

FREEDOM

JANUARY 20 1962 Vol 23 No 3

'Slavery results from laws, laws are made by governments, and, therefore, people can only be freed from slavery by the abolition of governments.'

TOLSTOY

Make 1962
a GOOD YEAR
for FREEDOM

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY - 4d.

MONOPOLY, INDIVIDUALISM OR CO-OPERATION?

WE are always pointing out that the capitalist economy is monopolistic, and that all this talk about free enterprise, and the stimulus of competition is just a lot of talk with no basis in fact. In his Annual Report the Registrar of Restrictive Trading Agreements, Mr. R. L. Sich, indicates that price fixing arrangements are being made on an informal basis in spite of orders of the Restrictive Practices Court against them. He also notes a "disinclination to enter into competition and little effect on prices following the ending of some restrictive agreements" though, he adds, in some cases keen competition has followed the ending of a price agreement.

One would be interested to know how such keen competition ended, since so far as we understand it, the effect of competition is to eliminate the weaker among the competitors, the ones with the least financial backing and who cannot sustain a price war, which may even involve marketing goods at a loss for a certain period, with the eventual emergence of a small group of large operators in a position of virtual monopoly. These either reach agreement among themselves in the question of price maintenance or, what is becoming more common, absorb each other on advantageous terms to the shareholders and executives concerned.

Mr. Sich observes that though "keen competition" has followed the

Unfree Enterprise

ending of a price agreement, in the cases officially brought to the notice of the registrar there has been little or no effect on prices.

What are paradoxically called the forces of inertia may be quite strong in stable or slowly expanding industries where no firm is particularly anxious to expand its share of trade.

If over a period of years there has been an agreement which required uniformity of prices and practices, the ending of that agreement is not necessarily an indication that the parties have become reconciled to unfettered competition, nor does it induce any sudden desire to depart from established practices. The immediate effect of the ending of a price agreement may be to deter any party from reducing his prices because of the widely held fear that any reductions will lead to cut-throat competition.

When changes of price become inevitable, the former agreement may still exert an influence because the parties have become accustomed to a common approach. . . . Where a firm has over the years had a major influence on the operation of the former agreement, that

firm on its ending may emerge as a price leader.

It is apparent that in many cases no stimulant to competition is readily forthcoming from distributors, who are able or impelled to pass on to their customers any increases or reductions in the manufacturers' prices, and who indeed prefer uniform and stable prices from the manufacturers without very much regard to the level of them."

The *Guardian* which still believes in the salutary effects of free enterprise at all levels simply overlooks the fact that competition—involving price cutting at the point of production and in distribution—is a vicious circle which must invariably end in monopoly: either the price cutters win and in doing so eliminate many of their rivals, and once they have the field to themselves there is no "incentive" to cut prices; or the price cutters over-stretch themselves and end up in the bankruptcy courts. (It may be recalled that last summer thousands of tourists were stranded on the continent by the financial failure of a number of private air-charter companies who to get the business slashed their prices to a point where they could no longer meet their commitments.

From the shambles a few have emerged, stronger than before. In the retail trade there was the case, last week, of one Mr. Ronald Evans of Crewe who did very well for 10 weeks, selling washing machines, electrical goods at discounts of 15 and 20 per cent. He did not go bankrupt. Other traders who saw the possibility of their own demise if this state of affairs continued, threatened the manufacturers that if they supplied Mr. Evans they would take their business to other manufacturers. Mr. Evans has now closed down because his supply line has been cut!

FROM the revolutionary, anarchist, point of view—that is from the point of view of those who seek to completely reverse the values of society so far as production and distribution are concerned—does the growth of monopoly make change more difficult or easier? Are the chances of change greater in a nation of small shop-keepers, small farmers, small industrialists, small businessmen than in one of huge combines in which agriculture has been industrialised, industry virtually internationalised and distribution centralised?

Continued on page 3



'AND WE'RE THINKING OF GETTING HIM A JOB WITH 'SPORTING LIFE'!

ASPECTS OF THE AFFLUENT SOCIETY

On his retirement after fifty-one years with the same firm my father was given a pension of £1 13s. a week.

This was additional to my parents' old age pension of £4 12s. 6d.

With my father now seriously ill in hospital, we have been told that, due to his works' pension, he must pay tax on his net income of £6 5s. 6d. How unjust!

I know only a few shillings are involved, but is this the way a faithful worker should be rewarded for a lifetime of service? Land of hope and glory indeed—H. M., Llanelly, Carmarthenshire. (Name and address given.) (Letter in *Sunday Pictorial*.)

Prince Charles was among eight marksmen on the Sandringham Estate yesterday

day for the first big pheasant shoot of the Christmas holiday. He contributed towards a bag of 350 brace of pheasants.

Prince Philip led the shoot and the Duke of Gloucester, Prince William, Prince Richard, the Duke of Kent, Prince Michael, and Lord Snowdon, also took part. (*Guardian*).

Dr. J. Maddison, medical officer of health for Twickenham, says in his annual report that some patients in his old people's experimental clinic are suffering from malnutrition. He says this is because the old people do not have sufficient money to buy the right kind of nourishing foods, and adds:

"Although it may be theoretically possible for old people to pay for house and clothes, and meat, fish, eggs, cheese, and milk out of a pension of £2 17s. 6d. in practice, by the time frailty and weakness have set in, it is almost impossible for a person to do proper shopping, cooking or self maintenance."

Dr. Maddison says he often has to apply to the National Assistance Board for supplementary allowances for old people whose diets are deficient. Pensioners would be healthier and better off if they were allowed to draw their pensions as a right and not have them reduced if they earn some money of their own. (*Guardian*).

A five-storey building in Market Street, Manchester, has been sold for the equivalent of about £7,500 a foot for the 34 ft. shop frontage. The Manchester agents for the deal confirmed yesterday that the premises have been sold for more than a quarter of a million pounds to Wallis and Co., the London costumers.

A representative of Maurice Rubin and Co., the Manchester firm of solicitors involved in the sale, said: "Market Street, Manchester, is the number one shopping street in England. It is a far better proposition than either Oxford Street or Regent Street. Nowadays, it is the frontage which counts, and the price of this property compared with round about £3,000 a foot for premises in Regent Street." (*Guardian*).

The Wind on the Belly, Brother

AT an international anarchist conference the question was raised of the attitude of anarchists to the bohemians on the fringe of the movement; immediately, some foreign comrades asked whether the English movement had a great deal of contact with the gypsies! The answer was 'no' and a re-translation.

Recent activities in the House of Commons and elsewhere have revived the question of the gypsies and their position in modern society.

Friday in the House of Commons is the one day when minor grievances get an airing, when Private members' bills are introduced and owing to the M.P.'s habit of the long week-end, party discipline is reduced to the minimum necessary for the minimum of members then present.

On Friday, December 1st, Sydney Silverman had a motion on the order paper about Civil Defence. It seemed more important to the remaining members of the House that Mr. Norman Dodds' motion on the gypsies be talked about from 11.5 a.m. to 4 p.m. Some may say that Mr. Silverman's motion was more important, but the parliamentary device of 'talking out' or filibustering would have frustrated Mr. Silverman's motion equally well as that of Mr. Dodds.

Mr. Dodds' motion read, curiously enough:

"That this House, recognising that the loyalty to this country of the Romany people and other travellers is in no way inferior to that of any other section of the community, is of the opinion that Her Majesty's Government in co-operation with local authorities must devise and implement, as a matter of urgency, a national policy which will ensure adequate living quarters for the gypsies and other travellers and provide for their good health, proper education and full employment."

Mr. Dodds' motion is merely an attempt to integrate the gypsies into the respectable community. He requires them, in short, to cease to be gypsies. The preamble to his motion implies that the gypsies are loyal citizens of this country; this in itself, if not pure bunkum, is a denial of the international loyalties of gypsies and of their international origin.

In his speech Mr. Dodds referred to the fact that "the old Romany life has gone forever". It is precisely the laws on the Statute book that have contributed to the decline of the Romany way of life. In particular, the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act, 1960 which only allows a caravan to remain upon a site for twenty-eight days. Mr. Dodds proposes now to challenge this Act by squatting with a group of gypsies on a caravan site and daring the law to evict him.

True, the Romany way of life is getting more difficult, but when was it ever easy? Is it an acceptable solution to create gypsy reserves or ghettos? Last week on the B.B.C.'s *From the South-East* one of the land-owners responsible for the latest rejection of a gypsy camp-site suggestion, logically hinted that gypsies should be given camping facilities on National Trust properties. Presumably so that they could be viewed as quaint survivals, like Indians on reservations.

The Hungarians and Spaniards have utilized some of their gypsies as tourist attractions. The Spanish Gypsy flamenco dancers are State subsidized and so are the Magyar Tzigane musicians. This is a better fate than Hitler willed for the gypsies who were herded into the gas-chambers but is it any less genocidal? Incidentally, the Nuremberg judgments decreed that the gypsies were not exterminated for racial reasons hence

their relatives did not qualify for compensation.

The gypsies, like the bohemians and tramps, have always been welcomed as adding to picturesqueness and individualism but never welcomed on one's own village green. They're always welcome somewhere else!

This has always been the case, everywhere. In England in the 16th century the penalties for being an 'Egyptian' as they were then called varied from the death-penalty, transportation, scourging, and, by way of a change, branding.

In our own time we can remember the gypsies being used as a childhood threat, and one fled in terror from being stolen by those vendors of clothes-pegs. More recently, one finds that the association of fortune-telling and the sale of white-heather, "for luck lady" has taken the place of horse-trading (and stealing).

It would be idle to deny that the gypsies have a very lax sense of property. A people accustomed to the bounty of nature, used to poaching and given to such customs as the burning of caravans at death, can hardly be expected to have a great regard for exclusive proprietorship.

It is true that the "old Romany life has gone forever. Gone are the tinkers and horse-traders, their places taken by the scrap-iron merchant and the car-dealer, whose worldly wealth is concentrated in a car parked before the caravan. Gone are the gypsy preachers and bare-knuckle fighters, their place taken by the radio nature-rambles and the booth fortune-teller.

The didicoi (half-caste) gypsies have so diluted the stock that to have a regular job, live in a Council House, and send the children to school regularly would seem (according to Mr. Dodds) to be the summit of gypsy ambition.

Continued on page 2

ANARCHY 12

(OUT NEXT WEEK)

ASKS

Who are the Anarchists?

ANARCHY is Published by Freedom Press at 1/6 on the last Saturday of every month.

ORDER YOUR COPY NOW!

"DEALING WITH DELINQUENTS",
by W. L. Herbert & F. V. Jarvis,
London, Methuen, 1961.

Anyone who expects this book to be a general treatise on the treatment of delinquents will be disappointed. The book is simply "good advice" addressed to social workers and more especially to probation officers. It might serve as a series of talks to probation officers in training, and its scope is narrowed almost exclusively to the field of delinquents on probation.

The authors begin with a definition of what they mean by the term 'delinquent'. "In this book we include in the term 'delinquent' not only those who have actually broken laws—minor or otherwise—but those who are likely to do so. In our sense, a delinquent is a person, of whatever age, whose attitude to other individuals, to the community, to lawful authority, is such that it may lead him into breaking the law, if it has not already done so."

Having given this quite wide definition of delinquency, the authors retreat to the familiar ground of the young-delinquent-on-probation for the rest of the book. They do not face the implications of the wide definition they have given, a definition which must classify many of the readers of this review as "delinquents". Much of their writing about the young delinquent and his relations with his probation officer is old hat, and unless this

WHAT IS A J.D.?

book goes on the required reading list of trainees in the probation service, I cannot envisage it having any considerable readership.

The authors dissociate themselves from the 'non-judgmental' attitude towards delinquents which is currently advocated by some schools of thought in the United States, and believe in a greater measure of sternness and criticism. Whether one attitude or the other has a greater or lesser degree of success in bringing J.D.s to heel, is difficult to say. The amount of ignorance about the causes of juvenile delinquency and the efficacy of different methods of treatment, is tremendous. The authors of

this book betray a certain arrogance in their assumptions about the proper methods to be applied which does them no credit. They appear to know all the answers and to be uninterested in lessening the field of ignorance. Dealing with the difficult problem of the relationship of broken homes to juvenile delinquency they write:—

"Of recent years there has been a tendency for the effects of the 'broken home' on the children to be discounted, and statistics have been brought forward by way of proof. We believe that few practising social workers will agree with the conclusions drawn from such statistics, although, obviously, many children from 'broken homes' do not become delinquent."

It would be more helpful if these "practising social workers" gave reasoned criticism of such research findings rather than merely disagreeing with the conclusions in the light of their own personal beliefs.

In criticising this book I do not wish to suggest that the probation service is other than an excellent alternative to most of the other methods used in present-day penology. But in consider-

ing the problem of delinquency in society it must be admitted that the probationary service is a very makeshift arrangement for a limited class of delinquents. The methods advocated by the authors of the present book are not necessarily the best methods which can be employed, nor do these authors bother to assess the efficacy of their methods. They are essentially didactic, and proceed as though they knew all the answers, a dangerous assumption in so confused a field. If we are to take their original definition of 'delinquent' seriously, then an enormous sociological problem is posed, a problem which is hardly touched by this book. To them the law is sacrosanct, and those whose attitudes may lead them to the unlawful action are "delinquent". Such a category must embrace a very mixed bag of people, e.g. big financiers, male homosexuals, supporters of the Committee of 100, advocates of revolutionary ideology. How would these worthy adjusters of other peoples' lives like to tackle such clients as these? Faced with classes of delinquents outside the normal run of the J.D.s. who are referred to them by the courts, the inadequacy of their social philosophy would become apparent.

G.

A STATE OF MIND

It was Hippolyte Havel who coined the phrase "Greenwich Village is a state of mind, it has no boundaries". This "state of mind", the equivalent of Bohemianism, is the subject of Allen Churchill's book *The Improper Bohemians* which is a quite pleasant scissors-and-paste job on Greenwich Village "in its heyday" (1912-30).

It is always rather sobering to discover that historical periods fall within one's own life and as the 'twenties' get more fashionable one realizes how time goes on. The Kingdom of Bohemia has had various habitations and names—Montparnasse, Chelsea, San Francisco, Soho and Hampstead, to name only a few. Greenwich Village like other *locales* one could name is still trading on its old reputation to bring in the innocent and the rubber-neck.

The figures flit through Mr. Churchill's book. Mabel Dodge slumming it among the intellectuals and radicals; Max Eastman, Art Young, Floyd Dell, Robert Minor, John Reed, Hugo Gellert, John Sloan, Harry Kemp of the *Masses* before it became the *New Masses* and a Communist propaganda sheet; Margaret Anderson and Jane Heap of *The Little Review*, Susan Glaspell, George Cram Cook, Eugene O'Neill and Edna St. Vincent Millay of the Provincetown Players, Hippolyte Havel, Lee Chumley, Marie Romany and Big Bill Hayward make brief appearances in its pages. But this book has all the defects of this kind of book, name-dropping, and an attempt to get everybody in on the act.

Randolph Bourne passes through but Maxwell Bodenheim, who lived on to 1954, when he was murdered in a sordid brawl, is given the full treatment (doubtless because full newspaper files were available).

Mr. Churchill has a magazine man's eye for the quotable anecdote and the picturesque personality. His introduction of Hippolyte Havel as a waiter who sneered at the customers. "Bourgeois pig!" and Hippolyte's to Floyd Dell on the question of *Masses* editorial voting on whether a poem should go in.

"Voting! Voting on poetry! Poetry is something from the soul. You can't vote on poetry!"

Dell replied: "But Mr. Havel, This is our way. Maybe you know a better one. On *Mother Earth* you editors have to get together and decide on material for your next issue, do you not?"

"Yes," replied Hippolyte grandly, "But we don't abide by our decisions." It is small wonder that Eugene O'Neill used Hippolyte as the basis for a character in *The Iceman Cometh*. Terry Carlin, a fellow-anarchist, was the man who introduced Eugene O'Neill to George Cram Cook and the Provincetown Players.

One is tempted to attack this book for being what it is and to say that it is not a social-psychological examination on what makes a Bohemian, or a Bohemian milieu. It is significant that the decline of Greenwich Village set in from 1929 "the day the money stopped". But one would think that this would merely kill off the phoney Bohemians. Or is it that the whole concept of Bohemia as a place, or as "a state of mind" is "phoney"?

But this is not Allen Churchill's book. It remains a quite amusing and pleasant book illustrated with cartoons from *Masses*, which are very good.

The nostalgia for the 'twenties' will be fortified by this book and in reading it one feels that anarchism has been a significant force in the intellectual life of America. J.R.

THE IMPROPER BOHEMIANS, Cassell 18s.

Bloodless in the Zoo

ANGUS WILSON made his name just after the last war as a writer of rather misanthropic short stories coldly satirising sexual and social relationships in the English middle-class. Most of his characters were unpleasant and unhappy, and were very harshly portrayed. Typically they were the lost people of Isherwood's pre-war novels seen as post-war survivals—"such darling dodos"—whose former certainties had dissolved into uncertainty and often despair.

This sort of mood was sustained through enough stories to fill three books and a brilliant short novel, *Hemlock and After*. More recently he has also written two long novels, *Anglo-Saxon Attitudes* and *The Middle Age of Mrs. Eliot*, which were wider in range and mellower in tone, but less convincing. His speciality has always been the unexpected moral judgment made by mercifully revealing character under stress, but when he gives his readers time to think it is his own character that is mercilessly revealed by the unexpected moral judgments he makes.

This latest novel, *The Old Men at the Zoo* (Secker & Warburg, 18s.), is prob-

ably the weakest he has written. The tension is even slacker, the characters even duller, the story even vaguer than before, and his one great advantage—social and psychological immediacy and astringency—is completely lost. It is a mixture of allegory, political fable, and slow-like professional in-fighting. The background is the London Zoo in 1970, and in the foreground three Directors rule it in turn—Leacock, who starts a nature-reserve in Herefordshire; Falcon, who turns the Zoo into a sort of Victorian curio-shop until war breaks out; and Englander, who falls into the clutches of a fascist government bent on staging gladiatorial contests with the wild animals—while the colourless narrator, Simon Carter, serves them all with equal loyalty, loses his American wife, and ends by looking like becoming Director himself. The war is between England and a federated Europe, and is even remoter than that in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. The higher allegory is provided by a giraffe killing a young keeper and an alsatian dog killing its mistress (in both senses), and of course by the whole business of human beings catching and

keeping animals.

But the meat of the book is the power politics among the old men at the Zoo, and tough, bloodless meat it is. I never thought Angus Wilson could bore me quite so much. Bad characterisation, bad construction, bad style—and of bad motivation and bad moralising as well. Yet another writer who isn't content with what he has, little be it or much, but must try to do things beyond his power. What he ought to write, if he really wants to write about war and power, is surely a novel about the middle 'forties, the time when his best stories take place. His merits are so considerable that we can scarcely afford to lose them in the sort of treacherous abstractions that take up most of *The Old Men at the Zoo*. A more suitable title would be *The Old Man of the Sea*; and the sooner Angus Wilson shakes him from his shoulders the better for all of us. *Hemlock and After* and half-a-dozen outstanding stories show what he can do when he wants to—let's have more of it.

N.W.

OLD MEN AT THE ZOO, Secker, 18s.

POSSIBILITIES FOR A GUILTY LAND

GUILTY LAND, by Patrick van Rensburg, Penguin Special, 3s. 6d.

THIS is both a useful and interesting book. For those who know little of the history and problems of South Africa it provides a good introduction; for those who know something of both it provides a valuable autobiography and some stimulating discussion concerning future possibilities in the Union.

Patrick van Rensburg is indeed an unusual Afrikaner, for he openly opposes apartheid in both his political and social life; he resigned from the South African Civil Service due to his dislike of Government policy and is an organiser of the multi-racial Liberal Party in South Africa. He was one of the chief figures behind the boycott movement of South African goods and is one of the few Europeans left fighting apartheid who receives the trust of militant Africans.

One thing van Rensburg never mentions is the courage needed for a white man, especially an Afrikaner, to consistently oppose racialism in South Africa.

Many a liberal will talk in loud tones of justice and truth, but to act on convictions is simply not done. Patrick van Rensburg deserves our respect simply because he practices what he preaches. I mention this to emphasise just how much was required of the man to stand out against racialism in South Africa.

The best sections of "Guilty Land" concern the future and its possibilities. After a study of the present situation the author discusses various means of opposing the Government. He concedes that extra-parliamentary action is essential but is quick to emphasise the dangers of African nationalism; I found him a little unfair to the Pan Africanists in South Africa and the omission of Sobukwe's activities leads one to suspect the objectivity of the author in this sphere.

When it comes to talk of revolution we find the three possibilities: armed revolution, peaceful revolution and intervention, discussed in full. Van Rensburg is half-hearted on this subject. He comes down in favour of that product

Continued from page 1

The migrant labour upon which the latter-day gypsies used to live seems to be dying out and (like the I.W.W.) the hop-picking community, and the fruit-picking gangs seem, due to mechanisation and deep-freeze, to find less work.

Camping sites grow scarcer. The Enclosure Acts started the decline which the Caravan Sites Act put the seal upon. The housing shortage makes for more use of sites for caravans (more luxurious than ever dreamed of) for dispossessed workers far removed from gipsy stock or ideas but houseless nevertheless. The rise in the cost of land combined with the growing inhospitality of villagers and farmers makes the securing of a site

Wind on the Belly, brother

virtually impossible except for the statutory twenty-eight days. No time to get a job, an education, on the housing list or even, on the voters' list. Only time for the sanitary inspector and the income-tax man.

One of the difficulties of what may be called the gipsy problem, or is probably better called the *gorgio* problem, is that adequate statistics are not available. Faced as they are with the failure of gypsies to enter themselves on the requisite forms, officialdom finds it difficult to solve the problem.

Mr. Dodds and his 'do-gooder' sup-

porters have in mind only one solution. The transformation of the migrant gipsy into a *kennick*—or house-dweller. It cannot be envisaged that there can be a social group content to be 'outcasts' and to do this it is only necessary to have a very few 'standings' for temporary encampments. The gypsies want to be free to settle down if they wish to do so and not to be compelled to settle down.

There has been a lot of romantic nonsense talked about gypsies, quite a lot of it in the House of Commons on December 1st. The sentimental viewpoint is illustrated by Shelley's patting a

gipsy child on the head, and the windy spaces in John Sampson's anthology. The 'wind on the heath' is a romantic view of the gypsies and 'the affectionated' see them as they are—and as Augustus John did.

The Romany stock has become so diluted with the job-seeking, house-dwelling, fortune-telling, bible-punching types that there is a tendency to drop the description 'gipsy' for that of 'traveller'. An old Romany saying is "the house is good for the housedweller". Is there no room in England for a people to whom the values of freedom and independence have always been paramount?

JACK ROBINSON.

BOOKS?

We can supply

ANY book in print.
Also out-of-print books searched for—and frequently found! This includes paper-backs, children's books and text books. (Please supply publisher's name if possible).

NEW BOOKS

Society in Focus: an Approach to General Studies
Denys Thompson 7/6
Rebel in Paradise (Emma Goldman)
R. Drinnan 48/-
The Wall has two Sides
Felix Greene 25/-
REPRINTS AND CHEAP EDITIONS
They Hanged my Sainly Billy
Robert Graves 5/-
Eating People is Wrong
Malcolm Bradbury 3/6
The Rebel
Albert Camus 7/6
The Prehistory of European Society
V. Gordon Childe 15/-
Seven Types of Ambiguity
William Empson 7/6
The Common Pursuit
F. R. Leavis 7/6
Cider with Rosie
Laurie Lee 3/6
The Status Seekers
Vance Packard 4/-
Guilty Land
Patrick Van Rensburg 3/6
The Teachers
G. W. Target 3/6
The Seventeenth Century Background
Basil Willey 8/6

SECOND HAND

Warsaw in Chains
Stefan Korbonski 12/6
The Need for Roots
Simone Weil 15/-
Mine Were of Trouble
Peter Kemp 6/-
Tom Mann and his Times (Vol. I)
Dona Torr 7/6
Art and the Beauty of the Earth
William Morris 7/6
Dialogues (Vol. 5)
Paul Valery 6/-
The Common People 1746-1938
G. D. H. Cole & Raymond Postgate 9/-
The Ship of State
Edward Jenks 3/-
A Critical Examination of Socialism
W. H. Mallock 3/-
A Dead Woman's Wish
Emile Zola 2/6
Some Religious Illusions in Art, Literature and Experience
Sir Ernest Kennaway 7/6
PAMPHLETS
The Workers' Opposition
Alexandra Kollontai 2/-
Does Eichmann Matter?
Maurice Orbach 6d.

Book tokens accepted

Freedom Bookshop

(Open 2 p.m.—5.30 p.m. daily;
10 a.m.—1 p.m. Thursdays;
10 a.m.—5 p.m. Saturdays).

17a MAXWELL ROAD

FULHAM SW6 Tel: REN 3736

UNFREE ENTERPRISE

Continued from page 1

Governments and the traditional "privileged classes" obviously view the growth of financial and productive monopolies with very mixed feelings. That governments should initiate legislation against monopoly, and create such bodies as the Restrictive Practices Court is not in fact surprising. The authority of government is in direct ratio to the division, the weakness, the competition that exists among the population as a whole. A nation of small shopkeepers, small manufacturers, smallholders, and "individualists" strengthens the hand of government, and the power of the politicians. Far from being on the side of revolution and change they are the hard core of reactionary movements such as the Poujadists in France.

It can be said, we think, that the growth of the huge impersonal corporations tends to unite the ordinary people in a way which "individualist capitalism" did not. It seems clear to us that the potential power of say the workers in Ford's factory is a thousand times greater than that of their grandfathers who were en-

gaged in workshops employing fifteen or twenty hands. That the growing concentration of production—and the consequent growth of centralised workers' organisations—tends to dehumanise, depersonalise, those engaged in industry, agriculture and public services is equally true. Anarchists must expose the growing centralisation of production, control, finance, power in their propaganda since the government is always talking about "free enterprise", "property owning democracy" as being the laudable characteristics of our "free democracy" which distinguish them from the totalitarian countries. But we should be careful to champion, or offer, as the alternative, a nation of workshops, smallholders and shopkeepers. Their "rugged independence" is as retrograde as the monopolists' world is impersonal. For us, the only alternative to monopoly is co-operation. And the only acceptable form of organisation for production is that which not only satisfies the needs of the consumers but also recognises that those so engaged are human, responsible members of the community.

BRITISH ARMS TRADE LOOKS UP

WHATEVER may be said about the state of British exports as a whole, one aspect of it which seems to be picking up nicely is that connected with the production of the weapons of destruction. Within the space of a few days, at least three large deals were announced. Switzerland has signed a £25 million contract for Bristol Ferranti Bloodhound Mark 2 surface-to-air guided weapons, and follows the example of Sweden, who signed a large contract for these weapons last July. Then of course the West German Government has generously offered to spend £72 millions in the next two years on arms purchases from this country. The *Guardian's* Bonn correspondent points out that this deal would "be of considerable value in helping Britain over her balance-of-payments problem". And what is so heartening about this deal is that it will be over and above what the Germans have already ordered in this country, and will not result in that country ordering fewer arms from our American cousins. One can therefore see in the present deal a definite expansion of the arms business, and this will reflect a growing prosperity throughout heavy industry, both for the workers

employed and the shareholders. The *Guardian* correspondent adds that

Some West Germans think that the arms offer has been made in return for a "harder" British policy over Berlin. The Foreign Secretary's remarks in Berlin yesterday have been quoted as an example of this. It might be more true to say that British firmness over Berlin has encouraged the Federal Government to make a concrete offer. The Anglo-German committee will still have a difficult job; Herr Strauss's own experts in the Defence Ministry have so far shown a marked disinclination to buy British.

Well business is business, and one cannot expect such a good customer to sign such a large contract without deriving some side benefits, can one?

Argentina, too is buying British. She has just placed an order for 10 warships—four frigates and six minesweepers—worth about £17 millions, which will mean work in two shipyards in the South and one in Scotland. This contract was obtained against competition in six countries. Which goes to show that British Industry is not dead yet. Though of course we may yet be killed by our own missiles MADE IN BRITAIN. Such are the hazards of business!

OURSELVES

DURING the past few weeks our routine at FREEDOM PRESS has been upset by a number of factors outside our control. Seasonal sickness, breakdown of printing machines, work-to-rule among Postal workers (which of course we support and applaud) have all contributed to slowing down all our activities. At the time of writing Bookshop orders have been almost brought up to date except those which go by parcel post, and they are ready waiting for the ban to be lifted. Most of our correspondence has been dealt with; those of our readers who have not received acknowledgement for monies sent will,

we hope, bear with us a little longer. We are also proposing to issue a financial statement for 1961 showing the real deficit; but this takes up more of our limited time, and at the moment, for the reasons already given given, we can just about manage to deal with current work. And this should include sending out reminders to hundreds of readers whose subscriptions expired at the end of 1961. Those of our readers who want to help us can do so by sending their renewals without waiting to receive a reminder from us. Help us to reduce our administrative work by each of you dealing with it yourselves!

EDUCATION is one of those areas in which authoritarian philosophies, on the old Jesuit principle that the child maketh the man, compete for control. In Poland, the Stalinist regime of the immediate post-war years secularised education as part of its campaign to break the Catholic Church's influence, but this did not weaken religion. Instead, the effect of the anti-religious programme, of which secularisation was an aspect, was to draw believers more closely together and, probably, to eliminate only the weaker brethren. Thus, between 1937 and 1957, the population of Poland fell from 33 million to 28 million, but the number of Catholics fell merely from 22,100,000 to 21,806,600. The number of priests actually increased to 10,912 from 9,731 (these figures from "Some Notes on Religion in Poland" by Maria Vejan, *New Reasoner*, Winter, 1958-9). Also, of course, the unpopularity of the Stalinists caused people who would not otherwise have had much to do with churches—the "dechurched"—to attend services in exercise of about the only readymade form of protest against a regime which must have seemed immovably entrenched.

The 1956 upheavals through East Europe had their aftermath in the more liberal or moderate Gomulka regime in Poland. This regime reintroduced religious lessons, probably in a bid to win and keep the backing of the Catholics who were, of course, the largest discrete group in the country. The secular principle, neglected by government, was subsequently taken up by an organisation formed in 1957, the Society of Secular Schools. To judge from an article by M. L. Burnet in the *International Humanist and Ethical Union's Information Bulletin* (October, 1961), the Society is doing good work and achieving a fair measure of success. It now has 155,000 members and 9,000 branches. Taking advantage of a government measure permitting parents to decide whether religious lessons shall be given or not, the Society's branches are trying to persuade parents to exclude such lessons from the curriculum. By the end of 1960, 5,000 schools are stated to have opted for secular education. Unfortunately, Burnet does not give more up-to-date figures, nor does he state how many schools there are altogether in Poland.

The possibility that the Society is a

A lesson from Poland

front organisation, carrying out for the Communists a task which political expediency inhibits them from carrying out directly cannot be excluded. I don't think the explanation is as simple as that, though. In any country there are at least some people in favour of secular education; in Western countries the respectability of religion discourages many from asserting their preference. The position in the Communist countries is probably rather different: the adoption of a new social system based on public ownership, and a new ideology based on scientific materialism, has created a situation in which lip service to religion is no longer essential to respectability. This, combined with the sudden reintroduction of religious lessons, seems to me to explain why there are more people actively concerned with the secular principle in Poland than in, say, the Anglo-Saxon countries (certainly so for Australia, Britain and New Zealand). And the liberalizing which has been a feature of some of the Communist countries since Stalin, means that a context exists in which movements of this kind are feasible.

There are three points which this anarchist sees emerging from the Polish experience—two relating specifically to Poland, and one more general. First, the passing of the initiative to parents for the decision on continuation or not of religious lessons is welcome as a decentralisation of authority; decisions are now being made by the people concerned (this seems to me a valid gain, for even though the decision is one which is rightfully the parents'—and the children's, too—in other countries the State decides without any real attempt at consultation). Secondly, the viability of the Society indicates the felt need for a pluralist society in which diverse groups are able to openly and publicly

engage in activities and polemics relevant to their conflicting interests. This need is probably felt more strongly in Poland, which has passed through a totalitarian phase, than in countries whose régime has been based on liberal democracy but in which real issues are constantly muted by politicians and press out of box-office motives. Thirdly, and this is my general point, the Polish experience confirms the futility of suppressing religious organizations or coercing their adherents. Religion can be countered by criticism of its intellectual bases, exposure of the specific interests which it represents and transformation of the social conditions in which it flourishes. Even if religion is "the opium of the people", any understanding of it which purports to be rational must explore the precise conditions which enable it to have that effect. This, I suppose, is what the Communists in East Europe could have learnt at any time from the anarchists. As it is, they have learnt the lesson (assuming it to have sunk in properly) only at the cost of failure and unpopularity. K.J.M.

WHILE BACK HOME . . . THE AFFLUENT CHURCH

Work on the new Liverpool Roman Catholic Cathedral, the revolutionary "church in the round" design of Mr. F. Gibberd, is to start in mid-1962 should be completed some time during 1966.

The cone-shaped body of the cathedral will be supported by 16 flying buttresses, angled at 45 degrees and supported at their end points by 55ft. columns. The areas between the ribs will be used for individual chapels and entrance porches rising to the same height as the main columns. The main entrance, at the south end of the cathedral, incorporates a campanile, and will have electrically operated bronze doors and warm air curtains.

At the north end the cathedral will blend into the existing crypt to which it is to be connected by two large staircases and the podium will be formed by extending the crypt roof, creating a piazza for open-air services.

Underneath the podium will be a car park, and lifts will be installed for the use of the aged and infirm. When finished the cathedral will have a seating capacity of 3,000, the congregation being grouped three-quarters of the way round the sanctuary so that no worshipper will be more than 70ft. from the sanctuary steps, and, as the whole edifice is to be surrounded by a podium 12ft. above ground level, a total of some 20,000 people could be contained within the precincts on ceremonial occasions. . .

There will be concealed lighting from the ring beam and natural light will flow from a large amount of stained glass—to be made by the monks of Buckfast Abbey—set in the tower, so that one tall shaft will shine over the altar. The entire cost will be more than £1 million. (*Guardian*).

Around the Galleries

GIMPEL FILS of 50 South Molton Street, W.1 have achieved the bizarre distinction of cornering the Eskimo market, for brother Charles has returned with some magnificent photographs of the Northlands and casefuls of Eskimo carvings and prints. That this work owes much to the guide, Jim Houston is acknowledged, but in the introduction of an alien culture to an isolated people, their own culture has suffered and this work, beautiful though it is, is pure trading-post stuff. The gaily-coloured prints and the carvings in steatite can only be judged in relation to the sophisticated work of the Eskimo's southern neighbours.

Cottie Burland of *Art News* has written of these prints and carvings that "the animals of the old art survive, but become more elegant and realist. Something new is introduced; a sense of beauty and charm to replace the ancient need for magic to help the hunter to his kill". It is an opinion to which I cannot subscribe, for the operative word is "charm" and the fashionable women who buy these prints and carvings are right to murmur "charming", as they buy them.

To form any judgment of these works one must go back to the John Barrow collection at the British Museum. Here is an art of simple repetition in design and subject matter, when even the hunting scenes upon the bow-drill handles can repeat the same scene twice and thrice within a limited space, while an extremely limited use of colour has given the Eskimo an unconscious feeling for relief work in the handling of their soft material. But there is a feeling of strength in this work of over a hundred years ago, for the design was always subservient to the tool, while the work on show at Gimpel's is a prostituted culture created by a people who must in the end sell their dignity like the American Indian or the Australian aborigines to sponge on the tourists.

If there is any comparison to be made for early Eskimo art, it is that it has much in common with the shell and bone carvings of the Hawaiian people, but the

traditional folk art of these active people has in its turn died before the tread of the trader and the priest, leaving only the grinning "natives" hawking their ersatz interpretation of their own folk memories carved in local material to fit the mould demanded by the dealer and the passing tourist.

While our abstract painters continue to churn out their poor imitation of the French and American scene, our regional painters are slowly building up a body of work that must within a few years win them international acclaim. Honour is due to two galleries for this. The Beaux Arts at Bruton Place has for many years unthankfully pioneered the work of the regional painters and Shiela Fell is a justification of all their efforts. Her paintings of her native Cumberland are the finest things to be seen for some time, for these canvases lit by a russet storm-light have living skies that break like seas over the torn earth from an horizon that topples over the edge into eternity; while Denis Wirth-Miller offers the Quietism of Wivenhoe through fields of waving ragweed, golden in the dying sun.

The Waddington Gallery at 2 Cork Street, W.1, has carried the cross for some of the saddest sacks in the painting business and the fact that most of them chose to operate around St. Ives gave them the label of the Cornish Group, but it was dreary stuff of a pattern that the Town has overlong become used to.

A year or so ago the exuberant and extrovert Mr. Rawinsky decided to open a gallery at 10 Newburgh Street, W.1, and with the charm of innocence has gone from success to success. Cheerfully and openly conducting his art education in public he has managed to rope in the young Cornish painters such as Shiels, Gaputye and Pearce while the Portal Gallery at 16A, Grafton Street, W.1 have Derek Guthrie's neo-primitive paintings of St. Ives, with their silent seas flooded with a light that etches every object into his background of placid waters and flowing skies that hint of infinity.

But it is the Waddington Gallery, who, in spite of many disappointments, lead

the field with the work of Alexander Mackenzie. While Shiels, Guthrie and Pearce owe a traceable debt to Alfred Wallis, the Cornish primitive, Mackenzie has gone to Ben Nicholson for his colour and for the handling of his material, but he has used Nicholson as his point of departure, and his delicate abstractions of Cornish grey, covered with their veins of delicate traceries mark for the first time a genuine English abstractionist worthy of international stature. With the Lithuanian born Elena Gaputye's evocation of the Cornish fields in stark black strokes, Shiels and Mackenzie's abstractions that catch and hold the Cornish light filtered through its grey sea, and reflected off its broken stones, and Pearce and Guthrie's innocent acceptance of the visual scene, we have for the first time a group of regional painters worthy to take their stand on the international stage.

ARTHUR MOYSE.

We must be sincere, tolerant and open with our opponents!

I HAVE read with great interest the "Inquest On the Sit-Down" articles appearing in FREEDOM but feel I must register a protest against the paper's unequivocal recommendation to the Committee of 100 of secrecy, not openness, as regards its future activities and general procedure.

My arguments, then, specifically concern means and tactics since the aims mentioned by FREEDOM are such as may be presumed to animate most of the supporters of the Committee of 100.

If it is agreed that we stand for a new order of society then we must, by all our actions, make it absolutely clear to the public that we offer a new way of tackling social problems, a way that implies complete openness, sincerity, integrity and tolerance. The good society will be brought forth only by good means and in this respect we cannot afford to equivocate or juggle with words and legalistic arguments. The people we want to bring into our fight for the just and good society are waiting for the right sort of appeal to be made to them; such people will never join in the struggle if they have reason to suppose that we are just another mixed-up group whose methods descend to the level of expediency whenever we experience a set-back. Looked at from the purely tactical angle, secrecy and expediency are weapons we simply must not use if we are serious in our determination to bring about a new order of living. We must err, if anything, on the side of the most fastidious correctness of behaviour and our supporters must be encouraged to examine their consciences with the utmost sincerity and scrupulousness. We must be seen to be a group that not only respects individuality and personal responsibility but insists on them and encourages them by every possible means. This demand for honesty and integrity at all levels of human conduct is probably just what our community

Another Deficit Already!

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AT JANUARY 13, 1962 WEEKS 1 & 2

Expenses: 2 weeks at £70 £140
Income from Sales & Subs: £70

DEFICIT £70

DEFICIT FUND

Los Gatos: C.E.S. 4/11; Glasgow: A.J. 5/-; Oxford: Anon. 5/-; Glasgow: J.H.* 3/-; London: C.S. £2; Co. Down: J.O.H. 18/-; Alberta: W.G.* 7/-; Stockholm: O.H. 5/-; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/6; Wolverhampton: J.G.L.* 2/6; London: P.S. 3/6; Surrey: F.B.* 10/-; London: D.S. 5/-; London: L.O.* £1; Hounslow: L.* 2/6; London: P.A. & J.B. £1; Belfast: W.G. 3/-; Glasgow: J.H.* 2/6; Ilford: C.S. 10/-; Blackpool: F.A. 15/-; Detroit: I Refrattari (per L.V.C.) £4/8/-; Sutton: S.A.D. £1/10/-; Copenhagen: Anon. 12/-; Rhu: J.B. £3/7/-; Nottingham: Anon. 11/-; Cambridge: V.F. 10/-; Pittsburgh: O.S. £1/1/6; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/-; Wolverhampton: J.G.L. 2/6; London: D.R. 14/-; London: R.E. 10/-; London: P.T.* 5/-; Surrey: F.B.* £2; Bradford: J.E.P. 4/-; London: J.W. £2.

1962 TOTAL TO DATE £31 7 6

*Denotes regular contributors.

SELECTIONS FROM 'FREEDOM'

Vol 1 1951: Mankind is One
Vol 2 1952: Postscript to Posterity
Vol 3 1953: Colonialism on Trial
Vol 4 1954: Living on a Volcano
Vol 5 1955: The Immoral Moralists
Vol 6 1956: Oil and Troubled Waters
Vol 7 1957: Year One—Sputnik Era
Vol 8 1958: Socialism in a Wheelchair
Vol 9 1959: Print, Press & Public
Vol 10 1960: The Tragedy of Africa
Each volume: paper 7/6 cloth 10/6
The paper edition of the Selections is available to readers of FREEDOM at 5/- post free.

PAUL ELTZBACHER

Anarchism (Seven Exponents of the Anarchist Philosophy) cloth 21/-

Correspondence

needs at this juncture and will draw to us the sort of people who alone can build the New Jerusalem—people activated by right thinking and right feeling.

Leaving aside for a moment the tactical argument against secrecy and referring the matter to the level of practical wisdom, surely the lesson of our times is that the good end can only be achieved by good means—double-dealing, double-thinking, expediency and evil result only in the frustration of the end. The very considerable failures of Communism are relevant here.

"Winning a demonstration" in the sense of achieving a victory over the police or the Government, whilst in many ways desirable is not in itself the ultimate criterion of success. Even more important is making a clear protest against some specific iniquity (a rocket-base, say) and making it in the correct spirit, which includes openness and appealing to the humanity of the men and women in the police force, the armed forces, etc., who may be called upon to oppose us.

I notice with regret that in FREEDOM's columns the opposition is frequently re-

ferred to in terms which indicate only too clearly that these forces are regarded by the writers as in every sense hateful and deserving of contempt. We really cannot afford to foster such an attitude. These people we are called upon to hate will cease to be devils and bastards only when treated consistently with courtesy, respect and truthfulness and when it is clearly understood that we are appealing to them, as to everyone else, in terms of common humanity. I may say that I have arrived at these views on pragmatic grounds, being in no sense of the word a religious person. A study of the methods of Gandhi, Danilo Dolci and Martin Luther King, and a consideration of the writings of Camus, have suggested to me that the pure milk of Christian/Buddhist ethics is the only food that will nourish the sort of revolution we are trying to effect. Another revolution! That may not be so impossible of attainment. But what sort of revolution we achieve will depend very largely on the sort of means we employ.

ANGELA M. ASPINWALL,
(Member of the Committee of 100).

PACIFIC POLITICS

Sukarno Needs a Crisis

WEST NEW GUINEA

For over 10 years the Indonesian élite have been issuing regular warnings to the people regarding "the threat from the Dutch colonialists".

A glorious liberation was promised—one day. "Bung" Sukarno seemed to "need" West Irian exactly as Moa Tse Tung "needed" Formosa: a useful diversion from internal chaos.

This could still be true. The price of rice and sugar has risen five times in recent months. Production of rubber, tin, copra, and sugar is the lowest for years.

Food is being imported. 60 per cent of the Budget is spent on armaments. (24 torpedo boats arrived from Russia in October).

On the Dutch side, however, after many years of occupation and suppression of all nationalist sentiments, the colonialists are now making frantic

efforts to inculcate Paupuan nationalism.

In the last few months they have introduced a Papuan Council, Papuan flag, Papuan national anthem (now being taught in the schools) and the formation of a Papuan Defence Force.

Sukarno probably fears that unless he acts now the Papuans will look upon their eventual "liberation" by the Indonesian nationalists as a threat to their own Papuan nationalism. Which is, of course, the Dutch colonialist's aim.

If and when West New Guinea is "liberated" by the playboy from Merdeka Palace some may wonder how he would then deal with dissatisfaction at home.

Probably by discovering a threat from Portuguese Timor. A Timor Republican Liberation Bureau is already established in Jakarta. Even in the Pacific a crisis can be essential to a ruling class.

A.A.G.

So Mr. Seaton was wrong!

WE were glad to see that George Clark, a member of the Committee of 100 who was given a 9 months' sentence by Mr. Seaton at London Sessions, has been released after serving two months. He won his appeal against sentence on the grounds that the judge had prevented a vital witness for the defence being heard because of a technical hitch over the right of witnesses to affirm as the alternative to taking the oath. The relevant exchange between judge and witness on which the Appeal Court came to their decision makes interesting reading.

A conflict of evidence arose at the trial as to what then took place. The police alleged that Mr. Clark had stood in the

middle of the road, raised his arms and had shouted to the crowd, "Sit", whereupon, they sat. Mr. Clark, on the contrary, said they sat down of their own accord. At the trial four or five witnesses were called for the defence (one of whom was allowed to affirm), most of whom were at the back of the crowd and were not in a sufficiently good position to say whether Mr. Clark had behaved as the police stated. One further demonstrator, Mr. Trevor Hatton, said to be a chartered accountant and who had been standing next to Mr. Clark, had wished to give evidence.

When asked to take the oath he said that he wished to affirm and the chairman, Mr. Seaton, asked: "Why?"

Mr. Hatton replied: "I don't believe that the Bible tells the whole truth, and would rather affirm."

Mr. Seaton: "Do you believe in the New Testament? Do you think that it tells the truth?"

Mr. Hatton: Parts of it, yes.

Mr. Seaton: Which parts?

Mr. Hatton: Well I think the Synoptic Gospels mainly are true.

Mr. Seaton (to the court usher): Give him the New Testament and he can take the oath.

Mr. Hatton: Can I not affirm?

Mr. Seaton: No, you cannot. Take the oath.

Mr. Hatton: I am an agnostic, you see.

Mr. Seaton: You have told us you believe in some of the Bible. You can take the Bible and take the oath.

Mr. Hatton: I am not sure I agree.

Mr. Seaton: Don't argue. Take the oath.

Mr. Hatton: I am not willing to take the oath.

Mr. Seaton: Very well. Stand down.

Section 1 of the Oaths Act, 1888 states: "Every person upon objecting to being sworn and stating as the ground of such objection, either that he has no religious belief or that the taking of an oath is contrary to

Expediency?

DEAR COMRADES,

At least "Parent" agrees with me that teachers who need it should get more pay and even if he claims that he is not singling out teachers he must admit that the Government did, as the first victims of its pay-pause policy and repudiation of arbitration agreements.

If "Parent" is an anarchist why does he find it 'shocking' that someone takes a job to earn money out of expediency? What high-minded principles does 'Parent' show in working for his employer? He might note that I do not live by the expediency principle as he so oddly states but I do compromise by going out to work so that my family and I can go on living and do some of the things that seem to us worth-while.

If he doesn't like this society based on wage-slavery why doesn't he say so instead of sniping at others, who suffer from it?

Yours fraternally,

Sussex, Jan. 9

TEACHER.

Individualism

DEAR EDITORS,

Mr. Parker, returning to his plea for anarchist individualism, graciously says that there need be no hostility between anarchist communists and individualists if the former do not wish to "impose upon the future a single pattern of life from which there can be no dissent." The reply is that if they did, they would not be anarchists. In any event, even if they did wish to do so, in the absence of coercive power, they would be unable to do so, and consequently there would be nothing to prevent any individual from making his own bricks, erecting a building, forging and assembling machinery to manufacture his own clothing, farming implements and tools, build his own car or bake his own bread, or to make anything he wished. But would this make sense, seeing that all these things can be produced so much better socially? In a voluntary society, it is obvious that no means would exist to compel unwilling individuals to join in the common effort, nor could they be excluded from the common product, even though they had not participated in producing. Is this the "slavery" which Mr. Parker fears?

If he really desires the "Sovereignty of the Individual"—and I am sure he does—can he not see that this can only be through the association of free individuals with a common interest, as distinct from his society of "self-owning" egoists, obsessed with the importance of their

his religious belief, shall be permitted to make his solemn affirmation instead of taking an oath." Lord Parker, giving the judgment of the Court said that

it was important in every case that when a witness asked to affirm, the Judge should satisfy himself that he came within the section. Counsel for Mr. Clark had contended that once a prospective witness had declared that he had no religious belief, or that the taking of an oath was contrary to his particular religious belief, he was entitled without more ado to affirm. That proposition was altogether too wide. The proper course for the Judge was to question the proposed witness in the terms of the Act; this was usually done.

In most cases where the answer was "yes" the judge would be satisfied that the witness complied with the prerequisites for affirming.

But the Court felt that the Judge must be satisfied that the witness was within the terms of the section and if he had reason to believe, or there were grounds for doubting, the honesty of the witness, the Judge was entitled to question him further.

In this case, the proper questions were never put to Mr. Hatton. The Court on reading the transcript was of the opinion that Mr. Hatton was an agnostic: he accepted parts of the New Testament as facts and did not accept that the central person was divine. He should therefore have been allowed to affirm. Evidence had been wrongly excluded from the jury and it was impossible for the Court to say that, had the jury been in possession of Mr. Hatton's evidence, it would have necessarily come to the same conclusion.

Lord Parker said that it may be that Mr. Clark was a very lucky man. May be, but by the same token one could say that in the first place he had been a very *unlucky* man in having to appear before Mr. Seaton whose feelings where pacifists and anti-nuclear war demonstrators are concerned are only too well known.

personal individualism. Such a society could result only in nature's jungle law of the triumph of the strong over the weak and in effect, be indistinguishable from the bourgeois individualism which he rightly deplores. When Mr. Parker contemptuously rejects as "slaves" those who choose to be with the commonality—or as he puts it—"at one with his milieu", surely the limit of absurdity is reached. Who is the "exclusivist" now, Sidney?

Although we are diametrically opposed on this issue of individualism and common ownership, I do appreciate his desire for liberty, and I am sure that in adopting this extreme form of individualism, he is retarding rather than helping in the realisation of his aims. Even supposing that individuals to whom "separateness" was the most important thing in life could ever act socially, how would we travel? Are we each to have our own private theatre? Can railways and airlines be owned individually? Surely realism is all on the side of common ownership.

To quote that grand old anarchist—Michael Bakunin—"The individual is a product of Society, and without Society, man is nothing. All productive labour is, before all, social labour, production only being possible by the combination of the labour of past and present generations. There has never been any labour which could be called individual labour."

Yours sincerely,
Surrey, January 19th F. BALL.

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP GENERAL MEETINGS

meetings to be held at The Two Brewers, 40 Monmouth Street, WC2 (Leicester Square Tube) Sundays at 7.30 p.m. JAN 21 Sybil Morrison (P.P.U.): Pacifism

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.
3rd Thursday of each month at 8 p.m. at Donald Room's, 148a Fellows Road, Swiss Cottage, N.W.3.
Last Friday of each month at 8 p.m. at Laurens and Celia Otter's, 57 Ladbroke Road, W.11.

JAZZ CLUB

This season's meetings are being held at 4 Albert Street Mornington Crescent NW1 at approximately monthly intervals.

ANARCHY Nos 1-10

Still Available 1/8 Post Free

Freedom

The Anarchist Weekly

FREEDOM appears on the first three Saturdays of each month. On the last Saturday, we publish ANARCHY, a 32-page journal of anarchist ideas (1/8 or 25c. post free).

Postal Subscription Rates to FREEDOM and ANARCHY

12 months 30/- (U.S. & Canada \$5.00)
6 months 15/- (\$2.50)
3 months 8/- (\$1.25)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies

12 months 45/- (U.S. & Canada \$7.50)
6 months 22/6 (\$3.50)

AIR MAIL Subscription Rates

(FREEDOM by Air Mail, ANARCHY by Surface Mail)
12 months 50/- (U.S. & Canada \$8.00)

Postal Subscription Rates to FREEDOM only.

1 year (40 issues) 19/- (U.S. & Canada \$3)
6 months (20 issues) 9/6 (\$1.50)
3 months 10 issues) 5/- (\$0.75)

Air Mail Subscription Rates to FREEDOM only.

1 year (40 issues) 40/- (\$6.00)

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.



FREEDOM PRESS PUBLICATIONS