

'The great mistake of modern society is that, instead of applying science to the abolition of slavery, we try to amuse the slaves.'  
—OSCAR WILDE

### In this Issue:

- BATTLES OVER?
- ROCKETS FOR JONES MAJOR
- BREAK THE THOUGHT BARRIER!
- ANARCHISM BROADCAST
- CORRESPONDENCE

## THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY - 4d.

# MARKET JUGGLERS

A PART from the gossip, from which it emerges that Bob likes Mac (Mac, of course cannot afford not to like Bob), if anything was seriously discussed at their week-end meeting, we have no doubt that the future of capitalism was accorded priority over the future of mankind. One did not have to have an ear at the key-hole of the conference room door to realise that Kennedy and Macmillan, as spokesmen, respectively, for the most powerful and the oldest bastions of capitalism, were discussing not the next step to take against the Russian Bear, but the financial crises which beset the so-called "free world", and in particular the "affluent" nations. That Kennedy does not apparently consider the international situation "serious" enough to warrant a Summit conference but has had no less than five meetings with Macmillan since he took office last year, surely points to where the real crisis lies.

The *Guardian's* Washington correspondent, Max Freedman, prefaces a recent dispatch (April 26) with the following comment: "It can be reported on the highest authority that the Kennedy Administration would regard the failure of Britain to join the Common Market as a 'catastrophe'. The failure to work out satisfactory terms of membership would have serious results for Western Europe, for Britain and for the United States". He follows these highly significant remarks with a paragraph of clichés about "unity of Europe", "partnership" and "the larger interests of the free world". It is undoubtedly true that America is interested in the success of the Common Market for political reasons. In their view an economically "united" Western Europe would be obliged by the force of circumstances to be also politically, militarily "united"—which now they are not, in spite of their allegiance to NATO—to the advantage of the United States in its power struggle

with the Russian bloc. But there are also financial and economic considerations behind the United States' pressure on Britain to join the Common Market such as

the power which President Kennedy seeks in the new trade legislation to eliminate industrial tariffs on those goods on which the US and the Common Market jointly account for 80 per cent of world trade would be virtually meaningless unless Britain became a member of the EEC. Without British membership it would be possible for the US to eliminate industrial tariffs only on two or three categories of goods. With British membership the reductions could be impressive in economic terms and even more important for their symbolic value in pointing to the American ideal of a maximum flow of industrial goods with a minimum of restriction.

★  
**MR. WALTER PADLEY, M.P.**, member of the Labour Party Executive and President of the Union of Shop, Distributive, and Allied Workers (we remember him as the one-time blue-eyed boy of the I.L.P.) at his union's annual conference is reported as saying that:

For nearly twenty years he had been a little sad at how easily some who proudly proclaimed their international socialism suddenly became Little Englanders, neo-imperialists, or economic nationalists when confronted by the reality of an emerging European union of which Britain was and should be a natural part.

Having lashed those who proclaimed "international socialism" and who could not support a European Union with those for whom de Gaulle, Adenauer and Fanfani, are the three principal spokesmen, Mr. Padley, hack politician that he has become, then goes on to cover him-

self, just in case the conditions for entry are such that even the Labour Party would not be able to accept without committing political *hari kiri*:

But though he was strongly in favour of Britain's entry into the Common Market in principle, it was stupid to commit the Labour Party to support entry before they knew the terms. When the conditions were known, discussion in the Labour movement could proceed with tolerance and a sense of unity.

Mr. Padley, then, is in favour of Britain's entry into the Common Market in principle but at the same time he admits that the conditions for entry are not known, and therefore the Labour movement should not be expected to commit itself until they are. But why favour Britain's entry even in principle? The answer, if we have followed Mr. Padley is that a Common Market means European unity.

As anarchists we too would favour any steps which are in the direction of the abandonment of national sovereignty. But is there any evidence that the Common Market is anything but a device to consolidate the Capitalist system? As anarchists we would welcome any attempt to use natural resources and human effort in the interests of mankind. Is there any evidence that such are the intentions or the possibilities in a Common market?

The answer to the first question was given at the meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the E.E.C. (European Economic Community—that is the "Six") in Paris last month at which European political union was discussed, and ended in such complete failure that not even a communiqué was issued! And according to press reports "all that is definitely known is that no further meeting of the body which has been attempting to agree on a draft treaty, has been arranged".\*

\*Clare Hollingworth in the *Guardian* April 18.

According to Richard Scott, in his *Diplomatic Commentary* in the *Guardian*:

One of the main causes of this internal dispute is the differing views of the Six about the form that their political union should take. President de Gaulle is strongly opposed to a federalist union. What he looks forward to is a union of fully sovereign states—a *Europe des Patries*—under French or Franco-German leadership.

He would like to strengthen the governmental control over the separate communities and bring them together under the political umbrella of a Council of Ministers in which each member-Government would enjoy the right of veto. At recent meetings which the Italian Prime Minister, Signor Fanfani, had with President de Gaulle and Chancellor Adenauer it seemed that the German and Italian Governments had been brought some way towards accepting the French thesis. But Holland, Belgium and Luxembourg have remained to fight for their own strong preference for a federalist form of European political union in which an international civil service would exercise real powers on a developing supranational basis.

And one is not surprised to learn that at the last meeting which ended in deadlock, it was the Belgian representative, supported by the Dutch, who maintained that "it would be quite wrong to go ahead with the discussions without British participation, or alternatively until Britain joined the Common Market."

On the one hand one can "sympathise" with the French when they, to quote the *Guardian's* correspondent, considered it "somewhat quixotic" that the Belgians and Dutch "should hold up the formation of a political union until Britain joins, when the British Government is well-known to oppose their project for a federation with supranational authority"; on the other their attitude is not surprising if one bears in mind that, to quote another *Guardian* commentator, de Gaulle dreams of "a little Europe" dominated by France rather than "a greater

Europe in which Britain would have, at least, equal influence".

Unity, as we understand it, and we think most thinking, reasonable, people will share our approach, cannot exist except among equals. Only equals can expect to have common interests. For this reason there can be no unity between employees and employers; if there could, what need would there be for Trades Unions and the F.B.I.? To our minds the Common Market is an attempt by monopoly capitalism to survive by eliminating competition—take-overs are doing so on a national scale; the only alternative to tariffs and subsidies is amalgamation or take-overs internationally. From the point of view of shareholders what matters is that their investments should produce a profitable return whatever the source. On the other hand the politician, in his own interests, is also concerned in ensuring political "stability" nationally. And it is clear that the measures deemed necessary by the latter do not always coincide with the interests of the industrialists and financiers. (A glaring example of the disunity among the ruling classes is the recent show-down between the Kennedy administration and the American steel barons. Kennedy was able to challenge the steel interests because he had behind him the even stronger backing of the steel-users whose markets would be threatened by an increase in the cost of raw materials. But the basic impotence of that same administration is clearly illustrated by its supine adoption of a "defence" programme which is determined by the sectional interests of the armed forces, and those industries whose prosperity depends on military contracts.)

★  
THE post-war generation in this country has grown up to the sound of the exhortation "we must  
Continued on page 3

## Education and the Teachers' Bag of Tricks

The present educational system in schools did little to help the maladjusted child, said Mr. J. E. Sadler, principal lecturer in education at the City of Birmingham Training College, and a former member of the National Marriage Guidance Council Education Committee in Oxford recently.

He was speaking at the annual conference of Workers for Maladjusted Children at Sommerville College. He said:

"It is quite obvious that the prob-

lems of maladjustment are not attended to very much. The whole of our education system is an incentive to the top half of the class, but quite possibly a source of maladjustment to the bottom half. It is saying to the children most likely to be maladjusted, "We will give you a further kick down."

"The curriculum of our schools, by and large tends to be irrelevant and unadapted to the lives and interests of the majority of children. The majority of teachers come from State primary schools to secondary schools and to the sixth form, where they are given studies to enable them to go to a university. These studies are traditional and not much altered from year to year. They tend to be the teacher's bag of tricks, his stock-in-trade, irrespective of the fact that it often has little impact on the average child."

Eighteen years after the 1944 Education Act, a Government-appointed committee was considering what education was best suitable for the average and below-average child. "Apparently he has been forgotten in the interval."

Some schools, however, were successfully answering the needs of the average and below average child. Mr. Sadler said that society concerned itself with the extreme forms of maladjustment—such as obvious cruelty, deprivation, and anti-social behaviour—but did not pay so much attention to the less obvious forms. It had tried to solve severe maladjustment problems by establishing social welfare services.

## HOW CATAclySMIC CAN YOU GET?

THE middle-aged type standing on the pavement at Victoria looked across at the CND march. "Lunatics . . . they should drop a bomb on them". The point was made that that could not be done without dropping a bomb on him at the same time. He was not persuaded.

The West Indian contingent appeared with a steel band. This most unorthodox of music with its fascinating rhythm was, in itself, a response to a challenge. The British governors of the West Indies had banned musical instruments from political gatherings; but the West Indians made music from dust bins and oil-drums and the like. Today the steel-band, like the calypso is a West Indian affirmation of life.

In *On Thermonuclear War*, by Herman Kahn published by the Centre of International Studies at Princeton University (Princeton University Press, London: Oxford University Press, 1960, 55/-), he writes: "We are not going to reach the year 2000—and maybe not even the year 1965—without a cataclysm of some sort, and that this cataclysm will prove a lot more cataclysmic than it needs to be."

The West Indians snaked on, covering double the ground of many marchers. This was coming to the end of the

largest march so far. The marchers seemed younger than ever, although this may be a sign of ageing in observers. But only the young could survive the long treks, and the fitful sleep on hard floors. The march is life-affirmative and the older are too ready to give up.

Mr. Kahn put it so:  
"The treatment of thermonuclear warfare will mostly concern itself with four typical possible postures, which I will call *Finite Deterrence*, *Counterforce as Insurance*, *Pre-attack Mobilization Base*, and *Credible First Strike Capability* respectively."

Sunday was warm and spring-like. Lollipops put aside, young lovers embraced on grass at Iver. Beatniks lolled magnificently on lawn frontages like the gypsies of whom they are the legitimate heirs. Children begged CND badges as trophies. In the woods the birches stood out silver against the springing green.

Mr. Kahn's table 3 reads: *Dead*—2 million *Economic Recuperation* 1 year; 5 million=2 years 10 million=5 years; 20 million=10 years; 40 million=20 years; 80 million=50 years; 160 million=100 years.

The advent of Polaris gave several new songs to the Campaign—"You canna spend a dollar when you're deid". The obvious anti-Americanism of the-

songs is to be deplored and enjoyed. Consigning the Yanks to the Stanks or up the Alamo has a swinging vigour lacking from the pious invocations of "The H-Bomb's Thunder", "The Family of Man", "The Hammer Song" (which did make the Top Ten), not to mention the Saints, "Down by the Riverside" and the imputable "We Shall not be Moved". Freed from the camp-meeting Parsifality of Canon Collins' constitutional exercise the "Glesca Eskimos".

It's in and out and up and down and on and off the piers.

There's councillors, collaborators, pimps and profiteers;  
The hairies jouk the polis and the polis jouk the queers.

We are the Glesca' Esk'mos.  
"Despite a widespread belief to the contrary, objective studies indicate that even though the amount of human tragedy would be greatly increased in the post-war world, the increase would not preclude normal and happy lives for the majority of survivors and their descendants"—Herman Kahn.

On top of a suburban cinema's flat roof stood a fading blonde watching the march passing by, she was close to the edge. Wolf-whistles went up as the breeze ruffled her skirts. Fortified by

Continued on page 4

## ANARCHY 15

(NOW ON SALE)

## discusses THE WORK OF DAVID WILLS

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

# More on Obscenity

TWO bad books about dirty books, one light and one heavy. THE EROTIC IN LITERATURE (25s.) by David Loth is published by Secker & Warburg, who also published *An Unhurried View of Erotica* (30s.) by Ralph Ginzburg three years ago, and the best thing to be said about the former is that it is at any rate better than the latter. They are both badly-written American accounts of literary obscenity in history and in law which nevertheless contain plenty of interesting material. In the new book Chapters 3-10 can be read as a tolerable historical survey of the subject, and there are bits of a legal survey in some of the other chapters as well, though Loth doesn't come anywhere near the standard set by Norman St. John-Stevens in his *Obscenity & the Law*.

Apart from random arrangement and journalistic style, the trouble with both Loth and Ginzburg is that they make no distinction between the various forms of obscenity. They include the lavatory jokes of Rabelais, Benjamin Franklin and Mark Twain, but surely scatology can't be called erotic. Loth indeed says all the words mean the same thing—but bawdy which generates laughter and pornography which generates lust are quite different from each other even if they are both obscene, and even that isn't always the case. Loth, like Ginzburg, doesn't begin to come to grips with the subject.

## 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

Maxim Gorky: Romantic Realist and Conservative Revolutionary Richard Hare 21/-  
Lonesome Traveller Jack Kerouac 15/-

#### REPRINTS & CHEAP EDITIONS

Escape to an Autumn Pavement Andrew Salkey 6/6  
Foundation and Empire Isaac Asimov 2/6  
Breakdown John Bratby 3/6  
The Blackboard Jungle Evan Hunter 3/6  
Philosophical Dictionary F. M. A. Voltaire 21/-

#### SECOND-HAND

Russia's Message (1908) William English Walling (unbound) 5/-; Back into Power Alistair Horne 6/6; Francis Bacon Benjamin Farrington 3/-; The New Macchivelli & the Food of the Gods H. G. Wells 3/-; Sesame and Lilies John Ruskin 2/6; Callineus J. B. S. Haldane 2/6; Everyday Art at School and Home D. D. Sawyer 6/-; National Welfare and National Decay William McDougall 3/-; The Youngest Director Martyn Goff 10/-; The Morlocks James C. Welsh 3/-; Russia and the Struggle for Peace (1918) Michael S. Farbman 4/-; Behind Gods' Back Negley Farson 3/-; Margaret McMillan: Prophet and Pioneer Albert Mansbridge 3/-; The Great Conspiracy Michael Savers and Albert E. Kahn 2/6; Maurice's Own Idea Miles Malleston 2/6; What We Put in Prison G. W. Pailthorpe 3/6; Damnable Opinions Llewellyn Powys 3/-; Why we Lost Singapore Dorothy Crisp 3/-; Race, Reason and Rubbish Gunnar Dahlberg 3/6; The Press and the Organisation of Society Norman Angell 3/-; The Mystique of Modern Monarchy Percy Black 5/-; New Hopes for a Changing World Bertrand Russell 4/-; The Seven who were Hanged Leonid Andreyev 3/6; A Primer of Socialism Thomas Kirkup 3/-; The Story of my Dictatorship (Land Values League) 3/-; Sometimes, Never Golding Wyndham and Peake 3/6; Power Bertrand Russell 4/-; Germany: Revolution and Counter-Revolution Frederick Engels 2/6; But Who Has Won? John Scanlon 5/-; Readers and Writers A. R. Orage 3/6; Dr. Heidenhoff's Process Edward Bellamy 3/6.

#### PERIODICALS

Rank and File, No 2 3d.  
New Left Review, Jan.-April 5/-

### 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

But his book has two virtues. One is that it is readable and entertaining though sadly superficial. The other is that it discusses obscenity quite sensibly, without either a blush or a leer, and as a result he comes to the only proper conclusion about literary censorship: "The obscenity laws should be abolished as useless appendages to an overburdened legal code a nuisance to the agencies charged with their enforcement, and a menace to the society they are supposed to protect."

He also quotes some useful remarks from recent American experience. In 1949 Judge Curtis Bok said the First Amendment protects all forms of literary expression unless "there is a reasonable and demonstrable cause to believe that a crime or misdemeanor has been committed or is about to be committed as the perceptible result of the publication and distribution of the writing in question; the opinion of anyone that a tendency thereto exists or that such a result is self-evident is insufficient and irrelevant."

Then in 1948 an Ohio court said that "obscenity is not a legal term" but "very much a figment of the imagination." And back in 1923 James Walker asked in the New York State Senate, "Did you ever know a woman who was ruined by a book?" (He had forgotten Francesca, but never mind.) We could ask a more relevant question: Did anyone ever admit to being harmed by a book? And we could follow it with others: Who protects the censors from being corrupted and depraved? Anyway, what is so corrupt and depraved about obscenity and sex in general? Does pornography really exist at all?—Alex Comfort says no, but there is surely a class of book which is recognisably pornographic. If so, does pornography matter?

If you want an answer to the last question, you might think of reading or even buying DOES PORNOGRAPHY MATTER? (18s.), which was published by Routledge last year. Don't—it isn't worth it. It is a very serious, very worthy symposium in the very worst English tradition, edited by C. H. Rolph (who did his best to spoil the Penguin summary of *The Trial of Lady Chatterley*), with contributions from a lawyer, an aesthete, a Catholic priest, a Methodist minister, a psychiatrist and an editorial epigone at the end.

Lord Birkett did his usual trick of saying almost nothing at all very elegantly indeed, though he does give a satisfactory account of recent changes in the English law of obscenity, including most of the classic quotations. Norman St. John-Stevens would have done this much better.) Then Herbert Read does his usual trick of saying almost nothing at all very obscurely indeed, though he does make the point that pornography is a symptom of a disease rather than the disease itself and that censorship is worse than useless. (Alex Comfort would have done this much better.)

Now take a pew. Donald Soper and Denys Rutledge deliver sermons from

## ROCKETS FOR JONES MAJOR

ONE of the marks of a genuine children's classic is a large adult audience. "Wind in the Willows", "Doctor Doolittle", "Tarka the Otter", and "The Hobbit", are read and enjoyed today as much by adults as by children and by and large they satisfy a purely adult aesthetic. It is therefore quite rational when judging the Mermaid's Easter Offering "Rockets in Ursa Major" to pose the question, "Did I as an adult person find the play satisfying and entertaining?" The answer in this case is a qualified yes. But there was certainly no doubt in the minds of the younger members of the second night audience. Not only did they vociferously enjoy the play; they also seemed to appreciate its satirical edge rather faster than the embarrassed-looking representative from one of the "posh Sunday's", who was sitting just across the aisle from me.

This play has the usual Hoyle stock characters; the aging professor, his brilliant young protégé, the military mind (bound by regulations) and the political mind (in all its glorious vacuity). Most reviewers have already mentioned James Grout's brilliantly acid portrait of the Prime Minister, but the impact is greatly increased by Colin Ellis's delicate and largely silent portrayal of the Minister of Defence.

The play could perhaps have done with a slightly firmer direction at the

pulpits on each side of the Christian aisle. In fact they discuss not pornography but sex, and they are against it, though they pretend not to be. The Catholic tries to be all things to all readers and goes round in so many circles that he makes himself quite ridiculous. The Methodist tries to stand firm against prostitution, idleness, alcohol, delinquency, violence—the lot—and reveals such a bigoted and intolerant "Non-conformist Conscience" that he makes himself quite contemptible.

But it is really the two-faced Catholic who deserves contempt, as well as ridicule. The mad Methodist deserves pity and psychiatric treatment, though it is worth remembering that he writes for *Tribune* and that Morgan Phillips once said the Labour Party owed more to Methodism than to Marxism. Well, well.

Now turn with a sigh of relief to science. Robert Gosling's well-written contribution is a fine example of Freudian analysis of a completely suitable subject, explaining the function of pornography in the life of the individual and naturally destroying the foundations of censorship. He reiterates D. H. Lawrence's contention that pornography is closely connected with masturbation, but draws no moral conclusion. He simply points out that it is the refuge of the inadequate rather than the wicked, that "corruption is felt to endanger others and not ourselves", and he ascribes "more influence to the public spectacle of the struggle between pornographer and censor than to the pornography itself."

It is a pity that at the end of this thoroughly sane essay Dr. Gosling unexpectedly confesses to "the contradictory view that I want to be able to see pornographic works myself and at the same time want some censorship to be exerted in the society in which I live"—and he derives this view from "a wish to live in a society that has some stability"! If only he were as sophisticated in politics as he is in psychology. But his strange confession is fortunately confined to his

## BATTLES OVER?

ONE of the perennial attractions of the Town has for many a long year been "the film they said they dare not make", and year after year in spite of constant disappointment, we have queued to be one at the caravanserai for the showing of alleged forbidden masterpieces. Having just digested "Thou shalt not kill", banned by the French government, the "Connection" frowned on by the American government and "Judgment at Nuremberg", hindered, it is said, by highly placed secret neo-Nazi's, we are now offered Luis Buñuel's "Viridiana". John Coleman has rightly written that "Jokes played on tyrants

are irresistibly attractive, combining as they do the rare virtue of humour and bravery, and Luis Buñuel's 'Viridiana', now showing at the Curzon, is likely to have us heavily enlisted on its side even before the credits come up." For one cannot but admit that the publicity boys have done their job well with this film and unrequited queues are being turned away from the packed Curzon Cinema without being able to indulge in the expensive privilege of paddling in "this moral cesspool"—to quote my favourite Tory critic—for every paper carried the story of how Buñuel made his film under the all-embracing nose of the Franco régime; of how Franco is alleged to have "blown his top" at the finished article and how the single copy was smuggled to France to win the Palme d'Or at Cannes last year while the Spanish Ambassador was frantically getting the film banned in Paris.

But who is kidding who? Franco is an old man and like so many old men who have spent their lives in the pursuit, and the practice, of evil he now wishes to create an image of benevolent liberalism. A few months ago London was plastered with the works of the Spanish Abstractionists and these paintings, blessed by priest and politician, we are told, was an example of the new liberalism in action.

Franco himself is said to have invited Buñuel to Spain for the making of this film and the Spanish authorities cannot be as naïve as the publicity boys would like us to believe or were, month after month, in ignorance of what a film company would be shooting. If there were any genuine protests they could only come from the lunatic fringe of the Catholic Church, and while the film continues to reap accolades abroad, the home-town politicians can go through the motions of protest. For what is there to protest about. Salvador Dali, Buñuel's co-director of the "L'Age d'Or", has long made his peace with the Catholic Church and is profitably churning out surrealist Madonnas for his salvation, and this film could be Buñuel's first offering to the Church. If this opinion is at odds with the general press hysteria one must then wait for Buñuel's film, as yet unseen in this country, "Nazarin", in

Shall we live happily without any war.  
And forget the Atom Bombs forevermore?

Shall we live in houses, or in holes in the ground?

Will they be bricks, or just a small mound?

JOHN PILGRIM.

last paragraph, and it is to some extent redeemed by its honesty.

Geoffrey Gorer's contribution, which is also very well written, is a fine example of anthropological (or sociological) analysis of an equally suitable subject, explaining the function of pornography in the life of the community and once more naturally destroying the foundations of censorship. He too mentions the link with masturbation, and he also points out that pornography isn't necessarily obscene—see, for example, the sexological work of Kinsey or Chesser which generates lust in its readers as well as knowledge. Obscenity involves tabu-breaking, while pornography is simply sex-in-the-head, with the object of hallucination (or playing with fantasy models of sexually significant bodies). In modern Western culture this leaves pornography nothing but "the description of the activities of various sets of genitals".

Gorer discusses this form of literary work along with thrillers, ghost stories, war stories, and books on food and wine, hunting and so on, and demolishes the censors' motives, showing in passing how forbidden fruit is sweeter, so that the circulation of dirty books depends partly on the fact that they are regarded as dirty. Then at the end of another thoroughly sane essay he unexpectedly decides that although "total prohibition does not seem the appropriate answer", for rather illogical reasons "it should be made (at the very least) extremely difficult for youngsters to acquire pornography", and that "as a matter of public policy, its circulation should be restricted, its acquisition demand a certain amount of knowing the ropes".

The immediate reply to this very mild sort of censorship (which is roughly the sort we are now moving towards) is surely that if the young don't get straight pornography they will get it crooked. One of the best points in David Loth's book is his reference to Professor Collingwood's attack on the "make-believe sexuality" of modern popular culture, on "pornography homeopathically administered in doses too small to shock the desire for respectability but quite large enough to produce the intended effect". This was Lawrence's attitude, and is now David Holbrook's; and although I think it is much over-emphasised I would certainly press it on anyone who favours any sort of formal censorship.

C. H. Rolph indeed, in his rather dull epilogue, suggests that the "strongest erotic reaction" is probably produced by "semi-pornography"—an idea which Gorer mentions but avoids. But he also accepts the necessity of censorship, although he wants to reject censors at the same time! It is odd how so many people are full of concern for other people's welfare when it means stopping them doing something, and so empty of concern when it means doing something difficult to help other people. So we have censors and policemen, and starvation and homelessness; we won't teach people to read good books, and then we try to stop them reading "bad" ones. I loathe pornography, because it is dishonest and unreal and badly-written, but when I hear self-righteous people saying it should be suppressed, I feel like Dr. Johnson when he heard someone saying beggars shouldn't spend money on gin and tobacco (which I also loathe): "And why should they be denied such sweeteners of their existence?" he thundered. Why indeed?

N.W.

## Culture calls in Mammon

The property interests of Brasenose College are to be looked after by a new company just formed by the college and City Centre Properties, the Cotton-Clore property group.

It is called City Centre Properties (College Developments), Ltd., and the capital is £1,000. There will be no shares on the market.

There are six directors, three from the college and three from City Centre Properties. Members of the college on the board are the Principal, Sir Noel Hall; the bursar, Mr. Norman Leyland; and another Fellow, Mr. Ronald Maudsley, Mr. Cotton, the chairman of City Centre Properties, is one of the group's three directors of the new company.

Sir Noel said yesterday: "We have formed a small company to hold and develop our properties. Like many other colleges we have properties all over the country. This is imply a convenient way of managing and developing them."

"VIRIDIANA". Directed by Luis Buñuel and starring Silvia Pinal as Viridiana, Francisco Rabal as Jorge and Fernando Rey.  
Length: 815 ft. R/time: 90 mins.  
Cert: "X". Reg. No. F.

which he goes a long way along the road to conciliation with the Church by his tender and circumspect treatment of the priesthood. We, as a Protestant nation, are easily shocked by any suggestion of blasphemy committed against the Catholic Church, but is any committed in Buñuel's film? The beggars seated at the table in the much advertised parody of the Last Supper can, if taken out of context, offend, but within the film they are shown as creatures despised and rejected. And as the film draws to its end we are shown them drifting towards the village as a sub-human group of scavengers beyond redemption, for Buñuel no longer protests but stands in judgment, and the scarlet thread that runs through this film is the guilt of betrayal and the punishment it must bring. Even as the beggars are forced to parody the Last Supper; a cock crows in the background and though the soundtrack may open with a chorus of hallelujahs from Handel's "Messiah" and close with a pop song, the camera does penance by showing a child lifting a blazing crown of thorns from off the fire.

Buñuel may cater for a few of his old clientèle by throwing in a few phallic symbols such as the drooping wooden handle of the skipping rope used for a suicide's noose, and Viridiana's coy play with the cow's teats. But apart from a brief shot of some shoe fetishism the old days are over. Luis Buñuel once walked as one with his social scavengers as they goosed the priest and spat upon the altar, but Sade's Chateau de Sellyn that housed the roués of "Un Chien Andalou" has become cold and cheerless and the heart-sickening degradation of "Land without Bread" must seek another spokesman to plead its cause, for well-fed actors in warm if tatty clothes now ape the hungry and the dispossessed.

Luis Buñuel has fought his battles against bigotry and authority and now seeks to rest his head upon the bosom of Mother Church; but as long as men and women are made to meet in private sessions to witness "L'Age d'Or", Luis Buñuel will be remembered.

ARTHUR MOYSE.

May 5 1962 Vol 23 No 14

# Anarchism Broadcast

Anthony Howard  
of the "New Statesman".  
Norman St. John Stevas  
of the "Economist".

BBC Home Service  
Friday April 27 7.30

Colin Ward, editor of "Anarchy",  
Anthony Howard speaks first.

Mr. Ward, the popular conception of the anarchist is, I think, of someone perhaps in a mackintosh and certainly with a beard, who is just about to throw a bomb at some royal wedding procession in Western Europe somewhere. I wonder, so that we can speak the same language, whether you could tell us first of all whether this is correct, or at any rate what your conception of an anarchist is.

C.W.—Well, the old jokes about anarchists as people who throw bombs at heads of governments have worn rather thin when it's obvious that what really threatens us is that the heads of governments are all too ready and willing to drop bombs on people. The word anarchy means contrary to authority, and we have all met the kind of person whom we call a natural anarchist, the person who persists in going his own way regardless of authority, who when he is alive we call a crank and when he is safely dead we call the salt of the earth.

But anarchism is a social philosophy as well as a personal attitude and it postulates social organization through voluntary co-operation rather than through authoritarian coercion.

A.H.—That sounds splendid, but I honestly think, you know, that even the director of the Co-operative Wholesale Society would not very much disagree with that, and it seems to me that this vision which you have put before us is something which we would all, you know, think is perfectly all right; but what are the means—how are you going to achieve this, because surely this is where you part company with people who would be your natural allies—guild socialists or whatever they may be—how are you going to bring this wonderful state into being.

C.W.—Well, at one time people thought a revolution would bring about anarchy, but since we are as far as we could possibly be from a revolutionary situation in this country, obviously we are speaking in terms of education. I am an educator for anarchism.

N. St. J.S.—Well, you say that anarchy is contrary to authority, but surely if you are to get rid of the existing authority you will need some form of organization to achieve this. So isn't there an inherent contradiction in your position?

C.W.—I think not. The classical anarchist thinkers, Kropotkin, Bakunin and Malatesta, thought of territorial organization in the form of the commune, which is simply the European word for a local authority—a local council—they thought in terms of a federation of communes organizing territorially, and of the syndicate—again it is a word of French origin—the syndicate being the unit of organization in industry.

N. St. J.S.—But surely that inevitably would develop into some form of organization very similar to the present State. What would be the difference between the federal ideas you are putting forward and the federal constitution of the United States?

C.W.—Well, the federal constitution of the United States is based on a series of small authorities; the kind of federalism which anarchists think in terms of a free association of *ad hoc* organizations which are freely joined or freely left.

order. You, I suppose, would not agree with that.

C.W.—No. I believe order is the opposite of government.

N. St. J.S.—Well, are you against society as well as the State . . . (or are you in favour of some form of society?)

C.W.—Yes, exactly. The anarchist postulates the society on one side and the State on the other. Society, of course, is infinitely older in human life on this planet than the State.

N. St. J.S.—Well, let's get down to rather more direct details. How in an anarchist society would criminals, for example, be restrained?

C.W.—Well, what are criminals? Criminals are social deviants. Why are they deviants, what social norms have they violated? Usually, of course, it is they have committed offences against the propertied classes—

N. St. J.S.—Well, never mind about the propertied classes. What about our lives. Suppose A. in an anarchist state takes B's life, what do you do then—or an anarchist milieu, I should say.

C.W.—Well, what happens in our society? You cannot restore B's life.

N. St. J.S.—No, but you can stop A. in our society taking C's life.

C.W.—Yes, but as you know, a murderer is a particular kind of criminal. He—

N. St. J.S.—Well this is very important, isn't it? I mean, that we should all be able to go on living our lives is a very important assumption.

C.W.—Yes. Somebody might murder you tomorrow—you have no guarantee against that.

A.H.—I think it is an old anarchist battle cry that the prisons are the universities of crime. Do you still believe this?

C.W.—Yes. Mr. Butler shares my opinion—he said it last year at a public meeting.

(Both questioners jumped up together.  
One—You stand—  
Two—"the whole of the Conservative Party doesn't share his opinion".)

N. St. J.S.—Well, you said about property-owning classes—taking that in a fairly widespread sense—never mind about millionaires. We most of us have some tiny bit of property. How would that be protected in an anarchist situation from attack?

C.W.—Well, probably the anarchist saying that everybody knows is Proudhon's dictum that Property is Theft. As you know, he later modified this (laughter) to Property is Freedom. He was thinking on the one hand of accumulation of property in land and so on, and on the other of a man's home and his clothes and so on. Now, in a society at our stage of technical development we have enough of everything for everybody. Why should one wish to steal another man's house or his clothes?

(To be continued)

## The Broadcast

DEAR FRIENDS,

What a terrible farce! Not that I am freshly disillusioned. It reminded me of the trial of the Six. "And why are you an anarchist, Mr. Ward?" Perhaps a good answer would be because of the existence of such a set-up that can produce such a "serious" programme. Not "do not answer that," but "now what about this?", and this? all at 50 m.p.h.

Anyway, congratulations to Colin on his patience. And on with the "educating".

April 28.

SHEILA BESKINE.

## BREAK THE THOUGHT BARRIER!

IN a thought-provoking article in the *New Left Review* (April 1962) "Damned Fools in Utopia" Nicolas Walter suggests that if the "New Left" put forward anarchist ideas "dressed up as new departures in socialism and/or pacifism" this is not a "compliment to the anarchists. On the contrary, it shows up their failure to break through the thought-barrier surrounding them". Without for one moment wishing to discount the validity of our comrade's criticism, we would, nevertheless point out to him that the basis of anarchist propaganda is to provoke people into thinking for themselves for we believe that when they do they will tend to arrive at libertarian rather than authoritarian conclusions. The closed mind is authoritarian, the open mind libertarian.

We are not interested in political labels. If the "New Left" or the Committee of 100 arrive at anarchistic conclusions in ignorance of Kropotkin, Godwin, Bakunin or Malatesta so much the better. What one discovers for oneself is always more important than what one reads in books or newspapers. If the "New Left" or the pacifists "discover" the anarchist thinkers and call them by another name what does it matter? We as propagandists are not "selling" Kropotkin, Godwin, Thoreau or Malatesta; we want people to think for themselves. We pin our hopes for a free world, a happier, a more responsible, a peaceful world on succeeding in getting enough people to think for themselves.

For this reason we believe that anarchist propaganda should incite thought and not brainwash. We know that a number of readers are disturbed by some of the articles published in *FREEDOM* and that others deplore the lack of a clear-cut anarchist "programme". Our critics also point to the failure of anarchism because we have no organisation in the sense that a political party has an organisation. We are believers in organisation when it adds to the efficacy of joint action, and opposed to it when it hinders individual initiative and isolates people from their fellows. We want to reach out to all sections of the community, and we therefore consider that our propaganda is along the right lines when it is read by a representative cross-section of the community. One of our correspondents this week attacks us for publishing "this 'high-brow' stuff, Around the Galleries, etc." main-

taining that "working class people don't want it". This correspondent will be interested to learn that *FREEDOM*'s art critic is himself a working man who visits the galleries in his leisure hours as well as doing many other things. Should he be a "real worker" and spend his Saturday afternoons jammed tight at a football match?

★

HAVING said this in our defence, as it were, we must agree with Nicolas Walter's criticism that we have "failed to break through the thought barrier" surrounding us in the sense that the vast majority of people in the English speaking world ignore the anarchist ideas, or even the existence of an anarchist press. Lacking the resources of the mass-communicators or the possibility of using these mediums for our ideas, our "impact"—to use a fashionable word!—is in direct ratio to the number of propagandists in the movement. Obviously to progress we must also work outside our own circle of friends and workmates. We must seek to establish new contacts and devote considerable time and intelligence to arousing interest in our ideas. This, we at *FREEDOM PRESS* can do only in a very limited way; we can make all kinds of suggestions and assist in a number of ways but unless there are those prepared to carry out the work we shall go on marking time. The Aldermaston march, for instance, was a golden opportunity to put over anarchist ideas. To the extent that we sold nearly 1,000 *FREEDOMS* and about 400 copies of *ANARCHY* during those four days, we can claim a minor "break-through"! But for instance last Saturday in Trafalgar Square there was a mass rally of nurses from all parts of the country, but not a single comrade with the recent issue of *FREEDOM* with the front page article on "Nursing Grievances". There are hundreds of opportunities each week to "break through", to reach a few or many of our fellow beings on common ground, of speaking to them about the problems they understand, from the anarchist point of view.

Until we do this seriously and systematically our ideas will remain the cherished hopes of a very few, and all attempts to explain why they progress so slowly mere rationalisations to explain away our lack of activity. Ideas, like plants will not grow if you do not prepare the ground and sow the seed.

Continued from page 1  
export or perish". "Perish" must be taken with a grain of capitalist salt, but, as the Economic Editor of the *Observer* was pointing out last Sunday "the trouble is that nearly every other major country in the world is also convinced that it must strengthen, or at least maintain, its own overseas balance." He confesses that "up to now" his stock reply to the question; "How can every country in the world increase its exports more than its imports" has been that "we must improve our export-import balance at the expense of other countries with stronger trading positions and larger reserves". But the trouble is that those countries are arguing along the same lines!

America is trying to stem the "outflow" of gold. If they succeed "it will make other countries even more export-conscious than they are already". It won't be the underdeveloped countries who will do the importing; they can't afford it. The Japanese "are just recovering from a payment crisis of their own". Of the countries of Western Europe: the Swiss franc "is under pressure", in Germany "the export surplus has already dwindled away"; the French are "worried about the possible repercussion on their trade balance of a recent sharp twist in their wage price spiral"; and "Italy, which for all the strength of the lire, can hardly absorb the export drives of the whole of the world". And to complete this Alice in Wonderland world picture we are told that "Figures just

## Market Jugglers

published by the Board of Trade show that *world imports exceeded world exports by nearly £700 million last year*". (The *Observer's* italics, not ours!).

The *Observer's* Economic Editor goes on to tell us that "far more important are a great many correctly recorded movements of money, which are treated as worrying debit items by the countries at the losing end", etc., etc. . . but we assume that our readers are as uninterested in the fortunes of these pieces of paper as we are, except to reflect that it it they that receive the attention of

governments, they that are the tokens of power, and not the humble millions of human beings who actually produce the wealth, the basic necessities of life and the services we need.

★

WE repeat, we are for unity, not just of Western Europe but of the whole of mankind because we believe that only by the pooling of skills and initiative will mankind natural resources, the sharing of find a way of living together in peace.

We agree with Leonid F. Ilyichev, described by the *New York Times* as a "leading Soviet ideologist" when he described the Common Market as a vain project for "the

salvation of capitalism" and as "a new form of redividing the world market and as a new aggressive anti-peoples union directed against the vital interests of the working people of the capitalist countries, against the Socialist camp and against national liberation movements."

We do not share Mr. Ilyichev's uncritical appraisal of the Marxist hell (the "socialist camp") and the ex-Colonial dictatorships ("nationalist liberation movements"), but we cannot disagree with his analysis of the motives of the spokesmen of the Common Market. But it will be a "vain" project *only if the workers of the world succeed in matching the unity of the bosses by an effective unity of the exploited*. It is not a question of "utopia"; it is a matter of survival.

But some are more equal than others

WITHIN the last year I have come into contact with a group of anarchists and have given their philosophy considerable thought. Their integrity is undoubted and their ideals of the highest, but their fundamental mistake is an inability to see their fellow men as they are, and a failure to comprehend that most people confuse freedom with licence. They argue that such people can be "conditioned". This I find quite unacceptable. One may condition people to certain ways of behaviour, but a sense of true freedom requires a magnitude of spirit which is inborn. Pavlov's dogs may have responded in a more or less uniform way to their conditioning, but men are very different animals. Adversity strengthens some and weakens others; likewise does affluence. Most people are conditioned to some extent by their upbringing, environment and occupation, but they can only be conditioned to behaviour within their capacity, and there is an immense gulf between the capacity of a Schweitzer and that of a racing tipster. It used to be called the soul. Now it is genes. Whatever it is, the capacity for thought and intellectual honesty is given to only a few. The majority are natural slaves

The Affluent Society

Chicago, April 24

A "frustration room," where guests can throw lamps and ash trays against a brick wall, is one of the features of a motel being built in Chicago. "Throwing a lamp base is safer than drinking martinis," said Mr. Harry Linsky, the designer.—British United Press.

The U.S. Tests

Sir,—It is to be hoped that we shall be kept as fully informed on the rising levels of radio-activity this summer from the American tests as we were about the Russian ones. But I doubt it.—Yours, etc.,

Donald A. E. Cross. Moonrakers, Ducklington Lane, Witney, Oxon.

(Guardian).

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

—to their acquisitiveness, their lusts and whatever God's upbringing or choice has given them. These people must be governed because they are incapable of moral responsibility. Positive morality is unattainable without intellect.

Governments themselves are of course defective, because they are chosen by this inferior majority. But a defective government is better than no government, for a government organises the complicated machinery which is essential to any modern society. The government may not be of the highest integrity, because it could never have come into being without promising impossible benefits to acquisitive voters, but the members of the government usually have sufficient wits to avoid complete chaos, and the comparative well-being of the masses is essential to the wealthy.

The necessity for government is not so much moral as expedient. Populations are now so immense, and communications and essential services so complicated, that, without a central organisation, society would collapse into conditions of savagery and starvation, or be taken over by another state efficiently organised.

The anarchist society would have to be a very small one, and composed of kindred spirits. Even then it would probably not last long, for philosophers do not inevitably breed their like, and the latest genes of acquisitive ancestors would in time rear their ugly heads and upset the utopian apple cart.
London, April 28. A.C.

LETTERS

Neither justification nor condemnation

THE EDITORS,

I cannot see any connection between my article on the Israeli collectives and your correspondent's comments in "Utopia Arraigned" (FREEDOM, April 14). If the object was to express the platform of the Third Force I personally can see not objection, and feel in sympathy with some of his comments. But because Israeli politics are as partisan as any other country in the world, it reflects little upon the structure of a social organism like the Kibbutz. It would be just as ludicrous to blame a successful community here in England for the follies of a Conservative government. As a matter of interest, the Kibbutzim for the most part favour a much more conciliatory attitude to the Arabs, so much so that pressure from these elements forced a recent change in government policy concerning military government in Arab areas.

As far as these collectives using Arab's abandoned land is concerned, this is quite true but why let land go fallow when there is a great need for food production to feed both Arab and Jew? As there is no hope of these lands being

returned to their Arab owners at the present moment it is only reasonable to make use of this land in some productive manner. It would be just as silly to accuse those Arabs living in houses abandoned by the quarter of a million Iraqi Jews, who were allowed to leave Iraq with only what they could carry in both hands. Their homes and possessions are now in Arab hands, and no doubt being made use of.

The rest of your correspondent's accusations could be easily countered were this writer interested in rehashing Zionist policy or straightening out some of the lopsided facts presented by your correspondent, but politics of whatever label are still just politics, and ethics have little influence on politics generally.

The object of my article was to paint a slight picture of a different way of life, neither to justify Zionist aspirations or condemn them for that matter. It aimed at nothing else.
London, April 26. S.F.

Anarchist Middle-Class Snobbery

DEAR SIRS,

A few weeks ago I wrote saying that, intellectually and morally, Anarchism had very little that one could find fault with and that nationally there wasn't much hope for it, to which you gave some quite fair editorial comments, but, nevertheless, I still feel that as a movement it is infinitely too narrow, i.e. it hasn't got that mass infectiousness about

How Cataclysmic can you get?

Continued from page 1
this tribute she stayed on. "Don't jump" shouted a section of marchers. A group of young men watching turned and saw the blonde, "Jump" they chorused.

"Barring an extraordinary course for the war, or that most of the technical uncertainties turn out to lie at the disastrous end of the spectrum, one and maybe both of the antagonists should be able to restore a reasonable semblance of pre-war conditions quite rapidly. Typical estimates run between one and ten years for a reasonably successful and well-prepared attacker and somewhat longer for the defender.

Upon the pavement at Southall stood a crowd of Hindus who had just come out of a cinema. They may have been watching a film or attending a religious service but whatever it was they were gathered together with their compatriots in this strange land where they had come to earn a living. They looked at the march with wonder but without hostility.

"The only point to be made now is that those waging a modern war are going to be as much concerned with bone cancer, leukaemia, and genetic malformations as they are with the range of a B-52 or the accuracy of an Atlas missile.

London reaches out its tentacles into the rural areas. Motor roads are driven through old village greens, slicing off corners of copses. The once rural stream besides which we pass is coloured with effluents and choked with refuse. Through the back lanes we pass the commuters' prides of well-kept houses interspersed with Baptist chapels left behind by the march of affluence and materialism. We break through on to the Common with its "Bomb the Ban" notices and harangues by hoarse Young Conservatives whose worst fears seem to be realised by this invasion of their suboptimal snuggerly by a rabble with red banners.

If 180 million dead is too high a price to pay for punishing the Soviets for their aggression, what price would we be willing to pay? This is a hard and unpleasant question. I have discussed this question with many Americans, and after about fifteen minutes of discussion their estimates of an acceptable price generally fall between 10 and 60 million, clustering toward the upper number.

The off-beat magazine Private Eye has a cartoon of a citizen parading with a poster 'Slough wants to Live'. I have my doubts, the smug information that Slough is a safety town smacks too much of the wishful-think and its shop window poster jumbles of Bingo-Wrestling and the Twist are symptomatic of this boom-town which bears no mention on the milestones which marked our progress from Reading. Was it progress or safety that made a company on the Trading Estate manufacturers of 'Ethical Plastics'?

The estimated amount of human tragedy and accompanying misery is un-

comfortably high. It is believed that if everyone in the world were subjected to a 10r dose, approximately one million children, who would not otherwise be defective, would be born defective in the next generation if this dose should be repeated generation after generation (the world population remaining stable) a new and higher level of defective genes would be established. When this new level of stability is achieved, every generation might see the birth of about ten million seriously defective children as a result of this NAS limit exposure. These are very large numbers, even for a generation.

The March seems to be taking the place of Mayday as a political event. The failure to book Trafalgar Square was not as catastrophe as thought since the picnic scene in Hyde Park was more delightful than the huddling to be harangued by well-meant clichés. The London Anarchist Group banner, as was a syndicalist banner, was on the March for the first time and it was estimated at one point (Knightsbridge) that one-hundred-and-fifty (whether by design or accident we know not) were behind them.

Washington, April 25. The United States began its new series of atmos-

pheric nuclear tests in the Pacific today with an explosion over Christmas Island. The device was dropped from an aircraft at 4.45 p.m. BST, and the test was said to have been a success. The Atomic Energy Commission said that the detonation was of intermediate yield. A spokesman explained that intermediate yield range meant that the explosion was equal in power to less than a million tons of TNT but greater than 20,000 has usually signified an explosion equal to 100,000 tons of TNT or more.

Today's US explosion keeps the Western world in a numerical test lead over Russia, although the Russian tests have a greater accumulative power.

How cataclysmic can you get?

J.R.

ANARCHIST POSTSCRIPT

THE END of the Aldermaston March is invariably a carefully organised anti-climax, but whereas in previous years it has been a mass anti-climax in Trafalgar Square, with uninspiring speeches delivered against a background of the shuffling of thousands of tired feet, this year the end of the demonstration was organised to be nothing more than the petering out of the march in a side street on the Embankment. Here the marchers were instructed to fold their banners and hurriedly disperse to get out of the way of the thousands following. It felt rather like being part of the bathwater disappearing down the plughole.

Now although anarchists are renowned for throwing the baby out with the bathwater, when the marchers behind the London Anarchist Group banner arrived at this particular plughole they all refused to be sucked in.

Instead they brushed aside the policeman trying to order them to disperse and set out on a little extra march of their own along the Embankment, up Northumberland Avenue, round the corner of forbidden Trafalgar Square and back down the top end of Whitehall. By this time the police, who had been taken by surprise by this break-away from the respectable, law-abiding, over-marched majority, had gathered in strength and headed us off into—of all places!—Great Scotland Yard.

Fortunately, on one corner of the Yard stands a pub. And this was a more suitable stopping place than the previously arranged plughole, so in we all went and that was that.

It doesn't sound much in cold print, but it made the day for the anarchists, surprised in the first place by the unexpected numbers falling in behind the LAG banner and delighted by the vigour and enthusiasm at the end for the break out from the constrictions of the CND organisation, and for the roar that went up in the streets of London not merely against the bomb and the politicians of all sides, but for anarchism!

DEFICIT FUND

Table with 4 columns: Description, Amount (£), Amount (£), Amount (£). Includes rows for FINANCIAL STATEMENT AT APRIL 28th 1962, EXPENSES: 17 weeks at £70, INCOME: Sales & Sub. Renewals, DEFICIT £205.

Table with 4 columns: Location, Name, Amount (£), Amount (£). Includes rows for DEFICIT FUND contributions from Glasgow, London, Portland, etc., and a TOTAL of £547 11 6.

\*Denotes regular contributors.

it that say communism is always showing us that it potentially has (a deplorable thought). Our Capitalist adversaries show finer strategy indeed, just look at the Common Market for instance.

The biggest fault with the movement and I say this after having shown my allegiance to its "militants" on the CND Easter march is that it appears to be "riddled" (perhaps only liberally dressed?) with "middle class" snobbery, much friendlier response was shown to the Communist Party well-wishers, giving them a feeling of identity (perhaps I'm a silly sentimentalist?) but further evidence of this can be seen in FREEDOM; "working class" people don't want this "highbrow" stuff, Around the Galleries, etc. No, an infectious spirit for the movement will only come when this exclusivist intellectualism has been replaced by some "Common" working-class guts.

Yours sincerely, Altrincham, April 26. JOHN BOYLE.

Cambridge Meeting

The Cambridge Anarchist Group will hold a meeting on Wed May 9 at 8.30 pm Speaker: Philip Sansom on Anarchism and Direct Action For details of meeting place, etc., contact Krishan Kumar St. John's College, Cambridge.

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP CENTRAL MEETINGS

meetings to be held at The Two Brewers, 40 Monmouth Street, WC2 (Leicester Square Tube) Sundays at 7.30 p.m. MAY 6. Mary Stevenson on Louise Michel MAY 13. S.F. on Anarchy, Sex and Freedom

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. 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 MAY 11 at 8.30 John Kendall on Pee Wee Russell

ANARCHY Nos 1-14 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

Table with 2 columns: Period, Rate. Includes rows for 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

Table with 2 columns: Period, Rate. Includes rows for 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)

Table with 2 columns: Period, Rate. Includes row for 12 months 52/- (U.S. & Canada \$8.00).

Postal Subscription Rates to FREEDOM only

Table with 2 columns: Period, Rate. Includes rows for 1 year (40 issues) 20/- (U.S. & Canada \$3), 6 months (20 issues) 10/- (\$1.50), 3 months (10 issues) 5/- (\$.75).

Air Mail Subscription Rates to FREEDOM only

Table with 2 columns: Period, Rate. Includes row for 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.