing of the British Employers' Confederation, a body which has proved useless. Professor Lady Williams in *Recruitment to Skilled Trades* (Routledge 1957) recommended apprenticeship to an industry instead of to an individual firm, a method which is employed in the building industry in America, and which would encourage small firms to take apprentices. The Engineering Industries Association recommended group apprenticeship schemes to enable apprentices to circulate among a number of firms. Mr. Austin Albu alleged in the House of Commons on 30/4/59 that the EIA's rival, the Engineering

Employers' Federation, was deliberately trying to sabotage this scheme. The Principal of Llandaff Technical College (*Technology* Nov. 1958) recommended the setting up of basic apprentice training schools financed by a levy on industry, like the French *centres d'apprentissage* which give a three-year course. The Crowther Report (15 to 18, H.M.S.O. 1959) made similar recommendations, and urged "sandwich" courses and "block release" instead of day-release. Dr. Kate Liepmann in her very thorough study *Apprenticeship: an enquiry into its adequacy under modern conditions* (Routledge 1960) concludes that "Considering all circumstances, the national interest would seem to require that the State must take the prime responsibility for training for industry, both in its quantitative and in its qualitative aspects", and finally Margaret Croft in her pamphlet *Apprenticeship and the 'Bulge'* (Fabian Society 1960) surveying progress, concludes that "a considerable amount of potential skill has already been wasted during the last two years, owing to the inaction of both industry and government".

What Does it Add up to?

Our first conclusion is that the apprentices themselves, in the attitudes that emerged in this year's strike and in, for instance, the Rochdale *Progress* group are right. In their demand for a bigger slice of their industry's cake, in their contempt for antiquated systems of demarcation which set up barriers between workers whose interests are the same, and in their demand for improvements in educational provisions. None of the studies and reports dreams of mentioning the idea of a national committee or national union of apprentices to press for their own interests, none of them produces so sensible an idea as the local committee of apprentices to supervise their own practical training that *Progress* envisages.

The "national interest" arguments evoked by many of the critics leave us cold. It is perfectly true that a nation that spends so small a percentage of its income as we do on education is going to reap the fruit of this neglect. But in the specific

field of technical education what does the national interest demand? Ballistic missiles, moon rockets, a new Cunarder? Whatever the alleged national interest demands it will rapidly provide training for, as the influx of millions of workers into the engineering industry in the last war showed. The failure of so many apprentices to obtain their City and Guilds or National Certificates because of their weakness in mathematics is a reflection of the state of maths. teaching in the primary and secondary schools, which in turn, as Dr. Kathleen Ollerenshaw ("How Not to Teach Mathematics" *Sunday Times* 1.6.58.) and Dr. J. Bronowski ("Maths as a Language" *Observer* 25.1.59), have shown, as the result of faulty teaching methods, and a failure to apply to teaching practice the lessons of educational psychology. But in a society which concentrates its best teachers on an intellectual elite, we



must not be surprised that the majority are given so sketchy a grounding in basic mental techniques. It is the general education of apprenticeships that gives most cause for alarm.

Restricted to One Job

Two features of apprenticeship which the reports show to be restrictive and antiquated are the rigid age limits and the length of training. On the latter, a Youth Employment Officer, Miss Croft, makes this reasonable suggestion:

"Some trades obviously take longer to learn than others, quite apart from the fact that modern training methods make the traditional length of all of them look antiquated. Prestige and status play a big part, and no trade unionist is willing to admit that his own trade is less skilled than others, which is very human and

Continued on p. 4

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

(Open 10 a.m.—5.30 p.m. and till 5 p.m. every Saturday.)

New Books . . .

The Chinese Communes Richard Hughes 10/6
History of the American People, Vol. 2 H. Aptheker 30/-
Men and Ideas J. Huizinga 25/-
The Bargainers: a Survey of Modern Trade Unionism G. Cyriax & R. Oakshott 21/-
Vicky Must Go! Vicky 5/-

Reprints and Cheap Editions . . .

Collected Short Stories H. G. Wells 15/-
Wit and Wisdom Oscar Wilde 5/-
The Sweet Life Lo Duca 2/6

Second-Hand . . .

Twenty Million Black Voices Richard Wright 6/-
London Labour and the London Poor (shabby and damaged) Henry Mayhew 5/6
National & International Measures for Full Employment United Nations 1949 3/-
The Eclipse of Russia (1918) E. J. Dillon 6/-
Perspectives, No. 4 Saroyan, Stegner, Seldes, &c. 2/6
Chinese Science Joseph Needham 3/-
Mysticism and Logic Bertrand Russell 7/6
America and the Intellectuals Barzun, Burnham, Hook, &c. 5/-
Human Knowledge, its Scope and Limits Bertrand Russell 12/6
Freedom is as Freedom does Corliss Lamont 7/6
Julian the Apostate and the Rise of Christianity F. A. Ridley 12/6
Great Essays of all Nations 6/-
Great Short Stories of the World Capital and Labour, Ideal Commonwealths, &c. (1890) Wilson and Harmsworth 3/-
Lectures and Essays R. G. Ingersoll 6/-

Pamphlets . . .

War Outmoded Anthony Weaver 2/6
This England 2/6

Periodicals . . .

University Libertarian, No. 11 1/-
Flame, October 8d.

Send for our second-hand book list of—Fiction, Poetry, Drama, Biography and Anthologies.

We can supply ANY book required, books searched for—and frequently fisher's name if possible, but if not we can find it. Scarce and out-of-print including text-books. Please supply pub-found!

Postage free on all items
Obtainable from

17a MAXWELL ROAD
FULHAM LONDON SW6

Tel: Renown 3736

The Lapps

THE South African Foreign Minister recently made a criticism of Sweden's Social Democratic Government, whilst referring to their foreign Minister's attacks against South Africa's racial policy.

Mr. Louw stated that the treatment of the Lapps in Sweden is synonymous with that of the non-white population in South Africa. The Lapps are of palaeo-archaic origin speaking a Finno-Ugric language. Their population is estimated about 31,000 of which 19,000 are in Norway, 8,000 in Sweden, 2,000 in Finland and 2,000 in Russia.

The reindeer supplies the Lapps' chief wants such as clothing, food, transport. The Lapps have believed to have wandered from western Siberia into the empty lands of arctic Europe.

Of the many masters which the Lapps have had to bear, the Swedes and the Russians left the strongest imprint, forcing upon them the Greek Orthodox religion, the Swedes through Gustavus Adolphus. In their wake came exploiters who formed the Lapps and even owned them.

Mr. Louw mentioned a series of three articles published in the Swedish Liberal paper *Expressen* in 1959 where it was stated how state laws and discrimination harass the Lapps.

The South African Foreign Minister's criticism in the "United Nations" seems to point out that racial discrimination is international, and in this case we have a capitalist kettle calling a capitalist pot black. Seeing as Sweden is the first to give itself to the lost causes of "The International Red Cross", "Save the Children Fund", "Refugee Year", etc., etc., within a capitalist world. One wonders how they justify their "humanitarian" calling in the treatment of their 8,000 Lapps.

St. Pancras

Everyone would like to go to bed:
And let the tenants of St. Pancras bleed instead—
Whose demonstration inks a river down
The street-map of the sleeping town.

A well-bred Tory boat-face grins
At worker-speakers on the platform of their sins:
"A harmless antic, anachronistic, gone:
A thousand well-paid policemen draw them on."

In Hendon, Pinner, Harrow, Chelsea, Barnes, St. John's Wood
Christopher Robin is saying his prayers:
"God protect Daddy's guilt-edged shares.
Children's Hour taught me it had to be so—
God Queen Country and the Status Quo."

Down through the bottleneck of Thursday night
This human river flowed by the light of its own light
Into a skilful staff-college tactical trap
Worked out on an ordnance survey map
By Christopher Robin's father in a copper's cap.

Neat, impersonal, an officer first and last
Waits to signal in his weapon of the past
A faceless black attack by Metropolitan ghurkas
Against a peaceful procession of St. Pancras workers.

Antique, barbarous, the sword of history was drawn
The demonstration quartered like an idea worn
Not long enough to train its own street fighters.

Coppers are the sediment of workers souls
A minute scorpion-tail of poison stinging
The unheard voices buried deep but singing
Of primeval problems and their one solution:

"In the beginning were the people
And when God spoke, the word was Revolution."

ALAN SILLITOE.

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 21, No. 44 October 26, 1960

Prerequisites for A FREE PRESS

Continued from p. 1

one of those readers must have known that the price they paid for their newspaper hardly covered the cost of the paper on which it was printed, and that the continued publication of "their" favourite daily depended on its being considered a worthwhile medium for the national Advertisers.

The public's indifference to the freedom of the Press was demonstrated when in 1957, because of rising costs, the *News Chronicle* raised its price from 2d to 2½d. That extra ½d. lost the paper 230,000 readers! Mr. Cadbury in his obituary statement declared that in the first 9 months of this year the *Chronicle* and *Star*, between them had lost £300,000. A lot of money for you or me, but if the 1,800,000 loyal readers, lovers of freedom of the press, had paid 3d. instead of 2½d. for their paper, in a year Mr. Cadbury's coffers would have swelled by nearly £1 million gross. Even the newspaper sellers on the street-corners could have received a little extra recognition for their services to the free press! The fact that he did not try to do this does not mean that he and his advisers did not think of it, but that perhaps with the experience of what happened three years ago it was felt that a further substantial drop in circulation would result in a further cut in advertising revenue. The old story of the vicious spiral.

Have we exaggerated the question of public meanness when it is a question of paying an extra ½d. to enjoy the "freedom of the press"? We shall see where the million former *News Chronicle* readers go for their daily news ration.

THE *GUARDIAN* which is by far a better paper than was the *Chronicle* has a circulation of about 250,000. It is a sober, safe, informative national newspaper which eschews sensationalism and upholds the best traditions of journalism. It is a liberal paper, a paper of the centre. It is solid and, apart from occasional unorthodox letters in its correspondence columns, can be relied upon to view human affairs with its feet well planted on the ground. After all it is now a National newspaper and this status apparently carries special responsibilities, the principle of which is that there is no room in its columns, editorial or feature, for anything but orthodox, establishment, ideas.

On Black Tuesday it wrote its "Farewell" to its two liberal *confères* and even exaggerated the facts when it declared that they had "gone down with flags flying and guns firing". But then "to write dispassionately about the death of friends is not easy". By Friday however the hard facts of life had taken over. "An uneconomic newspaper like an uneconomic pit, must close; that is inevitable". With such an approach by the *Guardian* what hope is left for the freedom of the Press?

Let us face the realities as they are for then we, the public, may draw strength from our knowledge. We use the example of the *Guardian* because though most of the National Press present themselves to the public behind a facade of a Trust,* which has probably much more to

*The *Observer* which is itself a Trust, commented that you need very big funds these days to run a popular paper, and the people most likely to have big money are successful business men who treat newspapers not as a trust but as a saleable commodity. The *News Chronicle's* particular form of "trust" ownership turned out to mean very little.

do with the avoidance of paying Death Duties than with guaranteeing a public service, the *Guardian* at least, is not in the business for the benefit of shareholders. But the *Guardian* a staunch upholder of the capitalist system, government and the *status quo*, looks upon the dissemination of news as essential but at the same time a service which should be provided only if the public pays for it. Viewed from a strictly practical point of view, we have no objection to this. We consider it sheer hypocrisy however when the *Guardian* is sold to the public at a third or a quarter of its economic price simply because it has succeeded in persuading advertisers that it is in their interest to subsidise the other two thirds. Clearly, the day the advertisers cease to consider the *Guardian* a profitable medium for selling their goods or services either it must ask 9d. or 1/- from its readers or give up as the *News Chronicle* has done with more than four times the *Guardian's* circulation. Today, even the *Guardian* would not hold its 250,000 readers at that price, not because it is not worth the price of 4 cigarettes or a pound of sugar but because the public has been conditioned to accept the Press as a service subsidised by the Advertising industry. And the Press has only itself to blame for this.

It is obvious that for decades the newspaper proprietors realised that they could make more money out of the Press by using it as a medium for advertising than as a serious medium for news. Circulation therefore is the means not to a better newspaper but to a larger advertising revenue. Hence all mass circulation papers are sold at a nominal price. An extra ½d. on the price and they are either "quality" papers or the *Daily Worker*—but subsidised papers just the same.

UNFORTUNATELY, instead of learning from experience both the public and the professionals continue to think in the same terms and with the same values as in the past. We will concede that the *Guardian* did write in one of its editorials

Will others go the way of the *News Chronicle*, the *Star* and the *Empire News*? It seems all too likely. Advertising revenue now dominates the economy of any newspaper, and the tendency, except where much local advertising exists, is to strengthen the strong publications and weaken the weak. But enterprise and the use of new techniques—helped by a higher critical standard among readers—can still save casualties.

But this does not go far enough, as we will attempt to show. On the other hand professionals such as Mr. Francis Williams, agree with our approach on two issues. In his article in last week's *Sunday Times* he argues that the price of newspapers is still "far too cheap by overseas standards" and an increase in price would help middle-group papers if "they could hold circulations at the higher price" and thereby lessening their dependence "to some extent on advertising. But it is unlikely to be taken until the successful newspaper publishers find it necessary". He also thinks that costs could be cut. But we part company when he writes

If costs could be lowered then it would seem possible on the evidence of the quality Press that viable circulations of between one million and 1,500,000 could be obtained for daily papers in the middle group—more serious than the papers of mass circulation, less comprehensive than those in the present quality sector.

But in any such effort advertisers and their agents must be prepared to play their part. It cannot be in their interest, on purely commercial grounds alone, to see their outlets steadily reduced. And it is difficult to believe that in a prosperous society circulations of that order, which means readerships of three to four million, could not now have considerable advertisers' value.

It is ridiculous to suppose that a free press can exist so long as it depends for part of its existence on the good will of the national advertisers, to whom Mr. Williams makes his appeal not as lovers of freedom but

"on purely commercial grounds alone". For a free press may well feel obliged to attack those "purely commercial grounds" by which the advertisers make their profits, and to do so, if they depend on advertising, would mean the death of their papers. We also very much doubt whether a mass circulation press as envisaged by Mr. Williams as "viable" can be free in the true sense of the word. Indeed we are convinced that the press is free only when it springs from the need of a community; when it exists because a community has given it life. For this reason we do not believe that the mass circulation press can ever be other than it is in this country—or in Russia.

THE action committee of the staff of the *News Chronicle* which plans to start a new "radical publication" was last Sunday circulating a statement of what the *Observer* calls "moral support from leading figures in many walks of life". The statement reads

"We, the undersigned, believing that the country suffers from the increasing concentration of the mass-circulation national Press into the hands of a few people, recognise that there is an urgent need to promote a revival of independent and responsible popular journalism.

"We accordingly welcome the efforts of former members of the staff of the *News Chronicle* to keep alive the traditions of that newspaper and wish them success in their campaign to promote a publication for that purpose." An independent and responsible newspaper will need more than

moral support. Will those among the signatories who are publicists agree to withhold their collaboration from the gutter press and promise to write for the new paper for a reasonable fee? Unless they are prepared to do this they should be written off as "phoneys".

As to the action committee, they are quoted in the *Observer* as having already set up a newspaper organisation in miniature and as having said that it would be "an entirely full-time professional venture and that the Editor would be a damn good radical and a damn good professional". But they have not said a word of where we, the readers come into this set-up. The *Guardian* quotes the Committee as saying that "public, political and financial support was growing for the idea of a new radical daily newspaper . . . Several potential backers had said they would like to discuss the project this week". This, to our minds is a bad start for the newspaper in spite of the committee's assurance that "such a new paper would be along new lines, catering for all radicals and providing a forum for every shade of Left of Centre opinion." Such a paper not only must not rely on advertisers but should also steer clear of "several potential backers" if it intends to keep its hands clean and really serve a public need. In which case it should seek to contact its public first, and make its financial appeal to those who will be its readers. Let each one of them have a stake in the new paper, by which

we mean let them take a modest financial risk but also give them an opportunity of having a say as well as feeling a sense of responsibility for the success of the new venture.

Furthermore may we suggest that the action committee start off on the right foot if they really intend to run the paper "along new lines" by abolishing differentials and hierarchies among themselves. Let them establish a basic salary for all concerned with the production of the paper (with allowances for those with families and other similar commitments), thereby recognising that every person employed on the venture is performing a useful job, is contributing to the best of his ability to the success of the venture.

Clearly the moment is ripe for a real radical newspaper, which the *News Chronicle* was not. Whether the self-appointed action committee of ex-employees of the *News Chronicle* are the right people, in view of the depth to which that paper had sunk in the last years, and for which they must accept their share of the responsibility, is another matter. We regret that all we can do is to wait and see, especially since, for a long time we have maintained that a radical daily with only a 20,000 circulation was an economic possibility. We specially regret that the initiative should be left to those who until a fortnight ago were quite content to earn very comfortable livings hacking away for the millionaire Press. Only in unemployment have they discovered their true souls. Well, let's see what they have to offer!

AROUND THE GALLERIES

VAN GOGH'S 'POTATO EATERS'

ON the 27th of July in the year 1890, Vincent van Gogh tried with fumbling hands to end his troubled life and even this self-sought oblivion was denied him, for the hand that held the brush could not wield the gun and it took six months for the life to drain from his broken body. The painter whose last words were "misery will never end", was laid in the soil of the tiny churchyard of Auver-sur-Oise to await his brother Theo, and the hawkers and the hucksters fluttered down like pale vultures to profit from the discarded canvases of this tragic painter.

Yet van Gogh's suicide was as inevitable as the death of Oedipus, for his life was a life of retreat until even the agony of personal solitude was too much to bear. He saw evil in all things and cried out against it but he had no answer to the sorrow and misery that he so deliberately sought. The Dutch youth that was mocked by his landlady's daughter became the art salesman who despised commerce and the incompetent schoolmaster became the droning preacher. Unable to compromise with evil he could only seek his salvation in the misery of others and in return for the gift of his worn coat he could only ask to be allowed to share their tears and bind their wounds.

In 1885 van Gogh painted what was for him his most important painting for he had rejected the dark misery of the coal miners and under the literary influ-

ence of Zola he again sought a personal salvation in the shadowed huts of the Dutch peasants. It was in that year that van Gogh painted the "Potato eaters" and in a letter to his brother Theo he wrote: "I intend to keep in mind the suggestion to the spectator that these people eating their potatoes under the lamp and putting their hands in the plate have also tilled the soil so that my picture praises both manual labour and the food that they have so honestly themselves procured. I intended that the painting should make people think of a way of life entirely different from our own civilized one. So I have no wish whatever for anyone to consider the work beautiful or good."

But this painting marked van Gogh's last grasp with the world around him and from the black soil of Nuenen he fled to the parochial world of Paris and to a palette of warm bright colours. Always in retreat he poured his heart's sickness and his sorrow onto canvases that sang of the golden killing sun and when the colours no longer lulled his tired soul into sweet oblivion, he killed himself. To the Marlborough Fine Art Gallery at 39 Old Bond Street, W.1. they have come, the tourist and the well-heeled matron, the drifting dilettante and the bored schoolgirls to bear witness to the greatness of Vincent van Gogh, for this lush gallery is showing 18 self portraits and there they hang, this sad record of human despair. The eyes watch us as we drift around the room and the colours glow as all the books have stated, but we English love him because like our food we like our artists, our poets and our politicians to be over ripe and rotten. On the background of his own painted face upon the canvas van Gogh laid his bright beads of colour and only the dark eyes soon to be glazed in death formed an anchorage in this whirlpool of greens and reds and blues and yellows. Like his compatriot Mondrian he so arranged his colours and their position on his canvas that it became not an act of painting but a ritual, for like a priest counting his beads van Gogh traversed the map of his own mask and repeated and repeated the pattern of his brush strokes. And when I left the gallery I tramped from the Tate to the National Gallery and into every print shop in Bond Street and the Charing Cross Road, even to the Ganymed Press in art-loving Great Turnstile in Holborn and in each one I asked for a copy of Vincent van Gogh's "Potato eaters" and their answers ranged from amusement to contempt and even to anger that one should expect the reproducers of Great Paintings to waste time and money on stuff that nobody ever asks for, for these

kulture hucksters with the souls of stage butchers are as indifferent to what they hawk as the cashier in a flash self-service shop.

Here is one of the great artists of the 19th century and in the greatest art market capital of the world it is impossible to buy a reproduction of one of his major works, for the shopkeepers and the commercial printers have decided that there is insufficient profit so to hell with culture and would anyone like an earless portrait of a balmy artist, frame extra. But all we can do is to purge our anger with a mild amusement and to do that we can only read the catalogues of the passing shows.

The I.C.A. have been offering Matter Painting and Lawrence Alloway alibies that Robert Melville of the Arthur Jeffress Gallery dreamed up the idea for the exhibition. The title, a matiere, is part of the jargon of French art critics and our lads are trying to use it for that style of painting demonstrated by the Beaux Arts school of muscle painters when the paint is inches thick, Rembrandt used the same gimmick in 1655 when he painted Hendrickje Stoffels but like Liberace our boys are all gimmicks and no talent.

Finally, to end this depressing week, one could go along to the Molton Gallery to view Gillian Ayres sad daubs and read another Alloway catalogue.

ARTHUR MOYSE.

MANAGING THE MANAGERS

A change in production methods which will increase output, has been started at Northfield Colliery, Shotts, Lanarkshire, which is due to be closed next year as uneconomic.

A smaller undercut—it has been reduced from 4½ft. to 3½ft.—was introduced in the main section of the colliery. It will mean a shallower "bite" into the face line during coal cutting operations and will ensure that the coal will be taken out every day.

Mr. William Moore, the National Union of Mineworkers branch delegate, said: "We have been advocating a smaller undercut for about a year, and now the management has finally agreed to it. This new method will increase production and also extend the life of the field of coal being worked. Previously the coal in this section was taken out only two or three times a week."

(Guardian).

Problems of the FREE PRESS!

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!

WEEK 43

Deficit on Freedom £860

Contributions received £801

DEFICIT £59

October 14 to October 20

Bristol: E.B. 10/-; London: A.W.U. 5/-; Stockwell: Anon. 2/6; Sheffield: P.M.B. 2/-; Detroit: J.S. £1/15/0; Surrey: F.B.* 5/-; Romford: S.W. 1/-; Bushey: J.R. 13/-; Hartford: M.G.A. 14/6; Leeds: G.L. 2/-; Wolverhampton: J.G.L. 4/6; Cleveland: T. & D.H. £1/1/0; Brooklyn: C.W.S. 14/-; New York: N.R. 3/6; Farnborough: A.G. 1/-;

Total ... 6 14 0

Previously acknowledged ... 795 5 8

1960 TOTAL TO DATE ... £801 19 8

*Indicates regular contributor.

VIEWPOINT

Labour in Labour

(From a Correspondent)

DESPITE what was suggested in FREEDOM a fortnight ago, the present crisis in the Labour Party is unprecedented, not because there have never been major quarrels or splits before—1931 of course is the classic date—but because the environment is now quite different. Before the War social circumstances were always favourable to the organised Labour Movement, whatever its leaders did; thus in 1931 more than three million people were unemployed. But today the "Revisionist" argument—that proletarian class-consciousness and party loyalty are no longer reliable because of the workers' prosperity and the Conservatives' moderation—is obviously broadly true, so long of course as the workers go on being prosperous and the Conservatives go on trimming their sails to the various winds of change. The simple fact is that since 1951 the total Labour vote has declined steadily in absolute as well as relative terms, and there is no prospect of any increase in future elections unless there are great changes either in the world or in the Labour Party itself.

This is the situation in which a reigning Leader of the Party is being directly challenged for the first time since 1922 (when MacDonald ousted Clynes—hardly an auspicious precedent). MacDonald deserted in 1931; Lansbury insisted on resigning after Bevin's attack in 1935; Attlee was never openly challenged, for the Bevanites preferred to concentrate on the succession. But since 1955 the opposition in the Party—made up of a combination of Socialist attitudes held by Keir Hardie, George Lansbury and Aneurin Bevan—has been turned against Gaitskell himself. Since the 1951 Budget he has himself been one of the chief "Revisionists" and it has become quite clear since the 1959 Election that he belongs firmly to one of the factions in the Party rather than to the Party in general. Thus the second simple fact is that in what is a declining Party there is no basis for unity.

Of course the Labour Party has been

a loose coalition ever since—or even before—its foundation. As well as being a coalition of interests including craft unions, general unions, bureaucrats, careerists, intellectuals, co-operatives, etc., it has always been a coalition of attitudes; and in the present split—as in all previous ones—both sides consist of coalitions. Gaitskell leads the "Revisionist" intellectuals, the old-fashioned trade-unionists, and most of the bureaucrats and careerists; and in the background is the entire Conservative and Liberal press and most "responsible" opinion in the country, praising him for his statesmanship and courage in defying his own Party and insisting on his right (if he is ever Prime Minister) to incinerate the world in defence of Frogna Gardens. The third simple fact is that, like Joseph Chamberlain and David Lloyd George and Ramsay MacDonald, Hugh Gaitskell has rattled.

What of the opposition? Inevitably, the further "left" you go, the more people are going to disagree; for while there is only one way to preserve society as it is, there are thousands of ways of changing it. It is therefore a pretty good rule that any left-wing opposition in the Labour Party will normally be severely fragmented. At the moment the opposition is united on only two things: the Bomb must go, and Gaitskell must go. Thus the pacifists, the fellow-travellers (and the Trotskyists and Communists in the unions), the socialists (whether of the Old Left—"Victory for Socialism"—or of the New Left), and several other smaller elements, are temporarily joined together as unilateralists. Of course Gaitskell and Macmillan are actually unilateralists *de facto*, but only through the force of circumstances; the present Labour opposition is at the moment *neutralist*—that is, it proposes to leave the Western Alliance. This will be denied by many of Gaitskell's opponents, but it is true nevertheless. But there isn't the slightest prospect of winning elections with a neutralist programme, especially with nationalisation and high taxation as well. The fourth simple fact is that unless circumstances

change drastically the opposition in the Labour Party is doomed.

Third Party Risks

The situation then is that Labour is in decline, despite its twelve million odd votes; that the Labour Party is split; that the Labour Leader is in no valid sense a Socialist; and that the Labour opposition cannot hope to win power. All this of course would alter if there were an economic crisis, as Crossman prophesies, or if the Conservatives plucked up enough courage to dismantle the Welfare State, which is far more likely. Barring such an eventuality in the immediate future, what is the prospect? Can either side win in any real sense? Gaitskell is pledged to "fight and fight and fight again"; and already opinion is being mobilised behind him and against his opponents. The way this is being done can be illustrated by one example. A branch meeting of the Transport & General Workers' Union was called in Transport House on October 11th to hear a report from the delegate at Scarborough; in the meeting a resolution was proposed without warning to censure Frank Cousins for exceeding his mandate at the Conference—it was passed by 18 votes to 10. This was leaked to the *Daily Mail*; what was not leaked was that no notice was given of the resolution, that those who voted for it had been fore-warned, that those who spoke for it had prepared speeches, and that the union members who weren't there heard nothing about the vote until the news appeared in the press! Altogether a rather peculiar proceeding. If Gaitskell is to secure a firm victory, there will be similarly squalid battles in all the union and constituency branches, and in the end the Labour Party will lose what little principle it has left.

On the other hand it is almost impossible to believe that the neutralists could take over the Party either; and even if they succeeded in this they would be lucky to get half the twelve million Labour votes. Now all this is realised by most people who work in or for the Party, and some sort of compromise will

probably be patched together. A careerist like Harold Wilson might, as the *New Statesman* suggests, take on the mantle of Nye; or one of the elder statesmen might be called on to take on that of Cincinnatus; at all events the message will go out that now is the time for all good men to come to the aid of the Party. Already people like Crossman and Wedgwood Benn are trying to find a formula acceptable to moderate unilateralists and multilateralists alike. Their immediate fear is a head-on clash between Conference and the Parliamentary Party, for here neither side can possibly "win". As Keir Hardie said in 1907, "If the members cannot be trusted to be loyal and faithful to their great trust, then no programme and no regulations will be of any avail." The trouble is that when the Party has been in the position of accepting conscription and the Bomb for years there isn't much "great trust" left. But all the constitutional wrangles are really bogus; everyone on both sides intends to "fight and fight and fight again", so long as there is a Party left to fight in. They all hope that the inertia of a large political organisation that has existed for sixty years will see them through, though what happened to the Liberals in 1886 and 1916 is a fearful warning.

Mention of the Liberals raises the question of whether they will be able to profit by the Labour crises—either by beating the "Revisionists" at their own game, or else by joining up with them in a Lib-Lab alliance. The possibility of a Gaitskell-Grimond coalition is really very remote, but odder things have happened in politics. What about a com-

LETTER

What the Observer did not Publish in Full

TO THE EDITORS OF FREEDOM.

The *Observer* of 23/10/60 published a letter of mine correcting Philip Toynbee's statement about the ending of Orwell's *Animal Farm* and its pertinence to present-day international affairs. But the whole letter was not published: certain sentences were omitted and replaced by a funny picture by Haro. Here is the original letter in full, with the omitted material in brackets.

"To the Editor of *The Observer*, SIR,

In his review of *To the Finland Station* Philip Toynbee retails an incident which he alleges to occur at the end of Orwell's *Animal Farm*—'the spectacle through the open window of the farmhouse, of the pigs dancing on two legs with the farmers' wives'. This incident does not occur in *Animal Farm*, [but perhaps it is a 'screen memory' in the Freudian sense, in Mr. Toynbee's mind covering up the significant fact of what did occur at the end of the book.] The ending is a terrible row breaking out between pigs and men because Napoleon and Mr. Pilkington had each played an ace of spades simultaneously. [Here Orwell scores full marks for prophetic insight, for surely this is what has happened in U.N.O.]

Orwell did not predict future amity between the rulers of Russia and the Western capitalist powers. The ultimate horror of both *Animal Farm* and *To the Finland Station* lies in the fact that the subjection of the mass to the ruthless power-elite leads to further strife between the elites, in which the masses continue to be sacrificed." G.

Naturally the *Observer* can plead that this letter had to be curtailed for publication for lack of space—but a whole inch-and-a-half of column space in the middle of the letter was devoted to the funny illustration replacing the missing sentences. What I object to is that one of the main points of the letter has been dropped, that what Orwell foretold has come to pass in U.N.O.—that pig-Bolshevik and farmer-capitalist have each played their "ace of spades" simultaneously. I refer to the threat of the hydrogen bomb. But perhaps such a view of the deliberations of U.N.O. is not congenial to the *Observer*.

The Apprentices

Continued from p. 2

natural. Ideally, periods of apprenticeship might vary from one to three or four years; practically, a reduction of the lot to three years would be a sensible first step which would save hurt feelings and endless arguments."

And on the former, she tells this story:

"A few months ago a youth of 17 came to our office. He left a secondary modern school when he was 15 and got a job in a small engineering firm, supposedly as a pre-apprentice. By the time he was 16 trade was bad and the firm refused to indenture him, though his work was satisfactory and he had conscientiously attended both day release and evening classes. He left the firm in disgust and got a semi-skilled repetitive job in a factory, became bored to tears and asked me to find him something better. As he had reached the age of 17 it was impossible to find him an apprenticeship."

The kind of lifelong restriction to one craft which both these features imply could quite conceivably be heightened if apprenticeship were replaced by full-time education which is its equivalent in several continental countries. "Occupation," Dr. Stephen Cotgrove notes in *Technical Education and Social Change*, "would be even more closely determined by education, as in Germany. Here, the type and length of full-time education plays an important role in determining the level of entry into the occupational hierarchy, and there is little mobility between strata."

Changing Skills

One feature of modern industry which all the reports note is the changed nature of skill. The 19th century situation, with the highly-skilled artisan on one level, and way below him the illiterate unskilled labourer, has given way to one in which certain specialised knowledge has become obsolete, but in which the complexity of machines and the greater variety of processes and machines "make much greater claims upon the general intelligence, mental alertness and adaptability of the skilled worker". A striking pas-

sage in the Crowther report reminds us that:

"A boy who enters industry today will not retire until well into the next century. In that time the odds are that he will see at least one complete technological revolution in his industry. The job he will hold when he becomes a grandfather may not exist at all today; it will be concerned with processes not yet invented, using machines still to be designed."

In the light of such an observation, the question of individual craft training becomes less important than that of a higher level of general education, an education for versatility and initiative, and the question of individual craft privileges and differentials becomes completely obsolete, compared with that of the workers' share in the control of productive processes. The need for a different kind of industrial organisation than that of masters and men, of which apprenticeship is an heir is not discussed in any of these studies. But when an article in the *Rochdale apprentice's magazine* asks: Are Foremen Necessary? we have to reflect that this is not a frivolous question. For Professor Seymour Melman's study of one large English firm, *Decision-Making and Productivity* (see FREEDOM 18 and 25/6/60 and 2/7/60), tells us that in it "there were no supervisory foremen in the plants of this firm . . . thousands of workers operated virtually without supervision". And in describing the gang system in this firm, a Coventry worker, Reg. Wright ("The Gang System and Worker Decision-Making" FREEDOM 23/7/60) throws light on the way "apprenticeship" could develop amongst workers who had carved out a certain degree of autonomy for themselves and abandoned craft exclusiveness:

"Gangs are self-recruiting, nearly all new members being 'recommended' to a trade union for the formalities. 'Green' labour (i.e. people with no special skill) is put on simple repetitive jobs and when

the stage of boredom is reached is moved to increasingly complex operations. In effect the man or woman serves an apprenticeship of sorts while earning full pay as a gang member. They are all paid the same regardless of skill. The clever man will do the clever job—because he can and because he likes it. The not-so-clever (or even stupid) will do the job that is within his powers. It has been proved long ago, that distinctions cause more trouble than they are worth. Both management and men are agreed on this."

Why do we want so little out of life?

To us, after reading all the literature of the problems of apprenticeship in industry enslaved to tradition and craft exclusiveness, this comes as a breath of fresh air. Instead of talking about the preservation of privilege, he is talking of the autonomy of workers as a whole, the same demand for autonomy as the Rochdale apprentices make. And it leads us to a final question: *Why do we want so little out of life?* Why can't we devise a form of social organisation which permits young people to try out first one occupation, then another, or to work at an outdoor job in the summer and an indoor one in the winter, or to study in winter and work in summer as the economist Marshall suggested decades ago, or to combine brain-work and manual work as Kropotkin suggested. If those changes of occupation which future industrial development makes inevitable can be managed in the way Reg. Wright describes, they can be freed of economic hazard and demarcation disputes, and we can acquire new skills as and when we need them throughout our working lives, getting a variety and richness of experience and interest which is denied by a system which ties a man to one occupation for life, and penalises him economically if he changes it. For the young in particular this is a vital question. After all you only live once. C.W.

pletely new party? Michael Young's pamphlet *The Chipped White Cups of Dover* has already been mentioned in FREEDOM, and the idea of an unattached radical libertarian party is of course a perennial source of fascination for disillusioned left-wing intellectuals. In fact Michael Young is very much a Labour man, and the pamphlet was meant to put pressure on the Labour Party to take up the increasingly popular cause of the helpless consumer. The trouble was that he suddenly sprang it on the Fabians with its original title of *A New Progressive Party?* and insisted that it should appear immediately before the Conference opened, which was too tactless even for that tolerant body; but it was rejected by only 6 votes to 5 with some abstentions, so it was a near thing. The Liberal press has of course welcomed the pamphlet with open columns, despite its last sentence hoping that Labour will turn out to be the new progressive party after all. And the fact remains that no third party could appear in strength except on the ruins of one of the two existing enormities. In 1959 the Liberals more than doubled their vote, but six seats remained their portion—and two of these depend on Conservative support. No, the only chance for a new party when all regions and classes are well represented already—so long as the present electoral system is preserved—is the complete disintegration of the Labour Party.

Meetings and Announcements

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP and MALATESTA DEBATING SOCIETY

IMPORTANT

MEETINGS WILL BE HELD in basement, 5, Caledonian Road, N.1. (near King's Cross Station)

Sundays at 7.30 p.m.

All Welcome.

OCT. 30.—Jack Robinson on THE SIEGE OF SIDNEY STREET.

NOV. 6.—A. Rajk on THE VOCABULARY OF POLITICS

NOV. 13.—Tony Gibson on THE PRESS AS A SOURCE OF MISINFORMATION

NOV. 20.—Ian Leslie on Subject to be announced.

NOV. 27.—Ian Celnick on THE KRONSTADT REVOLT.

London Anarchist Group AN EXPERIMENT IN OFF-CENTRE DISCUSSION MEETINGS

1st Thursday of each month at 8 p.m.

At Jack and Mary Stevenson's, 6 Stainton Road, Enfield, Middx.

Last Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m.

At Dorothy Barasi's, 45 Twyford Avenue, Fortis Green, N.2.

1st Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m.

At Colin Ward's, 33 Ellerby Street, Fulham, S.W.6.

Study Group on Non-Violent Defence

(Organised by CND)

Every Thursday at 8 p.m. at 18 Campden Grove, W.8.

Admission 1/-.

NOV. 3.—Anthony Weaver on A NON-VIOLENT CAMPAIGN: NORWAY IN THE 2nd WORLD WAR

NOV. 10.—James Henderson on RESISTANCE TO TOTALITARIANISM: A GERMAN CASE HISTORY

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

17a Maxwell Road

London, S.W.6. England

Tel.: Renown 3736