

'Disobedience, in the eyes of anyone who has read history, is man's original virtue. It is through disobedience that progress has been made, through disobedience and through rebellion.'

—OSCAR WILDE.

In this Issue:

- THE INDICTMENT
- FREEDOM & EDUCATION
- BRINGING UP DADDY-O
- 'NOTHING TO LOSE BUT YOUR TELLIES'
- IT'S THE SAME THE WHOLE WORLD OVER
- LETTERS

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY - 4d.

Railway Rot!

EACH time there is an announcement that railway or other fares are to be raised the country is plunged into "a transport crisis".* The Press headlines the crisis and the Parliamentary opposition exploit it for its political ends. In due course the public pays up and the transport services—as public services—go down. Clearly, the raising of fares is considered an effective way for justifying further cuts in service. The argument goes something like this: wage and other operational costs are going up therefore fares must go up; but if fares are not to be increased by more than the proposed 10 per cent, economies must be effected such as closing down "uneconomic" branch lines, closing some stations and reducing services. According to Alan Day in last Sunday's *Observer*, by 1970 Britain's railway mileage will have been reduced to a half of what it is now, and that even some quite large towns, such as Mansfield and Lincoln "may lose their rail services".

We hold not special brief for the railways, but we are far from convinced that the "war" against the railways has either the public interest at heart or is concerned with providing the public with alternative means of transport which are both more efficient, economical and comfortable.

Being neither in the confidence of the F.B.I. (American readers please note, we are referring to our Federation of British Industries and not your secret police—the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which however, from the point of view of the man in the street have much in common—in so far as they are both powers unto themselves!), the Government nor on the inside of the

*See the editorial on "Transport: Business or Service?" (FREEDOM March 19, 1960) and in Freedom Reprints, Vol. 10, 1960, pp. 58-62.

Committee of 100—the Six Lose Appeal

As we go to Press the Press reports that the Court of Criminal Appeal has rejected the appeal against conviction at the Old Bailey in February of the six members of the Committee of 100 for offences under the Official Secrets Act.

Lord Parker, for the Court, said the appeal would be dismissed but that the Court would give its reasons later.

We send fraternal greetings to the prisoners in the name of FREEDOM and all our readers.

British Transport Commission, we write without any more information than our readers will find in the press, which is very little indeed. The British public, like other people who live in what President Kennedy is always referring to as the "free world", lulled by the illusion that their interests are being safeguarded by their parliamentary representatives, or just simply brainwashed by the gadget-full shop window of the "affluent society", seem to be unaware of the fact that they are being led by the nose into accepting policies which one day are defended by the powers-that-be with the same conviction as they are rejected by them a few months later. This is possible, apart from a state of public apathy—which in the case of a member of a family would be diagnosed by their doctor as a case of "acute depression" needing treatment—simply because the public is not in fact treated as thinking human beings by the professional administrators, and certainly not by that ever-growing professional and technocratic class which defends "brains", as their predecessors defended "blood", to justify privilege for an élite in society. The majority of us are considered biologically unable to understand the complexities of modern society and treated accordingly.

★ ONLY last week this writer, as well as millions of other "householders" (which simply means for most people that they pay a rent exclusive of local rates, and that therefore their effective rent increases with the rates assuming that the rent payable to the landlord, is controlled) received an official-looking printed communication from their local "Valuation Officer" a "Proposal for Alteration of Valuation List". For most of us this "List" is to advise us that we will have to pay higher rates. It is not this that makes us "see red". The writer of this column being, as readers will gather elsewhere from our correspondence columns, a disgrace to the anarchist ideal, cannot advocate non-payment of rates, in spite of the fact that with this money local councils pay the policeman's wages and other "services", he would be more than prepared to dispense with. The rates also pay for the education of our children (yes, for what it's worth), removal of refuse, our parks, local health service, public libraries, baths, sewerage and drainage and until the revolutionaries, reformists, disgruntled or intellectual Left not only

have something better to offer (which, undoubtedly, they have), but can also persuade the people by their militancy (which is not a matter of thrice-yearly symbolic gestures and an annual emergence with the cuckoo in spring) to take matters into their own hands, we recognise that we are a minority, victims of a "hostile" society. In the circumstances while we firmly believe that we have the right to demand that society should respect our freedom as dissenters, we can only demand such a right so long as we do not, at the same time, demand or accept as of right, without accepting to contribute our share, the amenities of that society. Let us try to make ourselves clear beyond misunderstanding! We believe that every individual has the right to demand that society should give him the possibility of "earning" his living; by this we mean that every individual has an equal right of access to the means of production for his needs; in societies, such as the United States (and many countries on both sides of the political Iron Curtain), not only do the physical possibilities exist for abundance; thanks to technology, they exceed the needs. These basic conditions being satisfied, we maintain that no adult individual has a moral right to demand from society that which he has not directly or indirectly contributed to. And, to our mind, no reasonable individual, no anarchist, would object to such an arrangement.

PRISONER at the bar you stand accused that you did feloniously and with malice aforethought prevent John Doe hitting Rose Roe over the head with a brick, and furthermore you did counsel and advise said John Doe on divers occasions to refrain from pursuit of his duties, viz hitting Rose Roe over the head with a brick, furthermore, you did conspire with other parties to put it abroad that a brick was not the most efficient agent for the purpose in mind, alleging that said brick would be too heavy for John Doe, furthermore it is alleged that you caused it to be made known that bricks would be more usefully employed in another capacity—for building houses I think was the project put forward...

In all my years at the bar I have never come across such a case of unmitigated and premeditated conspiracy to circumvent the normal and due processes of civilized behaviour. A lingering suspicion may cross the minds of some of you that the motives for this action may have some bearing on the case. In order that you may arrive at a verdict unbiassed by such extraneous factors, I would urge you to lay that consideration to one side. That the action of hitting Rose Roe over the head with a brick was one tending to cause undue suffering was outside the jurisdiction of this court and its introduction was no more than evidence of the accused's undue squeamishness. That the proven persisting importuning of John Doe to refrain and desist from usage of the brick merely confirms that the accused was determined upon this course. The fact adduced by the accused that a brick is unsuitable for the purpose is outside the competence of the accused to judge. We have institutions set up to advise on problems of that nature and their findings are that bricks are highly suitable for projects of this kind. The fact that the means involved was of a highly dangerous nature such as to cause grievous bodily harm to

No, we "saw red", and we hope FREEDOM readers will join us in protesting to the Authorities, not because we are being asked to pay more, but because the local authorities are clearly assuming that we are acquiescing morons. This writer's "Notice of Proposal" grants him the right "to object to the proposal". Good! But turn over the page and what do you read? "I hereby make a proposal" blaa, blaa, followed by: "The grounds on which the proposed alteration is supported are [this is printed] that the present assessment is incorrect and insufficient [this is typed in]. "On what 'grounds'?" is the question this writer (or anybody, surely, other than a moron) will put before paying the miserable coins that Authority seems to think it has the right to extort. On what grounds can the "reasonable" individual "object" if he is not in possession of the facts. These are the grounds of our objection!

★ THE foregoing has not been as wide of the mark as some readers may suppose! Even assuming the public is prepared to pay higher fares for railway travel what guarantee have they got that their best interests will be served? When we assert that we believe there are powerful forces determined to kill the railways we do not profess to be in a position to offer concrete evidence in support of this view. But we do believe that it is part

and parcel of the capitalist system that in the long-term, capitalist and not consumer, interests are served, just as in a libertarian, co-operative, society, service and not profits would be the guiding light. This is surely self obvious. Consequently when a Tory, anti-nationalisation government takes office and denationalises road transport but not the nationalised railways it is clear that these political stooges have had their marching orders and anybody who was fooled by the government's railways development programme into believing that the railways development programme was a "new deal" for this means of transport was a fool, or a Union official! It seems to us now, as it did at the time (1951), that the very fact that the Tories de-nationalised road transport but not the railways was a clear indication that the interests of the former far outweighed those of the latter. Obviously the motor industry and its ancillaries is, in the age of mass production, much more profitable than the railways. It's so much more wasteful! A writer in the *Sunday Times* last week was pointing out that

the whole organisation of traffic is wasteful under present-day conditions. For example, a goods wagon spends most of its time sitting in a siding. Only three in every 100 are being used at any particular time; a mere 11,000 out of 375,000.

The same is true of passenger coaches. In some regions on average more than two-thirds are idle. A sixth of the coaches work only one week in a year. If the number of coaches and wagons could be reduced to one half by making each work harder, costs would be reduced by about 15 per cent.

Continued on page 3

THE INDICTMENT

John Doe is again a factor outside the competence of this court.

The contention by the accused that the bricks could be used for building houses is one unworthy of consideration by any right-thinking person. Logically extended it would mean that bricks could be used for nothing else than building houses.

As is readily apparent to you, John Doe is well known for his brick-dropping. It is a reprehensible interference with his way of life to restrain or attempt to restrain his activities in the selection, procuring or usage of bricks.

The whole basis of civilized life centres round the evaluation, procurement and utilization of bricks. The basic tenets of civilization, property and the State are centred round the function of hitting persons over the head with ceremonial bricks. Many pages of our glorious history are given to encounters of this kind where the brick was the arbiter of our civilized destiny. The sacred institution of property was built up in such a way. The free transference of chattels was aided by the employment of such means, and the Commonwealth owes its survival to men such as John Doe, who dedicate their lives to this duty. Wherever there are bricks to be wielded, the John Does of this world will be ready, willing and eager to officiate.

It has been put to you that Rose Roe, a party to these proceedings, is worthy of some consideration. It is held that she is a widow of 80 years of age, with the care of several children. In his evidence, John Doe stated that he knew that Rose Roe was contemplating an attack upon him and it was his highly commendable intention to deter her by flourishing his brick, and in any case he was prepared to strike at her first in order to prevent her using a brick he

knew she had concealed on her person.

All this shows commendable foresight on the part of Mr. Doe and it cannot escape your notice that he had to his own financial embarrassment acquired control of a brickyard in order that he might be prepared to cope with any eventualities that might arise.

All this wise planning was likely to be retarded if not brought to a halt by the machinations of the accused but luckily the accused notified John Doe of his intentions and investigations were set afoot and from the conclusions drawn it was deduced that the accused contemplated such an action. We must be thankful that John Doe unmasked such activities otherwise I shudder to opine what would have happened next.

Our security and the basis of law and order rest upon the institution which men like John Doe uphold. The rights of Englishmen to bear bricks are inviolate, the sacred brick must not be sheathed. It has been truly said "the brick is the health of the State". And it is with the security of the State with which we are involved. The brick in question is the keystone of the triumphal arch which is erected around the pædium of our rights, the hippodrome of our liberty horses, the British Empire. Take it away, the arch is fallen, the keystone is no more. The brick has been dropped...

Gentlemen of the jury, your duty is clear. You must find the accused guilty.

JACK SPRATT.

ANARCHY 14 ON SALE NOW DISCUSSES

DISOBEDIENCE

ANARCHY is Published by Freedom Press at 1/6 on the last Saturday of every month. ORDER YOUR COPY NOW!

FREEDOM AND EDUCATION

THE editors appear to confuse strength of feeling with irrationality. (1) In anarchism everything is relevant to everything else. After all, according to the authoritarian philosophy of life, un-free education, militarism, obedience, clericalism, bureaucracy, punishment and all these other things go together, do they not? Doesn't one get a sort of mild shock when one encounters a unilateralist who wants to "bring back the cat"? Likewise one would expect an anarchist to believe in freedom for children, the equality of the sexes, the integration of the races and so forth. The authoritarian secret societies that Bakunin projected, the French nationalism adopted by Kropotkin and the anti-feminism of Proudhon strike us as odd and inconsistent. (2)

Of course there are problems for me as for everybody else. I can see as well as the editors that there are many difficulties to be overcome if one is to apply anarchism to life here and now. I would "exercise my authority" (if I could!)

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

Planning in the U.S.S.R.
I. Yevenko 4/6
Island
Aldous Huxley 18/-
Haste to the Wedding
Alex Comfort 10/6
A New Life
Bernard Malamud 21/-
Pan-Africanism: a short Political Guide
Colin Legum 27/6

REPRINTS AND CHEAP EDITIONS

Psychopathology and Psychiatry
I. P. Pavlov 21/-
Mademoiselle Fifi and Other Stories
Guy De Maupassant 3/6
As a Man Grows Older
Italo Svevo 18/-
Confessions of Zeno
Italo Svevo 25/-
Glimpses of World History
Jawaharlal Nehru 55/-
A Way Home
T. Sturgeon 2/6

SECOND-HAND

The Private Manufacture of Armaments (Vol. 1—and only!)
Philip Noel-Baker 5/6
A New Way with Crime (1928)
Fenner Brockway 5/-
Can Parliament Survive?
Christopher Hollis 3/6
The History of Mr. Polly and The War in the Air
H. G. Wells 3/6
Other Plays and not for Children
Elmer Rice 4/-
R.U.R.
Karel Capek 2/6
Ancient Man
Hendrik Van Loon 3/-
A Worker Looks at Economics
Mark Starr 2/6
The Foundations of Leninism and The Problems of Leninism
Josef Stalin 3/-
The Collapse of the Second International
V. I. Lenin 2/6
Soviet Electric Power Development
A. V. Winter 2/6
The Re-Conquest of Ireland
James Connolly 3/-
What Men Live By
Leo Tolstoy 3/-
The Evolution of the Idea of God
Grant Allen 2/6
It Happens in Russia
Vladimir Petrov 3/- (damaged)
Salvation Without Saviours
W. H. Parke 2/6
The Sage of Canudos
Lucien Marchal 4/-
The Decameron of Giovanni Boccaccio 6/-
The Universal Kinship
J. Howard Moore 3/-
A Handbook on Hanging (final revision)
Charles Duff 10/-
Hostages of Civilisation
Eva G. Reichmann 10/-

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

[As we disagree with many points in the following letter, and to save space, our reply is annotated. The numbers in the text are ours.—EDITORS].

over a child to the extent of pulling it away from a dangerous cliff edge, but I would also probably do the same to an adult. (3)

There is I think a difference between this sort of restraint and actually invading the child's freedom of action to the extent of compelling him to perform tasks to which he has no inclination. (4) I believe that a normal child will be guided by his own inclination to do the things for which his talents, still dormant, best fit him. (5) This seems to be borne out by the experience of A. S. Neill in his school. It is the basic principle of self-regulation. (6)

This brings us to another point. The "free child", we are told, is a myth. His parents choose to bring him up in a free way, and because he cannot make the choice for himself he is therefore not free. But the "free society" is also a myth, according to this argument, for the anarchists choose freedom for the whole of society (most of whose members give scant evidence of desiring it), and once freedom is established, if ever, those brought up in it will be conditioned to freedom and will find it as difficult to live in an authoritarian way as most people find it difficult to live in a free way now.

This is the old chestnut *absolute freedom*. Surely *absolute freedom* is an absolute myth. The editors are tilting at a windmill. A relative freedom is what the anarchist and the believer in self-regulation believe in. Although it's only relative freedom they want lots of it. Lots more than the authoritarian believes to be desirable. More even

than the editors of FREEDOM apparently. (7)

As for these children who do not display any special gifts, they must be abnormally stupid. (8) Anarchist children are probably above average in intelligence. (9) But even the children of authoritarian parents, unless they have been completely crushed, and had all the spirit knocked out of them, can usually distinguish themselves at something. (10)

"How poor life would be if we only did or could do those things in which we were gifted!" How poor life is for many, now, not because they haven't been forced to learn all sorts of things, but because they have been so crammed, sat upon, knocked about and at the end forced to the treadmill that their creative powers have never had a chance. (11)

The anarchist case is based fundamentally on the belief that every human being has powers within himself which authoritarian society frustrates. (12) If however a fair number of children cannot be educated without compulsion it rather suggests that this belief is over-optimistic and that the authoritarians may be right after all. Since the rearing of children is such a fundamental activity, it also suggests that they may be right in their demand for authority in other spheres. In which case the whole theory of anarchism begins to crumble. (13)

I find it disconcerting that the editors of the only regularly published English-language anarchist paper should come out against the theory of self-regulation, and help to undermine their own philosophy. (14) A.W.U.

Editor's Reply

[(1) Not all. But we refuse to confuse "feeling" with "rationality".

(2) We agree with our comrade's logic. Where we disagree with him is that he treats a child as if he were an adult. We treat him as a child, and adults as adult.

(3) Quite so, and for that reason people have the presumption to be propagandists. Without dreaming of obliging their fellow beings to follow their philosophy, or way of life, they try to influence them to think along the same lines as they do. If Uloth does not see that, to put it crudely, the anarchist propagandist is attacking the individual's "conscience", whereas the authoritarian is playing on "fear"—fear of punishment, etc., by society, then he might as well give up. (4) We have not suggested that the child should be physically coerced. If Uloth implies that in order to oblige a child to do his lessons, or whatever we may be interested that he should do, we would use physical force, withhold the necessities of life—including love, he is wrong as well as offensive.

(5) This is just a lot of nonsense! Analyse the sentence: "normal" child, "guided by his own inclination", "talents still dormant"; "best fit him". Such a child far from knowing what he wants should consult a crystal-gazer, or rely on Mum! (we favour Mum every time!)

(6) We believe self-regulation is possible when we are mature enough to understand the self and have learned self-discipline. We have never equated a child with a cat or a bird, either biologically or emotionally.

(7) We had no intention of playing "conkers" with our comrade! We agree with all he says about relative freedom and absolute freedom. In the circumstances we find it difficult to understand why he should so insist on absolute freedom for young children.

(8) They are not.

(9) They are not; their parents are!

(10) They do, and if Arthur Uloth will consult his colour supplement to last week's *Sunday Times* he will see a picture of a senior science student at a snob boarding school who is a promising painter, an Aldermaston marcher whose room is decorated not only with the "symbol" but also with a leaflet "survivre à la bombe atomique", which would indicate that they have also

"completely crushed" her by thrusting French down her throat!

(11) On the contrary the dullness in most people's lives is due to the fact that the "education" they have received has been designed to fit them into a dull job, and that their parents have connived at the conspiracy.

(12) The anarchist case is based on the belief that every human adult has powers within himself, etc. . . and that the possibility of change depends on the kind of education that the young receive. "Knowledge" has always been the weapon on which socialists and anarchists have pinned their hopes.

(13) It "suggests" nothing of the sort! The rearing of children is if not a fundamental, at any rate a *specialised full-time* activity, for which most "progressive" parents have neither the temperament nor the time. In general, and we take our hats off to the exceptions and apologise, the progressive parents are so concerned with their own relationships that they liberate themselves of their children by sending them to "progressive" boarding schools; their children are often easy-going, sociable, conformist illiterates whose parents are their friends. The professionals who for other reasons have neither the temperament nor time to bring up their children send them to schools where they get a good education and the right contacts for a "career" and lose their capacity for love; and the poor, ignorant "masses" don't know what it's all about. All they can give their children is a possessive love as fickle as their thoughts such as they are. Fortunately, there are still a large number of parents simply guided by love for their children and who are simple enough to believe that the more a child knows the happier he will be later on.

(14) The editorial to which comrade Uloth takes exception is the responsibility of one writer. His colleagues may or may not agree. Does it matter all that much? Would the ideas expressed be any different if we could tell comrade Uloth that they were the unanimous, collective opinion of the Editorial Board? If so, may we draw his attention to what he was saying in his first paragraph of the dangers of authoritarianism and all that!—EDITORS]

Bringing up Daddy-O

WELL, we certainly didn't need a crystal ball to foresee that the recent editorial on bringing up children would unleash a Force 8 howl of protest from outraged lovers of "freedom". Mind you, the bit about learning to play a musical instrument invited misinterpretation—which it duly got. The point at issue in this instance would seem to be: Have parents done enough by providing opportunities for their offspring? Should they not also supply some motivation? This invites the further question: What sort of motivation? Call it "encouragement" and no-one minds. Call it "pressure" and there is a whiff of heresy in the air. Call it "forcing for the child's own good" and there is a clear-cut case of blasphemy.

Like A.W.U. I had my chance to learn the piano when young, and like him I felt I had something better to do. We were probably right, at that. Now, if Mr. Suzuki had been living just round the corner it might have been a different story. Most children can be fired with enthusiasm, given an inspired teacher. The trouble is that these gifted pedagogues are thin on the ground. In all my schooldays I met only one real teacher. He was so good at teaching history that I got moved up into the A stream and lost him. That taught me a lesson, all right—it was too late to get myself moved back down again. Since then I've been a bit craftier about creeping out from under the bushel waving my torch.

Apart from a choice of words there is not much to argue about on this "opportunity plus motivation" score. Good parents provide both insofar as they are able. Where the real ding-dong starts is over "forcing" the child to go to school, or whatever, when the child has made it clear that the idea somehow fails to flood the heart with joy. The real issue is not whether the child should be "forced" or "restricted" in any way—it is a question of where to draw the line. Even the most libertarian parent finds it necessary to "imprison" the young child at home, if only to prevent its being butchered on the road. The child cannot appreciate this parental concern at the time, and may be very cheesed off at being restricted in this way. But this is a condition for survival, and I don't suppose many of us hold it against our parents that they

exercised their judgment and authority on our behalf on such occasions.

Going to school shifts the argument away from simple physical survival onto the plane of social survival. Like it or lump it, the child is going to be exposed to some kind of schooling, because that is the kind of society we live in. The alternatives to sending Bubbles to school are to provide an approved course of study at home, move to some foreign clime where they don't mind how ignorant your child is, or passively resist while the loyal education authority frog marches Bubbles off to a foster home as being in need of care and protection. The first alternative may sound reasonable, but you will still have to toe the line and provide your child with what the local pundits consider to be adequate schooling.

In other words, you can protect your child from environmental demands only up to a point. After that the environment has a nasty way of imposing itself. So, in all probability, you send Bubbles to the school round the corner where he goes through the mill much as you did. There is one thing you can do, though, to protect your child from Victorian sadists. You can expressly forbid the use of corporal punishment. This, funnily enough, is a prerogative invested in you by law, on the whimsical grounds that only you have the right to damage your own piece of property. If anyone else deliberately usurps this privilege you can sue for common assault. But I don't suppose you would bother.

Now, we can take this social survival argument a stage further. On the whole, parents, no matter how progressive, have long since learned the need to come to terms with the outside world, both personally and on behalf of their children. Where, I imagine, the fur really begins to fly is over the handling of domestic situations. In the home you have the chance to structure the situation as freely as you please. If you choose to let Bubbles finger-paint with faeces on the kitchen wall, none can say you nay. Most parents lack the patience and forbearance to let matters go so far, but I don't doubt that there are some who find the frail flower of creative endeavour in their children so precious that they are prepared to put up with the smell and lack of sanitation in the name

of art and freedom. Good luck to them. I hope they are duly rewarded with a Michelangelo for their pains. In the meantime, I trust they will not be offended if I decline their invitations to dinner.

The fact is, some restraints are necessary, not only for physical and social survival in the broad sense, but also so that life is bearable for those who are in close contact with the child. Even parents have rights. What is more, I am by no means convinced that the child who does exactly as he damn well pleases, without regard for the comfort, convenience, or feelings of others, is being well served by its doting parents. On the contrary, it is only insofar as we learn to consider the social consequences of our actions that we develop a sense of being worthwhile individuals rather than spoiled brats. Learning to treat others as doormats is no healthier than being a doormat oneself. These are just two sides of the same dud coin. To quote the ancient saw: There can be no self-respect without respect for others. No doubt this aphorism has been corruptly pressed into service by many a crypto-fascist of the public school variety. Which only goes to show that ideals can be abused as readily as facts or power.

Having so far been careful to do no more than echo the truism that "It's all a matter of degree", I shall now run up the Jolly Roger and reveal myself as an authoritarian tyrant so far as bringing up children is concerned. This may

well be preferable to being a canting hypocrite, which is the charge I am aching to hurl at those critics who have been sniffing heresy all along, with narrowing eyes and rising gorge, yearning for the fatal slip so that they may pounce to smite me hip and thigh.

Fear not, Little Nell, here I come—both feet right in up to the lug-holes. First of all let me say that I would never strike a child, except in self defence, and then only as a last resort. Now for my cardinal principle: Whenever possible children should be allowed to take the consequences of their actions.

In case this does not sound vile enough, let me derive corollary Number One: All children have the right to go hungry.

Example: I ask a child what it would like to eat, offering whatever is available. The child replies "A fried egg". I fry the egg, soft, hard, medium, sunny side up or turned, as requested. I serve it on a clean plate, plus the usual extras. The child has changed its mind and no longer fancies a fried egg. As far as I am concerned the child is exercising its right to go hungry. From then on it can buy and fry its own eggs. That's the kind of bastard I am. Come next meal time I shall again offer to provide whatever circumstances permit—fried eggs apart. After a while the child will cotton on to the general idea that it is not doing me any favours by eating. By that time it may be ready to do itself a favour and stop acting like a miserable little git. There's psychology for you.

Before the howls of protest mount to cyclone force let me enter a few provisos and caveats. In the first place, if the child has never had a fried egg

Continued on page 3

ANARCHY 14 discusses

DISOBEDIENCE

RAILWAY ROT!

Continued from page 1

But we also recall reading that the average private-car is used for about 10 days out of the 365 in a year. If ever there was a wasteful, uneconomic industry it is the car industry which supplies a "need", when analysed, limited to the summer months which could be much more satisfactorily dealt with (from the point of view of comfort) by the railways.

From the capitalist point of view road travel is a *more profitable* proposition than rail travel. The public spends on rail travel about an eighth of what it spends on motor cars and motor cycles, and from the point of view of efficiency and economy we are convinced that the railways would win hands down. In any case, and apart from any other considerations, the private means of transportation offer possibilities for a section of the community; the railways provide a service for the whole community.

★

THE argument is advanced that compared with the railway, the car is a symbol of freedom, for the individual driver has the possibility of driving where he wishes whereas the train traveller can only travel where the line (and the engine driver) takes him. Agreed!

But in the age of Motorways and mass production of cars this is no longer true. Before long many city centres will be closed to cars and the congestion on the main roads leading out of the big cities will only be temporarily relieved by Motorways, for Parkinson's Law applies to them as well as to office buildings! As it is, the estimates are that by 1970 the number of cars on the roads of this country will be doubled.

Just as cars were symbols of "freedom" when in fact they were owned by the rich only, so now the rich have once more solved the problem, for the time being at any rate. They travel by train or by air and bring their cars with them either on the train or on the plane! To our minds this is not so much symbolic of freedom as of a mad society, which has lost all sense of proportion and even its sense of humour. But above all it is the symbol of a chaotic, degenerate society.

★

THE closing of branch lines as well as causing inconvenience

to many people by depriving them of a service is at the same time a false economy. To many people's surprise the closing of 300 such "unprofitable" lines since 1950, mostly in remote rural areas, has saved the B.T.C. only £4,300,000 a year. How many people in the areas served by these lines have been forced to invest in motor cars as a result? How many petrol stations have since been opened in those areas; how many road widening schemes have been introduced, and how many buses have been put onto these routes?

The future of the railways cannot be planned in the interest of the community without at the same time planning the future of road and other forms of transport. Neither can they be economic in any sense of the word so long as the working population is concentrated in cities and obliged to live in dormitory towns always further from their place of work. Every morning 1,250,000 people come into Central London; the road congestion has to be dealt with by large forces of police, for which the public pays and not the road users (yet railway users are expected to pay the signalmen's wages out of their fares!), and yet only 100,000 people are travelling by private transport, and 240,000 by public transport. This leaves a further 900,000 who travel by rail—underground or suburban. Imagine the chaos if all these were in a position to, or decided to, travel by road!

Of course the problem of transport in a densely populated country such as Britain is a complicated one. It can be solved, and in the interests—and that includes the comfort—of the travelling public and the community as a whole if these interests are put first and foremost. But if the British Transport Commission takes its advice from the tycoons of the car industry, the civil engineering contractors and the oil companies it is only too clear what will happen! And mark our words, if they have their way it will not be many years before there is a "road crisis", and all kinds of arguments about the inefficiency of roads etc., in order to make us believe that "progress", and our rightful place among the nations can only be achieved by mass air travel. It is only a question of time. We only hope we shall have by then found a lonely island, silent, but for the song of birds and girls—to end our days!

OURSELVES

As readers will see from this week's Financial Statement, the steady flow of subscription renewals, and donations continues, and we thank again all who are helping us to keep ourselves financially above water. This week we have modified the presentation of our Statement to show how the *new* subscriptions are coming in. They are unfortunately not coming in as quickly as we would like, and we appeal to all our readers to undertake to introduce our publications to at least one new reader in the course of the year, and if possible to collect from them a

- year's subscription!
- Subscription renewals from the United States are coming in steadily but still too slowly. May we urge all readers who have received renewal notices to deal with them now if they have not already done so.
- We still need many volunteers for selling FREEDOM and ANARCHY on the Aldermaston March this Easter. The march is a valuable means for us of contacting new sympathisers but it can only be done if we have a large team of sellers. Please write to us if you will help.

YOU HAVE NOTHING TO LOSE BUT YOUR TELLIES

FERDYNAND ZWEIG is of Polish origin, and like many 'lookers-on' has seen much more of 'the game'. His previous studies *Men in the Pits* (1948), *Labour Life and Poverty* (1948) and *The British Worker* (1952) were excellent field studies of what is called 'the working class'. Now he has written *The Worker in an Affluent Society* (Heinemann, 25s.), which carries on the studies into the present day.

The radical movement has long been cursed with the hangover of Marxist jargon, that society is rigidly divided into classes, without allowing for the possibility of changes in position, or the possibility of the class-struggle being in abeyance.

Zweig has no political point to make and his views are therefore unblinkered by the theory of increasing misery or the theory of eternal affluence. Basically his conclusion is that 'Working-class life finds itself on the move towards new middle-class values and middle-class existence'. When Zweig compares the situation of today with what he saw and described ten years ago in *The British Worker*, he writes: "the change can only be described as a deep transformation of values, as the development of new ways of thinking and feeling, a new ethos, new aspirations and cravings."

One could wish that Zweig's sample would have been larger (there were 601) and that the sample from each factory (United Steel at Workington, Vauxhall of Luton, Dunlop of Birmingham, and Mullard of Mitcham) were of the same size, so that comparisons could more easily be made. Also data on personal habits such as food, gambling and smoking would have been welcomed.

Zweig found universal discontent with wages received and a continually expanding wage-demand. 55% of the family men had more than one wage-packet coming in. Five or six per cent had sidelines, and the high standard of living was maintained with a great deal of overtime and shiftwork.

The change in housing conditions is reflected by "moving to the front." The kitchen is no longer the centre of the family. (I can remember when the "kitchen" was called "the house" and the parlour or front room was rarely if ever, used, except at Christmas). Improvements in housing conditions, the provision of council estates, have directed attention to higher standards in the home. In Luton only 10% of the sample lived in privately rented houses; in Sheffield one-third. In Luton 47% lived in houses of their own; in Sheffield only 16%.

The minority of the sample (and mainly amongst the old men), were those living in sub-standard housing (without bath and/or indoor sanitation). About 85% had television sets, 38% radiograms or record players, 29% washing machines, 15% refrigerators and 15% had pianos. The piano as a status symbol was fairly evenly distributed whilst the 'fridge' was mainly confined to Luton and Mitcham which seems to correlate with the incidence of wives at work. Zweig says that the majority enjoyed a comfortable and well-equipped home. "One might hear such remarks as 'I have many things which would be unthinkable to my father'."

ZWEIG ANALYSES the tendency to early marriages with a consequent tendency to 'settle down' earlier to the home-making activity, and the drive to financial solvency. With this change in values has come a decline in the size of families. "Family planning seems to be one of the most important vehicles of prosperity in the working classes, or at least it is so regarded by the workers".

The child's upbringing and education is a majority interest. A desire to keep the children at school as long as possible Zweig believes "that many, if not most fathers and mothers, want to be 'outclassed'; although they may have mixed feelings about it later on".

The majority of family relationships were described as 'happy'. "Such accounts may not be accurate, but I had the impression that they were truthful". He concludes his examination on marriage with "There is a conflict in every man's mind between the desire to dominate and master and the desire to serve and please. But in this conflict the desire to serve and please seems to be on the ascendant in the working man's life." This conflicts with the image put across by Andy Capp; but perhaps Andy is a surrogate for the dominant male. In any case both attitudes are undesirable. Examining his findings Zweig con-

cludes that "the big majority of wives who are in a position to seek employment are actually at work".

* * *

WITH THE RISE of re-equipment and modernization, shiftwork, Zweig says, is spreading all over the country. This is financially necessary to the factory owners since the maximum output is necessary to recoup for the capital outlay. There is general majority acceptance of shift work; with a minority, actual preference for it. The preference is based upon lack of management interference, presence of 'better team spirit'.

Shifts mean more money but interfere with family life. "My wife doesn't mind my shifts; she has a telly" is a pathetic quote. Shift work frequently involves the necessity (and ability) to purchase a car.

Zweig finds the acquisitive instincts have risen and the worker tends "to loosen the sense of identity with his own class, to which he is bound no longer by the links of common hardships, handicaps and injustices, and the constant call to arms in class warfare."

This involves the quest for overtime, workers liking the extra money, but disliking the extra work. Zweig concludes that the dehumanization of industrialism is offset by the growth of welfare and personnel services. He finds a widening of contacts in the factory but a decline of the intensity of those contacts, coupled with a greater separation between home and factory.

Zweig conducted tests of cultural horizons by using sixteen well-known (or seemingly well-known) names from literature, science and learning, art and religion. The scores in this test show a fairly widespread ignorance and that "the two nations may be a thing of the past in terms of economics but not in terms of education and culture". There has been a decline in active participation in outdoor games but there is a rising interest in constructive hobbies. "The week-end is fast losing its character as a period of rest and is rather assuming the aspect of a second job, that of home-craft".

About 40% of his sample were non-readers, 8% occasional, 10% read Westens (which includes mystery, thrillers and detective). This makes over 50% without serious reading matter.

* * *

THE MOTOR-CAR is examined as an agent of social change, being a hobby, an expense, a luxury, a key to new social surroundings and a family affair. Television introduces a world of illusion and make-believe. It makes for laziness and limits conversation. Zweig also notes a 'honeymoon period' with TV after which the glamour fades. He notes that as easier transport and changes of work disperse the family, relationships become happier. Contacts with neighbours and mates have tended to lessen with affluence.

Saving as a habit seems to be spreading and house-ownership is less uncommon. This helps to spread the propertied-class ethos among the workers. This may explain the tendency of people to regard themselves as being in a class higher than that to which they belong in the Marxian sense. "Working class as regards work, middle class as regards living" is one of the statements reflecting the break-up of the mental class-structure. This tendency is also seen in the ambitions of the fathers for their sons to get into more skilled positions.

The statistics as to religion show that 12% are non-believers, 8% agnostics and about 50% are what Zweig calls "luke-warm believers". Unfortunately he failed to get figures for church (or chapel) attendance, pointing out that "Religion is not regarded as a suitable subject for conversation". He ignores politics altogether which is symptomatic in itself.

Zweig has done research into the status of the single young man, the widower, the bachelor and there is a chapter on the women operatives of Mullard.

* * *

HIS GENERALIZATIONS and conclusions are not very inspiring. He develops what he calls the homeo-static principle which is surely only the compensatory factor once expressed succinctly as "if a man has one leg shorter than the other, the other's sure to be longer".

This is surely only an observation of the human capacity for adaptation. This does not justify the institution (in this case the modern factory). In war, jail and hospital one has heard it said

"One can get used to anything". The retort should be "Why should one have to?" The case for adjustment has not been made. As Zweig says, "the counterfeit (of freedom) is cheap, giving the viewer in essence what he needs and leaving him free. The quest for freedom has assumed an unexpected aspect: the freedom to watch TV and the freedom to drive a car".

Zweig diagnoses tendencies to conservatism (in the philosophic sense), projective generalizations, ambivalence, amounting to a new social horizon.

His book concludes with outlines of the local backgrounds of the five firms which he has examined.

"The Affluent Society" is a red rag to many but as the term, in the Galbraithian sense, is outrageously misused, "What about the starving old age pensioners in Middletown?" is the usual comeback. Galbraith's case is that these pockets of squalour are endemic in an affluent society conceived without regard to basic human values beyond consumption for consumption's sake.

Zweig demonstrates that the squalour of the worker in an affluent society is a squalour of shifts, of overtime, of vicarious pleasures and sports, of limited intellectual horizons, of 'keeping up with the Joneses!', of near-illiteracy, of a budget chasing demands and never catching up, of the lonely crowd, of meaningless work and meaningful hobbies.

Capitalism may have solved the problem of unemployment some may say, by means of war preparations which have become even a little too unhealthy for the states, but it will never solve the problem of human freedom which demands, not an examination of affluence, but a revaluation of what affluence means in real human terms unmeasured by possessions or wage-claims.

JACK ROBINSON.

Daddy-O

Continued from page 2

before, then it has the right to find out whether it is to his taste. In this case I should probably let it try mine first. Secondly, genuine illness is another matter altogether. Sudden nausea at the sight of food prepared by myself is not unknown. Thirdly, be it noted, I would never force a child to eat anything. This goes right against the basic principle of freedom to starve. What the child is *not* free to do is to go out of its way to make my life a misery. That I prefer to do for myself.

Doubtless, the child who acts up in this way is trying to express itself. Possibly, the message it wants to get across is important, emotional, and unconscious. Doubtless, too, it is not the child's fault that it has problems. Obviously, it has been the victim of inadequate child-rearing practices. Be that as it may, I am not the one to confirm the child in its neurotic symptoms. It may have been rewarded for such negativistic conduct in the past, but it will have to learn more acceptable behaviour before it starts getting rewarded by Uncle Bob. If the message it is trying to convey is of a need for attention, then I shall try to spot this message and proceed to reward the child with attention for the kind of behaviour I want to encourage.

Direct physical punishment I have no time for. As a matter of fact it does not work in the way intended at all. In the jargon of learning theory, only non-reinforcement produces genuine extinction of a response—punishment merely inhibits it, to reappear later in perhaps a more objectionable guise. Anyone who fails to appreciate the subtle distinction between punishment, deliberately imposed in a spirit of vengeance, and letting the child take the natural consequences of its actions, would be well advised to steer clear of children. There are less trying ways of boosting the ego than spreading one's image over the face of the earth.

In conclusion, may I observe that I have little trouble with children? On the whole we get on splendidly. Incivility, selfishness, and plain bloody-mindedness are met by a smart withdrawal of co-operation on my part. Since any child in my charge perforce depends on my good will for its comfort it soon becomes clear, even to the least far-sighted, that my co-operation is worth preserving. We get on like a house on fire. What about my incivility, selfishness, and bloody-minded moods? All I hope, for the child's sake, is that I was well brought up.

BOB GREEN.

Eichmann and the Pirates

MAURICE GOLDMAN'S letter is really too absurd. Surely it is obvious that I feel indignation against the practice of genocide, otherwise I would not be writing on the subject at all. A doctor does not find the cause of a disease by abusing the germs, and to me Eichmann represents a diseased individual, a product of a diseased society. I am interested in what makes a man like Eichmann tick, and I would like to contribute just a little bit to decreasing the number of such people in the world. I doubt if I can hope to do more.

One has to keep calm when doing research of any kind. I lost no friend or relative to the Nazis, and I am very sorry for those who did, but I do have friends whose existence is threatened by the patriotic activities of the O.A.S. This makes me full of hatred every time I read in the papers of a new explosion of plastic bombs, but this hatred is useless, it does not lead to a diminution of O.A.S. activities or to a greater understanding of the reasons for them—unless indeed it gives one the sobering feeling that if I can feel hatred like that I am not so far off being like these terrorists.

The comparison of Eichmann to a pirate was made by the author of the pamphlet I was reviewing. (Which I may say is a very soberly written pamphlet, without anger, no doubt a fault to Mr. Goldman). The reason he made the comparison was that he was trying to find a precedent, which is a thing lawyers are prone to do. He was trying to find an "international crime" to which Eichmann's could be compared. That is to say that he was trying to discover a crime which is punishable by any government in the world, (in any circum-

stances. Now piracy on the high seas is such a crime, since the high seas are free to all, in theory, and anybody who robs there is fair game to the naval forces of any state. However, Mr. Rogat came to the conclusion, as was made plain enough in my review, that Eichmann's crime was not comparable to piracy, since Eichmann was himself the employee of a state.

The comparison of Eichmann to a crusader or slave trader is very apt. The crusaders sought to obliterate, as far as they could, the civilisation of Islam. In Spain Moorish civilisation was completely wiped out. Eichmann was aiming to destroy Jewish culture, but his technical resources were greater. As regards the slave trade, I can think of nothing closer to a concentration camp than the hold of a slave ship. It is true that the purpose was to exploit the labour of the slaves, and not to kill them off, however the results were much the same, and the degree of suffering which the slaves had to undergo was not very different, if at all, from that of the victims of the Nazis. If Mr. Goldman really believes that to make the comparison is "an insult to humanity losing its power of indignation" I can only say that he seems to be distressed by things which have happened recently, or have

Letters

affected him personally, but is unable to concern himself so much with the fate of people not directly connected to him. The after-effects of the evils of the slave trade are however with us still, in the widespread existence of colour prejudice, with all that springs from it. Future wars may be fought along colour lines, and white and black Eichmanns make their appearance.

I assume the bomber pilots had no imagination. Eichmann himself seems to have been a dull sort of person, and, although he carried out what he regarded as his duties with the bureaucrat's characteristic zeal, I doubt whether he really can have had much of that sort of imagination which makes a man capable of identifying with suffering people. The world is of course so full of suffering that it is almost impossible to recreate it completely in one's imagination. If one did one would go mad. One has to try to understand what is going on

in the world, without shirking it but without being overwhelmed and swamped by it.

There is need for understanding, because humanity has never yet either understood the Eichmann type or been able to deal with him. More importantly still, it has been unable to cope with the kind of people who follow, aid and abet folk like Eichmann, for without such assistance Eichmann would sink to the status of a Jack-the-Ripper.

Therefore the problem is one of humanity as a whole, not simply of Eichmann or the Nazis, or the Germans for that matter. One has to ask oneself, why do Eichmanns arise? Why do people follow them, or support them? And why do their victims so often resist so little? Why are minorities so frequently singled out for attack? Why is it that man is the only species who consistently destroys his own kind on a large scale?

The solution of these problems, and others connected to them, is a far more important task than denunciation. The history of mankind is so appalling that it leaves one dumb. It seems to be nothing less than a Wild Hunt, wherein quarry and pursuers periodically change places. I can assure Mr. Goldman that I have plenty of imagination, and if it

tends to produce depression and despair rather than indignation that is merely a matter of temperament. Let us hope that this trial shows that humanity is coming to regard mass killing as a crime, as single killing has long been regarded. If it does there is some reason for hope. But if it is merely an act of revenge by the Jewish folk on a representative of the Nazi folk, then, however "human" or "natural" it may be, it cannot represent a step forward.

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

Postponed Jumble

London Anarchist Group apologise for postponement of their Jumble Sale due to confusion (not ours!) about the renting of premises.

The sale will be held and we thank those who have contributed, and of course we would welcome more.

Date and place of sale will be given shortly.

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.

APRIL 8 Jack Stevenson: Solidarity Forever.

APRIL 15 Jack Robinson: Causes of World War II.

APRIL 22 No meeting: on pilgrimage. APRIL 29 John Pilgrim record recital: War, Rebellion and Resistance in Folk Music.

OFF-CENTRE DISCUSSION MEETINGS

1st Thursday of each month at 8 p.m. at Jack and Mary Stevenson's, 6 Stainton Road, Enfield, Middx.

1st Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. at Colin Ward's, 33 Ellerby Street, Fulham, S.W.6.

3rd Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. at Donald Room's, 148a Fellows Road, Swiss Cottage, N.W.3. Please note that the meetings at Donald Room's are now on the third Wednesday of each month, not Thursday as hitherto. (Next meeting 18th April).

Last Friday of each month at 8 p.m. at Laurens and Celia Otter's, 57 Ladbroke Road, W.11.

RE-FORMED GROUP

Last Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. Tom Barnes', Albion Cottage, Fortis Green, N.2. (3rd door past Tudor Hotel).

JAZZ CLUB

This season's meetings are being held at 4 Albert Street Mornington Crescent NW1 at approximately monthly intervals. Friday MARCH 23 Peter Turner and others choose Personal Favourites

ANARCHY Nos 1-12

Still Available 1/8 Post Free

Freedom

The Anarchist Weekly

FREEDOM is published 40 times a year, on every Saturday except the last in each month. ANARCHY (1/8 or 25 cents post free), a 32-page journal of anarchist ideas, is published 12 times a year on the 1st of each month.

Postal Subscription Rates to FREEDOM and ANARCHY

12 months 32/- (U.S. & Canada \$5.00)
6 months 16/- (2.50)
3 months 8/6 (\$1.25)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies

12 months 47/- (U.S. & Canada \$7.50)
6 months 23/6 (\$3.75)

AIR MAIL Subscription Rates (FREEDOM by Air Mail, ANARCHY by Surface Mail)

12 months 52/- (U.S. & Canada \$8.00)

Postal Subscription Rates to FREEDOM only

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

It's the Same the Whole World Over!

IN the course of trying to locate an incarcerated friend—one of the Committee of One Hundred—I was privileged to observe some fairly ordinary samples of British justice. I had been misdirected to a Bow Street courtroom (the pacifists were being tried upstairs, I later discovered) and observing my briefcase, for I was going on to do some library work afterwards, the attendants asked if I were a solicitor—the same enquiry they would make a few minutes later of a captured prostitute. When I grunted noncommittally, I was courteously seated in the overcrowded room.

The cases involved were petty thievery and sex crimes; and I wondered as I began to listen, if the justice meted out here would correspond with what I know it to be in New York. (While awaiting my own trial I had sat in on cases, much like here, and in my permanent memory is the picture of a frail, white-haired, seventy-two year old man, charged with assault and battery by a young, powerful thug—both Italian immigrants; after much incomprehensible evidence, mysteriously unrelated to the matter, or so it seemed—largely to do with real estate values of the principles' respective residences—the old man was sentenced to eighteen months' imprisonment. It had seemed obvious to my companion and myself that the true case had been tried behind the scenes; and that there was some reason, unknown to us, for putting the old fellow out of the way).

I could not expect these London cases to have that tinge of melodrama, but would the quality of justice be as strained?

The first case was that of a waiter who had stolen ten shillings worth of meat at Simpsons. He said that he and his family were hungry. The magistrate examined him carefully; an adequate salary, he pointed out (averaging twelve pounds); substantial tips (no, the defendant contradicted, the twelve pounds—sometimes very much less than that—included the tipping). We take a very dim view of stealing from one's employers, the magistrate concluded severely. First offence. Fine five pounds.

The second case was a prostitute with a long string of previous "offences". She seemed stupid, perhaps feeble minded; she was dressed like a housewife on North End Road. The bobby testified he saw her soliciting regularly. Warning and fine five pounds.

The third case was an unkempt boy who had stolen four oranges. (The bobby's testimony stated, and even repeated, that he had seen the boy pick the oranges up out of the gutter near the barrows. This, in a technical sense, of course, cannot constitute a theft; but no matter). "A psychopath", the magistrate stated virtuously, looking up from a substantial dossier on the accused. "The doctor says he can't help you. Now why do you do it?" No answer. The magistrate shrugged and sighed. Warning and fine of three bob. "He doesn't have the money, your honour." The penalty is changed to one week in jail and a recommendation again to the kindly offices of the doctor. (The most psychopathic person by far I ever knew was a prison doctor).

The fourth and most disturbing case—although the effect upon me may have

been cumulative—concerned homosexuality. The participants, both married, were an elderly man (67) and a young one doing a nine year stint in the army; the former had picked him up in Trafalgar Square—both were on the town, seeking an evening of fun and frolic—from whence they had repaired to a deserted house. The language of the accusation was of a D. H. Lawrence vintage and it was instantly apparent that whatever else, the extreme penalty these two would pay would be in public humiliation. The older man, in a muddled, pretentious and not very ingenious

speech, asked to bear full responsibility. His hands, clasped behind his back, were visibly trembling. The young man gripped the railing and blushed furiously the whole time. There was much questioning by the bench. An army captain testified that his subordinate's record was exemplary; but there were indications that the accused had been AWOL for the weekend, and that his superior was covering.

The only time a smile flitted over the dead pan of justice, it was in appalling taste. First offences. A smirking warning, five pounds for the seducer, a fourteen shilling fine for the seduced. And so it went. It was evident that the sex crimes afforded the court a steady source of revenue.

Finally, I located the upstairs court where the pacifists, dozens of them, were being tried. What a difference! Although obviously tired (tell Dachine, my friend had jestingly postscripted in a letter he had managed to get out to his wife, there are no mattresses here) not one had the browbeaten look of the other "criminals".

I watched them, five at a time, confronting the magistrate, and I privately commended them for the tonal and temperamental range of their "Guilty"; they succeeded, individually, in that one word to show contempt for their accusers, certainly of the justness of their action, defiance, a sweet and patient reasonableness, a profligate scourging of the law, compassion for the they-know-not-what-they-do law enforcers.

Presently, the magistrate grew either disconcerted or bored. Before trying the remainder of the civil disobedients, he relieved the tedium by requesting the other, ordinary criminal cases. At this point I repaired to a pub around the corner for lunch. As I sat inspecting the menu and considering the ten shillings of stolen meat, I caught the eye of a man seated at a large table across the dining room from me. Why, it was this morning's first magistrate. But no, there were eight men at that table, and any one could have been the magistrate; and at tables nearby there were others, alone or by two, or with an occasional woman; the men all placid and shaven, empty in visage and similarly clothed. One of these must surely be he or, if he were truly not here, he must be in a nearly identical place, taking his lunch.

I looked at the menu again. There was no entrée cheaper than six shillings and sixpence. Many were ten shillings and over. In any case, if one added a roll, a vegetable, one glass of wine and coffee, one could not escape under fifteen shillings. This would not include the good tip of which the magistrate spoke.

What schizophrenia enables the magistrate to go from his court affairs to lunch? Or is he only heartless? Until he comes to some understanding of himself and his behaviour, this is the justice the petty criminal may continue to expect.

I cannot pretend that the most flagrant malpractices of justice are here in London. The American South, Moscow, California (where Chessman was electrocuted for a sex offence) Havana can provide more terrible examples. The law is flexible, quixotic, but never just.

DACHINE RAINER.

GOING STRONG

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AT MARCH 31st 1962

Weeks 12 & 13
EXPENSES: 13 weeks at £70 £910

INCOME:
Sales & Sub. Renewals:
£ £
Weeks 1—11 566
Weeks 12 & 13 113
679

New Subscriptions:
January (32) 32
February (21) 24
March (40) 50

TOTAL (93) 106 £785
DEFICIT £125

DEFICIT FUND

Wolverhampton: B.L. £1/2/9; Toronto: Mrs. C. £1/8/-; Luton: J.C. 5/-; Worthing: B.D.B. 4/-; London: J.McE. 7/-; London: T.G. (per J.McE.) £1/1/-; Oxford: Anon. 5/-; Hartford: M.G.A.* £2/7/-; 7777: P.L. 13/-; Glasgow: H.McD. 5/-; Glasgow: L.B. 8/-; Wolverhampton: J.L.* 3/6; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/-; Glasgow: J.H.* 2/6; London: N.W. 4/6; Hounslow: L.* 2/6; San Francisco: p.p. social 10/3/61 (per 'Incaricato')* £17/10/-; New York: S.G. £1/15/-; New York: T.I. 4/-; London: H.D. 13/-; Southend: P.O.* 5/-; London: L.T.R. 8/-; London: M.I. £8/8/-; London: A.M. 3/-; Warrington: J.H. 7/6; Los Angeles: J.S. (per A.R.)* £14; Morongo Valley: A.R.* £1/15/-; Bletchley: R.S. 5/-; Tucson, Arizona: p.p. picnic £11/15/-; Tucson: A.T. £1/15/-; London: D.S. 8/-; Bristol: N. & S.A. 5/-; Mount Vernon: F.D. £1/2/-; Detroit: J.S. 3/6; Detroit: V.C. (per J.S.) 14/-; Detroit: Libertarian group (per J.S.) £5/6/5; Glasgow: J.H. 3/6; Oak Park, Mich.: B.D.S. £5; Seaford: D.T. £1; Brooklyn: A.S. £2/14/-; Southend: P.O.* 5/-; London: P. & G.T.* 5/-; London: T.K.* 5/-; Paris: S.K. 18/-; Nottingham: H.S. 5/6; Surrey: F.B.* 10/-; Isleworth: L.K.W. 2/-; Dar-es-Salaam: C.S. 3/-; London: R.S. 8/-; Wolverhampton: J.L.* 2/6; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/-; London: A.T. £1; Sunnyvale: L.M. 7/-; London: A.S. 1/6; London Colney: E.H. £1/8/-; Falmouth: R.W. 1/6; Baltimore: C.R.B. £1/1/-; Redcar: A.R.H. 8/-; Kirup: C.K. 18/-; Belfast: "Liam"* 4/-; Oxford: Anon.* 5/-; Cheltenham: T.K.W. £2; London: P. & G.T.* 10/-.

TOTAL 96 14 8
Previously acknowledged 389 8 7
1962 TOTAL TO DATE £486 3 3

*Denotes regular contributors.

FREEDOM PRESS PUBLICATIONS

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 5/6 post free.

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

CHARLES MARTIN
Towards a Free Society 2/6

RUDOLF ROCKER
Nationalism and Culture cloth 21/-

JOHN HEWETSON
Ill-Health, Poverty and the State cloth 2/6 paper 1/-

VOLINE
Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed) cloth 12/6
The Unknown Revolution (Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21) cloth 12/6

HERBERT READ
Poetry and Anarchism cloth 5/-

TONY GIBSON
Youth for Freedom 2/-
Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.
Food Production & Population 6d.

E. A. GUTKIND
The Expanding Environment (illustrated) boards 8/6

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

Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications:

Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A tribute cloth 5/-
Journey Through Utopia cloth 16/- paper 7/6

