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THE OZ CASE ...

AGAINST all the evidence, the OZ three—Richard Neville, Felix Dennis and Jim Anderson—have been found guilty on three charges of publishing an obscene article for gain and one charge of sending an indecent or obscene article through the post. The fact that they now face the major conspiracy charge is a miracle and a triumph (see the article on the significance of this verdict on page three).

AGAINST all the traditions and theories of British judicial procedure, Judge Argyle gave what must count as one of the most blatantly prejudiced summings up in recent times. The jury, faced with Argyle's snarling and dismissive treatment of the defence case, had no alternative but to find the three guilty on the lesser charges.

AGAINST the obvious integrity and intelligence of the three defendants, the judge reminded them in custody indefinite­ly for medical and psychiatric reports. Richard Neville called this 'bureaucratic nonsense'; he was right.

AGAINST normal procedure, the three were sent to Wandsworth Prison, one of the harshest in Britain, where they have been subjected to the humiliation of having their hair shorn — before sentence is even known.

AGAINST all common sense, the government has allowed these unequivocal acts of political repression to happen and — to use legal jargon — to be seen to happen.

WHAT DOES ALL THIS MEAN?

IT MEANS that this country, living out its economic and military ardor to the USA, has not learned anything from America's social experience of the 60s. Instead of trying to avoid an appalling polarization of generations and lifestyles it has chosen to encourage this situation here.

IT MEANS the final erosion of any common ground that there might have been between the two sides. Richard, Felix and Jim tried to fight their battle in the heart of the establishment's territory and in their very own language. Day after day of real experience, honesty — yes, and humour too. They tried to explain what OZ, and the culture that produced it, was about. No one listened.

IT MEANS that this trial, consecrated to the Victorian concept of 'protecting the innocence of children', has done more to radicalize and alienate (sexually and politically) the children of this country than a million OZs and Little Red School Books.

IT MEANS that this trial has also radicalized and alienated many adults, who, like their children, will never be able to feel the same again about the possibilities for social justice in Britain.

IT MEANS that the government will not realize that its blunt weapons work so well that they make ten new enemies for every one clubbed down. There will be more and more OZ trials. There will be more and more violence.

IT MEANS that three people known to everybody who has worked and played with them as honest, kind and generous have been treated cruelly and with contempt by people to whom 'honesty', 'kindness' and 'generosity' can be little more than words in the Oxford dictionary... like, for example, 'obscenity' and 'depravity' and 'corruption'.

IT MEANS that the wrong people have been jailed.
The verdict of the OZ jury was a battle for control of the Thought Police of Scotland Yard. The unanimous acquittal of all defendants on the drastic charge of 'Conspiracy to Corrupt Public Morals' was a very significant victory in the tumult and shouting about the controls and police-state that they had immediately added a conspiracy charge to the OZ indictment. This had three major consequences. First it turned the morals trial into a vendetta against the controllers and again the prosecution promised. Then, to the abstention of the defendants and their witnesses, all those insidious and dangerous doctrines rather than the schoolbook ideas.

The final and most significant consequence of the addition of the conspiracy charge was the unanswerable promise way it was answered. The papers which were both called by Richard Neville, they were Ronald Dworkin, Oxford Professor of Moral Philosophy and Richard Wollheim, Grote Professor of Mind at City University, London.

Not only did they swear that there ad no conspiracy moral purposes - they argued that its publication was a part of the contemporary moral climate of the country, that any judge of the jury, they went further than any witness in the trial to disprove that the prosecution itself argued that the press had no moral, that its publicity it was claiming to be the press.

In his final speech, Richard Neville stressed that the OZ was an action and the papers were doing as so opposed against our standards of fairness.

The other objection is that the very offence of "publishing public morality" rests on the assumption that there are all one-embracing moral code to which all aliens to the community subscribe, and that we have no business to publish, that a single publication may bring us into jeopardy. We live in a society, as Wollheim put it, where we regard it as moral to tolerate the press, which has a great advantage over totalitarian countries, which ram one political ideology down everyone's throats. It is the prosecution which corrupts public morality by seeking to rob us of our freedom of thought.

It is very rare - and very dangerous - for a defendant to argue that lie should not be convicted because public morality is immoral. By their refusal to con­ sent, after a summoning up by Judge Ingrams, to their introduction to them, the jury have struck the ulimate blow with the most expensive single law in the land.

No amount of a ndice of separation remnants, savage fines or penal sentences, can detract from the very real victory won by the OZ defence at the Old Bailey last week.

The essential victory was a strong case for arguing that the leader was thoroughly and grossly contemptuous of court. But even that is not a new issue. The fact is that the Telegraph sees OZ and the net of the alternative society as a major threat to its own well-being, and is using the full weight of its bigotry to try to crush us. The Daily Express was as predictable as it is always predictable. Its contribution was a centre-page story on the day of the verdict titled 'Wailing wall of weirdies!', a headline which is understood to have pleased its management no end. No surprise there.

For far more interesting, and relevant were the respective attitudes of the Guardian and the Times. Both papers are staffed by reporters who like to believe that they are not only liberals but committed liberals. During the trial they gave a fair amount of space to both sides of the case, and after the verdict the Guardians, in particular, seemed to be a bit out of sorts. Nicholas de Jongh got away with several comments in his report of the verdict, but then, suddenly, the Guardian seemed to lose interest. Despite considerable pressure from some staff members, it steadfastly refused to run an editorial.

The Times was even more reluctant. It reported the verdict, and then claimed up. There was no editorial, hardly a word about any of the post-trial developments. The world listened, but all the Times could manage was a deafening silence. Rumour has it that it might find its voice again after sentence.

There was plenty of time for them to get their 'expert' together, and to do some solid thinking about what the whole thing really meant. So a lot of people looked forward to last Sunday.

A lot of people, as it happened, were very disappointed.

The Sunday Times virtually pretended that the case hadn't happened, and the Observer buried its one and only analysis of OZ somewhere between the Paris fashions and the Entertainment guide. Not that it was worth reading anyway.

The Sunday Telegraph, not unexpectedly, carried its daily sister's banner still further onward with an article by some idiot called Derek Roberts-Morgan, who had this to say of Argyle: 'Every unbiased person who has heard him at work during this trial must acknowledge that he has bent over backwards to ensure that every possible point of any relevance to the defence has been put fairly and fully to the jury ... The OZ trio can be sure of one thing. Their fate will be decided in the best traditions of British justice.' Derek Roberts-Morgan must have quite a sense of humour.

The other, only the Mirror emerged with any sort of editorial stand. On Monday of this week, it berated the decision to cut the defendants' hair, at the same time being incredibly careful not to support anything else about them. The Mirror, weighed in during the trial with a double-page spread about 'The Underground', which was most of its readers no doubt took to be a report on the new line to Pinlimo. They would beleeve for not being any the wiser had they read the article.

Rumour has it that there is also a paper called the Daily Mail, but as no one has ever been reading it, its attitudes aren't particularly important.

As a final point, perhaps it isn't insignificant that only one daily paper saw the verdict in its true light - a defeat for the establishment's plan to destroy the underground. The paper headlined the not guilty verdict on the conspiracy charge. The paper was the Morning Star.
Detective Inspector Frederick Luff is a man with a mission. He has taken upon himself to lead the armies of Convention and Vested Interest in a crusade against the alternative society. He not only believes that there is an "Underground", he believes that it consists of a tightly knit group of politically motivated freaks. He is convinced that Release, BRI, TT, Frends, Agitprop, OZ and probably INK as well, are all part of a well-organized conspiracy to overthrow the established order. (If only they were.)

He believes that they have no right to 'attack society'. And it worries him that none of these long-haired perverts seem to do a decent day's work.

At the beginning of the OZ trial he told Richard Neville that the difference between their attitudes was that he, Luff, believed in God and he was doing what he did 'for the sake of his children'.

It was Luff who initiated the prosecution of IT. And the Running Man Press for the publication of Paul Allen's The Mouth and Oral Sex. And Frank Critchlow of the Mangrove Restaurant. And OZ of course. It was Luff who raided Richard Neville's flat with an obscenity warrant, shortly after the OZ raids, then brought charges for possession of cannabis.

It was Luff who devoted himself body and soul to the prosecution of OZ 23, providing crown counsel Leavy with as much dirt as he could muster on all the defendants and defence witnesses. He shot out of the courtroom each time a new witness was presented, to scour the bookshops and Scotland Yard files for everything written by or about them that might be used to incriminate them.

Luff is a man of quality old-fashioned habits. When his children cross the paternal will, they are given a formal caning.

His zeal has led him to exceed his duty on occasions. Frank Critchlow's friends remember him from 1969, when Critchlow was in court on a robbery charge, brought by the (then) Inspector Luff of Notting Hill Police Station. Luff's key witness, 'Boo-Boo' Roberts told the court that he had come to the trial against his will. He had already told the police that the man who robbed him was not Frank Critchlow but another man, whom he had identified. On his second visit to Notting Hill Police Station, said Roberts, Inspector Luff had plied him with whisky and cigars so that he eventually got drunk and signed a statement. Luff had told him that he wanted to 'get' Critchlow and needed his cooperation. The case was dismissed.

Several complaints have been lodged with Scotland Yard concerning Luff's drunkenness on duty. He was removed from the Obscene Publications Squad shortly after the OZ raids.

Luff's overreaching enthusiasm seems to have alarmed his superiors.

He told several people that he would have to leave the country if he didn't 'win' the OZ trial, because defeat would cause an intolerable loss of face.

Well he didn't "win" the conspiracy charge... but it seems almost too much to hope for when he got jail sentences ranging from 18 months to two and a half years...
Increased opposition to the military research carried out by British universities is planned for the next academic year. The stepped-up opposition will be led by members of the British Society for Social Responsibility in Science, who have teamed up to begin a campaign in opposition to Campus war games at Cambridge and other universities. The USAF grant of £20,000 received by the Cavendish Laboratory has been used to finance a project by Dr J. E. Field, a Fellow of Magdalene College and a lecturer in natural sciences. His work is described officially as an investigation into 'fast reactions in solids' involving a study of the properties of oxides, which is a euphemistic way of saying that Dr Field is working on explosive detonators.

The Cambridge branch of the SSRS was unable to force the cancellation of the USAF contract, but it has succeeded in bringing to the inclusion of a Science and Society course in the official physics syllabus. One of the SSRS members involved in the campaign was Peter Chapman, now lecturing in physics at the University. He said this week that he believes it is socially irresponsible to duck political questions associated with military research.

After all, he said, the USAF, and for that matter the Ministry of Defence, are not philanthropic bodies. If they finance research it is because there is going to be something military that will result ... which will be useful militarily. Research contracts such as the Cambridge project cannot be justified on academic grounds alone; accepting them is a political judgement.

Some SSRS members fear the development of an American-style military-academic complex in this country. Chemical and biological warfare research fields universities have been deeply involved in. Some SSRS members have been searching for the CBW centre at Porton Down in Wiltshire. And of the 22 members of the Porton Advisory Committee on Chemical Warfare, 17 are university professors, such as Harry Rydon of Exeter, D. M. Everest of Bristol, and Andrew Wilson of Liverpool.

The university based members of the Porton Committee provide a link between the Ministry of Defence and some of the best research facilities in Britain. Thus, Professor Rydon has accepted a grant from the Chemical Defence Experimental Establishment to study nits, one of the most toxic products of mould substances. Professor Everett is known to have and he has conducted research into the rates of absorption of gases by porous carbon materials, and Professor Wilson has completed work on at least one unspecified chemical warfare contract in the past two years.

Their colleagues have also benefited. Two other gas warfare contract went to Bristol, and during the past year Liverpool has had at least four defence contracts, one of which official of the 'university described to me as a research on the design of defensive ended cylinders', which I took to be a reference to torpedoes.

In the United States things have developed better. The University of Pennsylvania openly admitting conducting research for the Pentagon on gas and germ warfare offensive techniques and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology helping design the US Navy's new multi-warhead Polaris missile. In 1969 MIT, Stanford and other universities have been deeply involved in non-commercial defence contracts worth a total of $124 million in grants to just two military establishments: both students and staff has led to a decline in military contracts following sit-ins at MTD, Stanford and other universities.

In Britain there has been comparatively little student action on the defence research issue. Demonstrations are only known to have taken place at Exeter and York and at Liverpool last year when Professor Wilson's work was a contributory factor in causing a two-week occupation of university buildings. BSSRS General Secretary Dickson wants to make both students and scientists more conscious of the implications of their research.

'What we aim to do,' he says, 'is to gather together the available information about what's going on and then publicise it inside the academic community. We shall pressure people we believe are doing unnecessary research and think we shall find that some departments are financially over-dependent on military grants. We know of one department whose research was one-of-a-kind military financial support. University departments will accept Ministry of Defence work almost without thinking about it, but we heard of a university doing research on a moon-lighting contractor for freedom fighters? Acceptance of military work by a university is a political decision, and both students and faculty should have a say in it.'

Anthony Hetherington
Malcolm Addison used to work for 
Tracing Services, an agency notorious for its methods of tracking down debtors. He told us how he could find out almost anything about anyone, simply by telephoning government departments and using the appropriate disguises and jargon.

To prove it, he went to Leicester Square and took down the number of the first Rolls Royce he saw. He then telephoned the appropriate vehicle registrator, told them he was 'Sergeant Royce from West End Central' and within minutes had discovered the full name and address of the owner, the date he bought the car, the engine and chassis number, the name and address of the owner, his wife's name, her bank balance and so on—all without raising the man’s curiosity.

The methods he used were illegal. But they are being used every day with a high rate of success by employees of Tracing Services and similar agencies. Addison joined Tracing Services in January 1968 but he was so disgusted by their methods that he left after only ten days. When he approached the Sun, hoping to expose the racket, he was put in touch with George Edmiston, the Inland Revenue Investigation Department. He gave Edmiston the name of the director of Tracing Services and told him that the sales manager, Mr de Souza, had for months been working as an Inland Revenue District Inspector.

At Edmiston's request, he returned to Tracing Services to act as a spy for the Inland Revenue. His evidence contributed to the successful prosecution of the directors, Jeffrey Benson and Michael John Isaacs, who were tried at the Old Bailey and fined £5000 each, with costs.

He describes the most common method of tracing debtors—through local tax offices:

'Say you create an HP debtor. When he first entered into the agreement, he would have filled in a guarantee form stating the name and address of his employer. You phone the appropriate department and you're given the firm's name and address. Then you phone another tax office and quote the firm's reference number. You ask: "Is this taxpayer still alive?" and give his name, "Robin­son, R.H." You have to say the right words—"Live" means that the taxpayer is still on the files of that office.

'If the debtor has started work elsewhere, the tax official will be able to give you the reference number of his new firm. You phone the tax office which deals with that firm, assume the details of this office you last spoke to, quote the reference number and ask: "Who is this reference number for?"

'They will tell you the name of the debtor's new employer. Then you can phone the wages department, pose as an official from the local tax office, give them the debtor's name and ask: "What is his P.A.?"  And the wages department will oblige with the debtor's personal address.'

Addison explains: 'Anyone in tax can talk to anyone in wages. They'll tell you anything you want to know and get rid of you as soon as possible.' From the same source, the tracer can discover the debtor's income and his position in the firm.

There are simpler methods, often equally effective:

'Phone the consumer accounts office of the Gas Board nearest the debtor's last address. Pose as an official from the corresponding Electricity Board, read out the address and say: "We had a consumer at this address who left without paying, n.e.s. Does he still consume with you at another address? Try to establish a bit of rapport. If they have a card on your debtor they will know his address, the kind of tenancy he holds, how high he pays his bills and how much he is in arrears. If he pays by cheque they will have the address of his bank. They are usually quite happy to rattle off the whole card.'

'Banks, says Addison, are more difficult to deal with and should be used only as a last resort. For some reason few bank clerks find their way into the tracing business, so less is known about banking jargon. There are two standard methods of approach:

'If the man you're tracing is just an average Joe, you ring up and say: "I've lost your car. Have you seen it around?" You give him a card on your debtor and say: "Tell me when you see him." And then he will phone you if he sees the debtor. So you have his address and after that you ask: "What else is his name?" and give some reason why you need it. They almost invariably tell you.'

'The tracer, he says, does not always need to know the debtor's bank balance, but it is normal practice to collect as much information as possible. It all gets filed for future reference.'

'The second method of approach is for the more important, wealthy customers of the bank.

'Ask to speak to the chief cashier or the senior assistant. They will always call him "Sir." The better usually goes like this: "I'd like to speak to you confidentially, Sir. My name is Detective Inspector Brown, South­ern Command. Just a few questions I'd like to ask you, but before I do I'd like to fix an appointment for two of my officers to come and see you..." The appointment is duly made. "Is this necessary?" he asks. "It concerns one of your customers..."'

By this time he's interested—He's human after all. And the more important the customer, the more information he's likely to give.'

'Ask him to confirm the customer's address. Then ask what his account is and whether any large sums have been placed in it recently. This may put them thinking of spying.'

'When you hang up confirm the time of the appointment and add: "Of course you can assure me of your discretion in this matter, Sir...Good day, Sir..." You must sound authoritative and allay all his suspicions. You must know exactly what you are going to say and never falter. If you can do this the method is almost foolproof.'

Addison is also well versed in the Trading Services method of tracing servicemen. A former colleague of his, Leslie Vaughan (now head of the Southampton Branch of Tracing Services), once worked for the Ministry of Defence and possessed a copy of the Ministry's Year Book. This contained a full list of civil servants and details of their departments and salaries— including the senior Medical Officers of all army, navy and airforce bases. With this information the tracer could establish the whereabouts of almost any serviceman. Addison describes a typical telephone conversation:

'Tracer: (dialed Royal Naval Barracks Chatham.)

'Reply: Royal Naval Barracks, Chatham.

'Tracer: Sick Bay please.

'Reply: Good, morning. Surgeon-Commander Black, RNB Portsmouth here.

'Reply: Yes Sir.

'Tracer: Able Seaman Smith J. P/923440, suspected TBC (Tuberculosis Contact). Is he still with you?

'Reply: Hold on a minute, Sir, I'll check...No Sir he left us on 16th January 1966. He went to Vernon for a refresher course in Shallow Water Diving. There he went to Alton. She sailed from Ports­mouth on the 1st of February, 1967 and is due to arrive at Malta on February 20th...'

'Tracer: Thank you very much. Reply: Shall we inform the MO, Sir?...No, Sir. Tracer: No, I think not at this stage. I don't want to alarm over nothing...'

'Reply: Very good, Sir. Tracer: Thank you, goodbye.'

'This tracing method, Addison suggests, would be a useful asset to a foreign intelligence department wanting to know the position of the British armed forces.'

'A full list of a tracer’s regular sources include Social Security offices, the records offices of Her Majesty’s prisons, local electoral registers, the Inland Revenue, rent offices, rate registers, local authority water departments, GPO telephone accounts offices and hospitals. For each one is an appropriate disguise and a regular pattern.

'At regular intervals, the government issues warnings to its employees to beware of people looking for information. But the foreign intelligence officials stopped giving information over the normal channels. Instead, they bought a copy of the Ministry's year book. In the case of the Ministry of Defence, the information was kept strictly confidential. But at least it was getting through.'

'The method is almost foolproof. It is not deterred by the real professionals. There are two reasons why:

'Firstly, government officials stopped giving information over the normal channels. Instead, they bought a copy of the Ministry's year book. In the case of the Ministry of Defence, the information was kept strictly confidential. But at least it was getting through.'
Two great court battles to extend freedom of speech where fought in Britain towards the end of the 19th century. Both trials involved publications. One was a pamphlet advocating birth control, the other was The Freethinker, an atheist's weekly.

David Burdett investigates the same old motives and the same old methods.

The later half of the 18th century had been full of publications professing and advocating atheism and free thought, but as these only involved a small and articulate section of the aristocracy they were tolerated by the establishment. But the 19th century saw the beginnings of a secularist free thinking movement whose ideas on sex, population and society were directed at the 'toiling masses'. It was decided that what had been a personal eccentricity was now becoming a dangerous movement that had to be checked.

The first prosecution involved the publishers of a pamphlet advocating family planning. This was 'The Fruits of Philosophy', by Dr Charles Knowlton, edited by the secularist freethinkers Charles Bradlaugh MP and Annie Besant.

The pamphlet had a preface dedicating it to young married couples especially amongst the poor; it pointed out that for years philanthropists had been endeavouring to obtain and disseminate knowledge whereby doctors and churchmen regarding the evils of toilng. It was generally believed that doctors and churchmen regarded the evils of births. It was decided that what had been a personal eccentricity was now becoming a dangerous movement that had to be checked.

The pamphlet included quotations from every prominent doctor and churchman known to the 'toiling masses', and members of the 'toiling masses' were found guilty of printing, publishing and selling 'certain indecent, lewd, filthy and obscene book tending to incite unnatural and bestial unions bringing people to a state of lowness and debauchery'.

Two defendants were fined £200 and both Bradlaugh was sentenced to six months in jail. He immediately appealed on the grounds that the passages in the book said to be indecent had never been found guilty of printing, publishing and selling 'certain indecent, lewd, filthy and obscene book tending to incite unnatural and bestial unions bringing people to a state of lowness and debauchery'. The appeal was upheld. 'The Fruits of Philosophy' was slightly amended and continued to be published.

The second case involved a colleague of Bradlaugh in the secular movement — G. W. Foote. With encouragement from Bradlaugh he began publishing a weekly periodical, The Freethinker, devoted to a 'lively style for the people' in a relentless war against superstition in general and the Christian superstition in particular'.

Brash and crude, The Freethinker ridiculed, raged, pleaded, and delighted, containing the obvious blasphemy of Foote's pamphlet. In July the editor and the printer were summoned by the Lord Mayor to the Mansion House to answer the charge of blasphemy.

The editor was indicted for 'being wicked, and for profanely devising and intending to expose and vilify the said book of lewdness and debauchery'.

The indictment covered 16 counts contained in 28 folios and was an attempt to condemn the entire freethought movement. It was obviously going to be a long procedure, while the indictment was pending the magazine continued to be published with the banner headline PROSECUTED FOR BLASPHEMY, which it continued to run throughout the trial.

The case at Common Law was tried by Catholic Justice North, who went in for a quick kill. The prosecuting council, Sir Harding Giffard, took the line that some of the pictures were too bad to describe, thus leaving the public to imagine the worst. He advised the new jury, 'You may depend upon it, that whatever the view you take, there is not a respectable paper in the country that would have sullied its pages with these passages. The jury depended on the judge's assurances and without leaving the box, found Foote guilty. He was sentenced to a year's imprisonment in what was a technical point but it kept him out of jail, and in February 1876 the Court of Appeal upheld him. 'The Fruits of Philosophy' was slightly amended and continued to be published.

He concluded, 'If you are a special fundamentalist butcher, Henry Varley, had arrested whoever sold it to them. In the end he purchased a copy of the magazine, and then arrested the editor, publisher and three contributors. The trial lasted three hours and was described by the jury as a 'tumultuous and disorderly proceeding'.
Jim Haynes and John Wilcock are mirror images—twin but not identical. Haynes is taller, thinner, slightly etiolated, Wilcock stockier, a punch, who, if he had stood out in the street, might have been Vito tough. Haynes talks rolling, rich American, Wilcock a flat mid-Atlantic, with echoes of a childhood in Sheffield. Their odd similarity is to do with what they’ve done. Jim Haynes has been in Europe for five years. In 1970, he co-founded the Traverse Theatre, in Glasgow. He came to America, more than any other country, because of the underground press, and spread the word in Europe. His first paper, INK, was written by a thousand presscard-carrying men put down, including me. I’ve always put every cent I had into my newspaper. Now I want to go back to trying to live my life.

JIM HAYNES: You should have included in your list of alternatives obscene and not obscene. I’d like to say one thing about that. Everybody’s been talking about obscenity in America, and you know what to do with it. There’s a standard answer of course. Violence is obscene. We all know that. But also what is obscene is materialistic and this gets back to your polarizations of life or death. A Rolls-Royce car is for me a symbol of obscenity, far more obscure than a couple making love. A couple making love? Obscene? Any combination of couples, male, female, anything, making love is not an obscenity, and anyone who says it is crazy. But a Rolls-Royce is an obscenity bowing to materialism.

JOHN WILCOCK: Yes, it says ‘I not only have a bigger and more powerful cock than you’, and that is a wonderful change, more expensive and better protected cock. And you don’t touch this, because it’s guarded, it’s not available. It’s not a commodity, it’s an investment. This projection of my personality shows that I am a superior person to you in every possible way.’

JIM HAYNES: About two or three weeks ago, the front page of the Times showed that Titiann that was bought and sold for two and one-half million pounds. Everybody was bowing down in reverence to something that cat did many hundreds of years ago. Who cares? He was making the INK of his time. Let’s defensively art a little. All it is a brush and paint. It’s a medium which can do anything. It’s not a medium which can do anything more. As you say, except as a commodity, to sell. And because the nature of the medium is its scarcity, because there’s only one of a thing at a time, therefore the whole structure of supply and demand comes into being. It’s a reflection of society, and if some cat wants to get his reputation pumped up a little bit, he becomes an artist, an imitation man. Everybody comes around and says as a joke. It’s bullshit. It’s gross. The Rolls-Royce is gross. Art is gross. The diamond is gross. Coats are gross. Beauty is ultimately gross. It’s been made so.

Germaine Greer in The Female Eunuch makes this beautiful point about the eco-social effect of worshipping beauty, Miss America, the syrupy way, it is the end of stereotypes. Rapin nature, destroying pearls, killing tiny funny animals. For what? It’s ridiculous.

JOHN WILCOCK: Yes, but she’s involved in a stereotype. Germaine Greer, whose beauty and intelligence I respect, has sold out, Germaine Greer came to America, and signed autographs in department store. She was asked the staged talk shows. She was asked to give a true conversation, no true ideas, are ever heard. I can’t blame her for it, but I can still point out the fact that she could do better. She believed in the things she was supposed to do, that she believed in. She’s said: ‘Well, here I have an opportunity to write for the Sunday Times. Here I have an opportunity to go to the National Times and start up a magazine that wants to take me to Washington and pose me in front of the people, who are demon-baiting me. I go there for hours and no one ever stood up in front of me and waved my hand and be on the front.’ I like that. I like that. I like that. I think she was messed. I don’t think anyone has to go along with a publisher who says: ‘You have to do this, you have to do that.’ And that way you’ll be famous and rich and protect our investment.

JIM HAYNES: You’re opening up a strange chasmene Greer would have said. Maybe I’m too name because I was talking about what is obscene, and because I think Germaine’s past, and raping nature for vanity is beautiful. As far as using straight media, this has, this has always been my thing. I think you think one should take advantage of any offer there is. Obviously, there’s the old problem of taking advantage of the BBC, an interview, a journalist, and it’s the last thing you used, dangerous, difficult territory to enter, this.

JOHN WILCOCK: I’m sure she shares the ideals which all of us would agree we have. ‘I’m sure she’s fighting a battle too who are involved. But I feel one has to be very careful. The establishment, if one can use the word, is exploiting people who oppose it. Maybe I can be accused of the same thing. Sometimes individuals have been straight press. The Sun today started a thing on the underground press. I met the guy, and I don’t know how serious he is as one of the underground papers. He told me to write an article from the Sun to write about the underground. For the first time in his Fleet Street career he’s been allowed to write what he wanted, to do what they why he did. The Sun didn’t want any pornography, but they didn’t want a picture of the Sun on the underground. We’re not going to talk to you. You discothèque or Frenz?

Frenz is absolutely right absolutely correct. In my particular case, I have come across a lot of people, I have come across people, I know those people. I have had that career and left it behind me, fifteen or twenty years ago. I am not putting down those people who want to publicize my ideas. I am putting down that kind of person. I am putting down that kind of person. I am putting down that kind of person. I am putting down that kind of person. I am putting down that kind of person. I am putting down that kind of person. I am putting down that kind of person. I am putting down that kind of person.

JOHN WILCOCK: ‘You have to do this, you have to do that. Everybody who goes to see the Vietnam War. Not long after that, Martin Luther King, who was solely identified with the Vietnam War. Not long after that, Martin Luther King, who was solely identified with the Vietnam War. You and I have very strong feelings about a lot of things. We’re not going to talk to you. You discothèque or Frenz?’

Frenz is absolutely right; absolutely correct. In my particular case, I have come across a lot of people, I have come across people, I know those people. I have had that career and left it behind me, fifteen or twenty years ago. I am not putting down those people who want to publicize my ideas. I am putting down that kind of person. I am putting down that kind of person. I am putting down that kind of person. I am putting down that kind of person. I am putting down that kind of person. I am putting down that kind of person. I am putting down that kind of person. I am putting down that kind of person.

JIM HAYNES: In many ways the best thing that’s happened to us is the media. The media are the most powerful thing in the world, the most powerful thing in the world, the most powerful thing in the world, the most powerful thing in the world. People who are free want others to be free.

JOHN WILCOCK: I agree with that, one hundred percent.
The generals who run Peru’s revolution have no constitutional tradition to bind them down. The result is that they are transforming the country as I never thought possible — especially for professional military men. Their agrarian reform, now only two years old, is far reaching and effective; already about half of Peru’s 1,500,000 landless peasant families have been given land in large, government-supervised cooperatives. Only the poorest of the former owners have been paid for their expropriations; the rest are given bonds redeemable ‘when the country is totally solvent’. Standard Oil’s holdings have all been nationalized and the new exploration deal with the California-based Occidental Petroleum company is ‘a contract, not a concession’. A new law reforming private urban companies is now fully operative; it compels each firm to use 15 per cent of its urban companies is now fully operative; it compels each firm to use 15 per cent of its urban workers and management.

But most significant of all is the government’s new law ‘decreeing’ the mobilization of the masses. ‘A revolution from above always fails,’ Peru’s president, General Juan Velasco Alvarado, told me. ‘When we realized that’s what we were doing, we decided to change it.’ The president himself announced the ‘change’ late in June, in the palace but surrounded by tanks at the headquarters of the Armed Division, Peru’s most powerful unit. The message was clearly understood by all Peruvians: We, the military, commit our total strength to this tradition here — we viewed ourselves as the ultimate arbitrators in the country’s politics, but not because we were political, only because the politicians were always corrupt and perilously close to us. They were useless to the military, was called upon, or if you will ‘decreeing’ the mobilization of the masses. We killed de la Puente and we captured and jailed Bejar. But we began to study seriously what could be done about the miserable plight of our country.

Gradually, we consolidated our strength and, within a few weeks, we selected 15,000, or 15 per cent of the workers of our country, and the arrest is a necessary ingredient of the process...”

ARREST!

‘Please police me, oh yeah’, ran the old Beatles song, ‘like I police you.’ Sejarra Sullivan (no, not Pepper), at the end of a long legal career, wrote in similar vein. The Englishman is brought up as one subject to the police powers are sometimes clearly defined, sometimes left deliberately vague. The importance of this is that in legal theory and mythology you have the right to use reasonable force to resist a wrongful arrest. In practice, the exercise of this ‘right’ is most likely to lead to an additional charge of resisting a police officer (some courts send to prison for this like a shot) — unless of course you get away! It is usually to submit quietly if the odds are against you, and try to sue for damages for false imprisonment at a later stage.

An arrest is effected as soon as the person arrested is made aware that he is under arrest and of the reason for his arrest. There need be no actual physical seizure.

The case in question highlights the difference between that magistrate who sympathizes with, in contrast to their usual callousness, a man who had been charged with driving with excess alcohol in his blood, and the arrest is a necessary ingredient of the offence. The policeman told the driver, “You shall have to ask you to come to the police station for further tests’, and the man did so. The magistrate held that this involved no arrest, so the driver was acquitted. It is improbable that in a case where the socially acceptable drug they would take such careful account of the individual’s problems. An arrest may be made with or without a warrant. The general powers of arrest are defined, sometimes left deliberately vague.

The noble lord continued, perhaps tran­scending a police officer (some courts send to prison for this like a shot) — unless of course you get away! It is usually to submit quietly if the odds are against you, and try to sue for damages for false imprisonment at a later stage. An arrest is effected as soon as the person arrested is made aware that he is under arrest and of the reason for his arrest. There need be no actual physical seizure.

The case in question highlights the difference between that magistrate who sympathizes with, in contrast to their usual callousness, a man who had been charged with driving with excess alcohol in his blood, and the arrest is a necessary ingredient of the offence. The policeman told the driver, “You shall have to ask you to come to the police station for further tests’, and the man did so. The magistrate held that this involved no arrest, so the driver was acquitted. It is improbable that in a case where the socially acceptable drug they would take such careful account of the individual’s problems. An arrest may be made with or without a warrant. The general powers of arrest are defined, sometimes left deliberately vague.

The noble lord continued, perhaps tran­scending a police officer (some courts send to prison for this like a shot) — unless of course you get away! It is usually to submit quietly if the odds are against you, and try to sue for damages for false imprisonment at a later stage. An arrest is effected as soon as the person arrested is made aware that he is under arrest and of the reason for his arrest. There need be no actual physical seizure.

The case in question highlights the difference between that magistrate who sympathizes with, in contrast to their usual callousness, a man who had been charged with driving with excess alcohol in his blood, and the arrest is a necessary ingredient of the offence. The policeman told the driver, “You shall have to ask you to come to the police station for further tests’, and the man did so. The magistrate held that this involved no arrest, so the driver was acquitted. It is improbable that in a case where the socially acceptable drug they would take such careful account of the individual’s problems. An arrest may be made with or without a warrant. The general powers of arrest are defined, sometimes left deliberately vague.
The OZ verdict had at least two positive results: the acquittal on the conspiracy charge was a major setback for the enemies of the alternative society; and the conviction on the remaining four charges polarized opinion and forced people to take sides in the continuing conflict. On these two pages we print the reactions of various people and organisations whom we felt might have something to say.

VERDICTS ON THE VERDICT

Michael Foot MP: Like, I hope, multitudes of other people I am shocked by the verdict and I hope there will be pressure on all fronts to get the whole situation reversed.

Kingsley Amis: No writer likes censorship but no citizen should face the 'corruption' of children with equanimity.

John Peel: It fills me with a sense of impending doom. This will give them the green light to go ahead with a lot more repressive measures. I've never felt so helpless in my life. I've always been a very passive person and this is the first time I've felt moved to violence — out of sheer desperation.

Manager, Playboy Club: No comment.

Kenneth Allsop: What is really strange and disturbing about this case is the fact that the judge saw fit to jail the defendants and postpone sentence. This almost appears to be an act of ritualistic vengeance.

Charles Marowitz (Director, Open Space): The OZ 'conviction' explodes the myth of the permissive society once and for all. Anyone who does not believe that the spirit of repression is rife in England ought to read Judge Argyle's summing up.

Lord Longford: Why should I lay myself open for you lot to make fun of me again? I'm not prepared to comment at this stage.

Nick Lloyd (Editor, News of the World): No comment.

Ken Tynan: Such a familiar reaction — predictably the wrong verdict reached for the wrong reasons.

Charles Marowitz: Fucked up.

Sir Robert Lusty (Publisher): I've never seen OZ and until I've seen it, I wouldn't want to comment. I don't think we're ready to have checks upon society done away with altogether.

Richard Ingram (Private Eye): It's fucking silly, isn't it. What strikes one about these cases is that real pornography is not prosecuted — only literary pornography is attacked. The motives behind OZ are not to publish porn for profit. The whole proceedings are a total farce, everyone comes into disrepute. I don't myself see any political pressure behind the prosecution.

Charles Ball (Assistant General Secretary of the NCCL): The conviction of the editors of OZ is a further and more dangerous escalation in the current attack on freedom of expression. There is a calculated attempt being made to suppress opinions and attitudes particularly those of the young that conflict with the rigid morality of an elderly establishment. For the moment the NCCL can only express its anger at the result of the case. Our fear is that freedom of expression is no longer one of the fundamental liberties that can be guaranteed in Britain.

SUNDAY EXTRA

Doris Lessing: It's a disgrace. The trial has been used to intimidate young people and pornography is merely an excuse. It's quite terrifying that they seem to be using the threat of psychiatric treatment in exactly the same way as they do in the Soviet Union.

Richard Handyside (Publisher of Little Red Schoolbook): I most vehemently disapprove — it is going to be like Russia now, certifying them insane.

Lord Longford: // Why should I lay myself open for you lot to make fun of me again? I'm not prepared to comment at this stage.

W. H. Smith spokesman: We were never open for you lot to make fun of me again? It's not our place to comment.

Mervyn Jones (Author): It is a considerable blow to freedom of speech. In human terms I think it is a horrible verdict.

Cal McCrystal (News Editor, Sunday Times): While I haven't seen much in OZ to recommend it is interesting reading. I regret that the trial took place. The whole affair was like taking a sledge hammer to crack three nuts.

Anthony Blond (Publisher): It was a collision of the generations and the younger one has lost. Obviously. I regret it.

Grace Berger (defence witness): Sadly there was no connection between the gay, cheerful magazine and the vindictive, vicious legal process. I'm terribly concerned that the Obscenity Acts are being used to stifle mounting protest among young people.

Arnold Wesker: I think they're raving mad. It's an obvious act of spite and I don't see what else we could expect in the kind of climate created by a nonentity like Heath.

Anthony Sampson: Imprisoning them was a barbarous bit of crude revenge. Cutting their hair off reminded me of an atavistic headmaster's view of society.

Nick Lloyd (Editor, News of the World): No comment.

David Hopkinson (Editor Birmingham Post): No comment.

John Calder (Publisher): An absolute disaster. I'm not too surprised, mind you. Brutality doesn't surprise me. Imprisonment is barbarous.

Paul Barker (Editor, New Society): I disagree with the verdict myself. The jury should have found them not guilty. I also disagree with the way the defendants have been handled since the verdict was passed.

Robin Blackburn: Judge Argyle is teaching us a good lesson in how bourgeois democracy works — repression in obscenity, communication, sexuality and work is its truth and essence and in no way contrary to its basic organizing principle. That's why they chose to get OZ for the most political and subversive issue it has ever produced. Revolution in the schools hits the ruling class where it hurts, because it threatens the supply of tame workers, passive consumers and loyal subjects that the system needs. They may be able to imprison or deport Richard and Jean and Felix, but their real enemy is the idea of liberated schools and they can't imprison or deport that.

Ian King (Bit): I personally think the front cover of OZ was obscene. But I would not defend the right of the state to prosecute. This is not a criminal offence, though the people at OZ should be persuaded to change their viewpoint. It's hypocritical of our society to prosecute OZ and nothing else. Other magazines are worse than OZ. OZ's use of women, particularly black women, is irresponsible and indefensible. If Richard thinks a black woman with a mouse up her cunt is normal — who is Marty Feldman?

David Hockney: I just think it's terrible. I now believe, whereas I never did in the past, though the people at OZ should be persuaded to change their viewpoint. It's the absurdity of the law.

Robin Black: I think they got off lightly. It just shows the absurdity of the law.

John Cleese: I'm not a believer that any sort of material can corrupt people. The whole thing is very pointless.

Alan Robertson (Frenzi): Frenzi will do something. The robots are getting out of hand.

Ian King (Bit): I personally think the front cover of OZ was obscene. But I would not defend the right of the state to prosecute. This is not a criminal offence, though the people at OZ should be persuaded to change their viewpoint. It's hypocritical of our society to prosecute OZ and nothing else. Other magazines are worse than OZ. OZ's use of women, particularly black women, is irresponsible and indefensible. If Richard thinks a black woman with a mouse up her cunt is normal — who is Marty Feldman?
David May [Time Out]: By one act the establishment has polarized the generations.

Donald Trelford (Deputy Editor, The Observer): Prison, talk of deportation, a five-week Old Bailey trial costing £75,000, the enforced ritual shearing — surely all this is absurdly disproportionate and likely to confirm would-be citizens of the alternative society in their belief that they are victims of political persecution.

Rufus Harris (Release): I think it is the start of an intensified campaign against the free press. What happened afterwards betrayed the judge's attitude.

David Steel MP: I think it is very bad that they have been refused bail pending medical reports. Most people in similar circumstances would have been granted bail. Very disturbing.

Oliver Caldicott (Publisher): Personally I feel that OZ mishandled their defence but despite this I feel that it is a great blow against the freedom of the press and a step backwards in the attitudes of the law.

Jeremy Brooks [Literary Adviser, Royal Shakespeare Company]: Judge Argyle has nothing to do with the law, or justice, or morality or obscenity. It was quite simply and nakedly a frightened defence against knowledge which he is too sick to admit into his mind, for fear of the thoughts that might logically follow. One must pity his sickness — but fight it tooth and nail.

Tony Garnett [Producer]: It is a political event, just as the Upper Clyde business is a political event. Another example of the change of climate that came with the present Tory government. They are literally putting their kicking boots on.

Michael Schofield [Sociologist]: Although there were only three people in the dock there were in fact thousands of young people on trial. They have convicted a whole generation.

Roy Wright [Acting Editor, Evening Standard]: I'm happy to see them sentenced to jail if that's what the judge wants, but I wasn't too happy with the decision to send them to prison for psychiatric reports.

So Mr. Neville and his two colleagues have been found guilty of publishing a dirty magazine, namely the 28th, “schoolkids’ issue” of OZ.

Judge Argyle remanded the three in custody, saying that he wanted “social, medical and mental” reports about them before pronouncing sentence. That, in our view, just about puts the matter in the right perspective.

These people, and others like them, may not be potty in a technical sense, but their state of mind almost certainly requires expert examination.

They may, of course, just be in it for the money (and the 27-day trial, in which they have all been legally aided, has resulted in publicity which should greatly assist their future money-making capacities), but there must be more to it than that.

They seem to belong, in fact, to the great amorphous group existing in non-dictatorship countries which gets a kick out of pretending to be out to “destroy” society.

By courtesy of an anonymous leader-writer in the Daily Telegraph the day after the OZ trial verdict.

"Sir! It's about the obscene drawings in the prison magazine!"
Dolby B and noise reduction

Over the last few months, pre-recorded cassettes and cassette recorders have been appearing in the shops marked with a label saying 'Dolby System', and we've had several inquiries asking what this is and whether it's compatible with ordinary cassette recorders.

Basically, all sound systems carry two types of information: the sound you want - 'signal' - and the noise you don't want - 'noise'. And the relationship between the two is referred to as the signal-to-noise ratio (of s/n ratio) and is measured on a logarithmic scale called decibels or db for short. Because both the signal and the noise are part of the same electrical signal, it was thought until recently that any way of reducing the noise would degrade the signal as well by limiting the frequency response, (or range of sound frequencies that the system would carry), and by introducing distortion.

In July 1968 a patent was published for a system invented by Ray Milton Dolby which overcomes these problems, and was the basis for the Dolby A System used in recording studios all round the world. The studio were having problems from the introduction of 8-track recorders, because mixing the channels down to two for discs introduced an appreciable amount of noise.

The Dolby system works like this. The noise level of a tape recorder is practically constant. If the signal level is high the noise is not noticed, but if the sound being recorded is very quiet, the noise becomes obtrusive. The Dolby system takes the quiet sounds and amplifies them before they are recorded. In this way the noise signal-to-noise ratio is reduced. If the tape is played back again, and as the noise is quite damped down the same amount you end up with a better signal-to-noise ratio than you would otherwise have. The loud signals are left unchanged.

'Dolby A' applies this process to four bands of frequencies covering the whole range that the ear can hear. 'Dolby B' which was developed for cassettes and domestic recorders, is applied only to high frequency sounds to reduce 'tape hiss'. Signal-to-noise ratio on cassette recorders has been very poor so far because of the difficulty of recording two or four tracks on 1/8 in. tape at 1.7/8 in. per sec. and the Dolby B System means that a reasonable domestic level is now obtainable. We hope to do a survey of 'Dolby' recorded material at a later date.

Despite manufacturers' claims, Dolby cassettes are not compatible with ordinary cassettes and recordings with Dolby controls cutting the treble on playback will largely compensate and cut tape hiss as well.
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Why was Colin Jordan making overtures to the Egyptian military attache in London 1962? And why in Jordan's British Movement working with the National Front - and seeking co-operation with the Monday Club - in the Midlands today? David Holt explains in "The Send Them Back Campaign."

Plus: Obi Egbuna: Black Power Peter: 'The road to El Dorado' - The DHSSE and its Pound of Flesh

RACE TODAY is published on the first Friday of every month. Single copies 20p; Annual subscription of £2.00.

Institute of Race Relations,
36 Jemmy Street,
London S.W.1.
0-734 4002

EXCITING SEX OFFERS!

PICTURES - All guaranteed, unrestricted, uncensored, female nudes. Bundles: At least 200 different mixes up to 250 for £15 000, sex market. At £20 000, sex market. At £25 000

BOOKS - ENGLISH SEX TECHNIQUES - covers all forms of oral stimulation and coital positions - with frank text and real life vivid photographs. Cover price £5.25, special offer £2.50

NATURE GIRLS (UNRETouched) - contains almost 100 full pages, full nude photos. Seductive women as they really are, with nothing shaved, obstructed or masked. Cover price £2, Special offer £1.00

IMPORTED SWEDISH/AMERICAN MAGAZINES £3 each. These maps detail maps, addresses, population, lebberism etc. Money back guarantee.

ANDY WARHOL'S PORK
THE ROUND HOUSE: Chalk Farm Road NW1 01-267 2564
2nd - 28th August Preview, 30th - 31st July
Mon-Thurs 8pm Fri and Sat 6 and 8.45 pm
Special discount for Students

WARNING: This play has explicit sexual content and offensive language. If you are likely to be disturbed please do not attend - Mature Adults Only!
Michael Kustow reviews Peter Brook's King Lear at the Prince Charles.

The best Shakespeare films so far are Orson Welles' Othello and Grigory Kozintsev's Hamlet. Chimes at Midnight, Welles' Falstaff movie, is interesting but needs more money and continuity of work; he patched it together appearing in other money-earning films. And white also contributed to it. The Olivier films pioneered Shakespeare film in England, though their sturdy style was a center for spectacular chronicles like Henry V or the outrageous conspicuous of Richard III than for the more intimate film of Hamlet. There have also been some spectacular Shakespeare film flops: Zeffirelli's Romeo and Juliet and Sherry Peter Hall's Midsummer Night's Dream.

That's the end of all screenwriters, William Shakespeare' says the Columbia factsheet, 'who has the story and all the ingredients of a popular movie—action, suspense, sex, heroism and humor, all the essence of drama.' Resisting the temptation to imagine a Perelman-like producer explaining to camera-bumpkin Will from Avon that he should not consider making a Lear movie which could be both poetic and commercial?

"...the rock film has certainly arrived. But..."

Social scientists when they are not complaining about their lack of research funds (and all the goodies like expense accounts which go with the grant scheme) spend much of their time self-indulgently mourning about their moral dilemmas. Especially when working in such controversial areas as race, relations, crime and drugs they involve themselves more on those levels than actually doing any research and writing. This is all doubly true for the drug scene, where one either finds banalities about the 'need for more research until we know the answers to these interesting questions' or equally patently empty sets of unanswerable, unanswerable debate (or their adult equivalents) about whether or not pot should be legalized.

So, all in all, outsiders to the type of sociology that Jack Young stands for might pick up this book with some trepidation (which won't be allayed by the curious cover). But after the obligatory opening chapter setting out the nature and effects of different sorts of drugs, he will find little that is predictable. There is no self-indulgence, no empty pleas for more research and no equivocations about the political myths and absurdities surrounding this strange subject.

What there is an awareness of some of the real dilemmas of the sociologist working in these fields. He finds himself in a double bind: on the one hand, a meaning that which insists on looking behind how the public or powerful groups define certain conditions as problematic and at the same time taking very seriously these surface definitions in so far as they affect the shape of the phenomena. Young's commitment to this double bind (if one can be committed to paradoxed) yields an extraordinarily interesting and important book, certainly the most sophisticated single account of drugwriting written in this country.

Two major themes are contained in the subtitle of the book, 'the social meaning of drug use'. The one set of meanings surrounds the initial and continued use of different drugs by various groups in society. The argument here is that problems are structured and experienced in different ways by different groups (and in certain circumstances, encouraged) means of problem solving; that groups select drugs which have psychological properties seemingly suitable for their problems and that the effects of these drugs are shifted and interpreted in terms of the context of the drug taker. From this theme flows a consideration of the origins of drug use in recent years and their relations to such constellation as the youth culture and the hippie world view.

The second major theme is that which is attributed to drugtaking by society - rather, certain powerful and influential groups within society. The thesis is that it is not psychotropic drugs as such which evoke coercion, but that their use creates sordidly hedonistic ends. The battle is not about 'certain substances' but about current meanings and systems of viewing society. The origins of the reaction to drugs are located in an absolutist model of society; one which denies the values and personal integrity of certain groups, sees deviance as meaningless and deviants like drug takers as pathological or the victims of the Machiavellianism of the few; the eternal evil macho. This chapter on 'certain substances' is splendid and Young makes a good job of expressing the revolution against this monolith in the rhetoric of those such as Laing. Science has a lot to answer for.

This fairly abstract account of the symbolic battle is translated into the day-to-day language of the mass media and the operation of the police - particularly in the Notting Hill area between 1967 and 1969. It all concludes with a chapter on social policy: 'Combat absolutist dogma', 'avoid designating behaviour as illness', 'avoid scapegoating' and 'restrict legislation'. These rules - eminently sensible as they are - sound a bit like Chairman Young's Warnings To The Ruling Clique and I can hardly see them - a more radical reconstruction is needed.

As important, there is an awareness of the fact that the future is that it shows signs of being very different from anything that has happened before. There is a sense that Young is not unaware that to advocate such 'certain substances' but about drug use'. The one set of meanings surrounds the initial and continued use of different drugs by various groups in society. The argument here is that problems are structured and experienced in different ways by different groups (and in certain circumstances, encouraged) means of problem solving; that groups select drugs which have psychological properties seemingly suitable for their problems and that the effects of these drugs are shifted and interpreted in terms of the context of the drug taker. From this theme flows a consideration of the origins of drug use in recent years and their relations to such constellation as the youth culture and the hippie world view.

The second major theme is that which is attributed to drugtaking by society - rather, certain powerful and influential groups within society. The thesis is that it is not psychotropic drugs as such which evoke coercion, but that their use creates sordidly hedonistic ends. The battle is not about 'certain substances' but about current meanings and systems of viewing society. The origins of the reaction to drugs are located in an absolutist model of society; one which denies the values and personal integrity of certain groups, sees deviance as meaningless and deviants like drug takers as pathological or the victims of the Machiavellianism of the few; the eternal evil macho. This chapter on 'certain substances' is splendid and Young makes a good job of expressing the revolution against this monolith in the rhetoric of those such as Laing. Science has a lot to answer for.

This fairly abstract account of the symbolic battle is translated into the day-to-day language of the mass media and the operation of the police - particularly in the Notting Hill area between 1967 and 1969. It all concludes with a chapter on social policy: 'Combat absolutist dogma', 'avoid designating behaviour as illness', 'avoid scapegoating' and 'restrict legislation'. These rules - eminently sensible as they are - sound a bit like Chairman Young's Warnings To The Ruling Clique and I can hardly see them - a more radical reconstruction is needed.

As important, there is an awareness of the fact that the future is that it shows signs of being very different from anything that has happened before. There is a sense that Young is not unaware that to advocate such
Can we have a political theatre?

Michael Kustow presents more evidence in his investigation of an undecided case.

Exhibit G: Theatre Reviewing

The trouble with most drama critics is that they have also the question of creeping senility: the average age of the national drama critic was 53. Editors here insist on getting theatre reviews as if they were news, so the daily newspaper critics have to rush their work along as far as the performance is over, to get the notice in next morning's paper. This system doesn't apply in other countries: in France and Germany, next morning's paper will run a short news item stating that the play has opened and describing its reception. A considered review follows within a week.

Such prophecies have often been put up to the editors of our national dailies, and are always turned down: everyone's afraid to grant the shelter of space to the critic the best conditions for writing about plays — especially plays which are so operatic. If this alternative system had been in operation, plays like John Whiting's Birthday Party, or Athol Fugard's Boesman and Lena, would have been reviewed. But the theatre critics themselves accept this hard labour, ruthless and exacting, as the chance of a lifetime to express their first impressions against the clock. Like the poet Logue says: "they chained my tongue in office."

For six or seven years, months of writing, monthly reports, have to be wrapped up in an hour. Editors demand a short report because by and large our critics are better than they ever have a chance to show, with two or three notable exceptions who would dry up if they had days rather than minutes in which to talk about a play.

Ink Performance section will only review plays speedily when we think they're good or interesting. We won't review them if we think they're bad, or indifferent, or if we think they're a waste of time. We won't review them if we think they're a waste of time.

Ink Performance section will only review plays speedily when we think they're good or interesting. We won't review them if we think they're bad, or indifferent, or if we think they're a waste of time.
wanting it.
chasing it.
faking it.
taking it.

"making it"

20th CENTURY-FOX presents "MAKING IT" starring KRISTOFFER TABORI, MARLYN MASON, BOB GALABAN and JOYCE VAN PATTEN as BETTY, produced by ALBERT S. RUDDY, associate producer RAY FREDERICKSON, directed by JOHN ERMAN, screenplay by PETER BART, based on the novel "WHAT CAN YOU DO?" by JAMES LEIGH. Music by CHARLES FOX. AN ALBERT S. RUDDY PRODUCTION

DAVID CAUTE'S BLISSFUL TRILOGY
The Confrontation, consisting of THE OCCUPATION, a novel £2.00 THE ILLUSION, an essay £2.50 THE DEMONSTRATION, a play £1.40

The Confrontation explores ways in which literary structures both govern and are governed by political commitment. The three books form a unity at several levels and describe a central dilemma: the confrontation between the Old Left and the New.

BARRY RECKORD DOES FIDEL EAT MORE THAN YOUR FATHER?
Conversations in Cuba
The Jamaican dramatist examines this ‘Third World’ through the eyes of the Cubans themselves. £2.10

HAKIM JAMAL FROM THE DEAD LEVEL
Malcolm X & Me
A unique account of the life of Malcolm X by one of his disciples. £2.50
The Strawbs From The Witchwood A&M AML 46349
Tir Na Nog Tir Na Nog Chrysalis ILPS 9153
The Stomu Yamashta Family Summer Solstice ECT 1035
Black Sabbath The Thunderbirds Twelve Inches Of... Sonet SNTF 619
Andy Roberts Home Grown B&C CAS 1034
Roy Harper Stormcock Harvest SHVL 785

The Stones, Who, Kinks, Rod Stewart, all became part of the musical parade - clothes in (mainly American) styles taken off wholesale which were distorted, perhaps even rejected, by the hit parade music of the time. Later, they made their own individual music by adding new elements to the basic R&B mode, rather than rejecting it completely. That great series of singles the Stones made in the mid-sixties - 'Satisfaction', '19 Nervous Breakdown', 'Get Off My Cloud' - did for the blues what the Beatles did for pop. They began their musical careers in borrowed settings. Those that sound like Durham mining ballads have been given an English accent. The Brett Bretts, most of whose virtues stem from the air of happy amateurism that pervades their work, Andy Roberts is from Liverpool, a guitarist who writes his own songs and was for a while a member of the Liverpool Scene. With a light voice of the same quality as Paxton and Donovan, he has quietly made a name for himself. 'Na Na Na' lacks, a musical personality of his own. The influences are clear - Jansch's playing, the songwriting of all those we and he grew up listening to - but he has built from them a style to express his own feelings. And they are as unremarkable and important as your own: separation and loneliness, contentment, the search for home.

Because he doesn't go in for self-dramatization like some of the superstars who share the same themes, Andy would probably be overlooked by the people who write the thick black headlines in music papers. But don't let this deter you from finding a copy of his record to listen to. 'I never knew what kind of day it's been on my battlefront of ideas' begins the main song on Roy Harper's Stormcock album, and that's a fair sample of the lyrics of the four items on the record. He pines up lines long, part of whose tension lies in whether he can control the transformation to an 'A poes' cabaret than illuminating in his choice of images. The songs are very much in the manner of Dylan's 'It's Alright Ma', but Roy Harper as prophet hits the target less often than Dylan did. Compared to the earlier Paz Baroque and Berserk, whose songs were both more personal and pointed, this album is a failure, save for one, with Roy's high voice echoing eerily against the vibrant guitar chords and occasional bursts of strings.

**Single File**

Lonne Mack. She Even Woke Me Up To Say Goodbye. Elektra 45755

Better known for his guitar instrumentals, Lonnie, was always a fair singer with a tendency to sound 'black'. But now he's relaxed into the edge-of-country style that is currently fashionable, and added some country side, 'Lay It Down' is rather bland, his version of the Jerry Lewis hit is beautiful, Arranger Norbert Putnam has thrown in a lot of strings, but they never overwhelm Lonnie's attractive voice or delicate electric guitar.

Brentwood. Gimme Little Sign. United Artists 35266

Surely one of the hippest records to be a big hit here, when it was first issued in 1967. The song has one of those irresistible choruses that seduce listeners into believing they can sing too, although Brenton hits notes with such precision no amateur could expect to match him. It has a neat dance groove too.

**Around the World**

Anita Franklin. A Brand New Me / Spirit In The Dark. Atlantic 2001-127

Aretha's next American single will be 'Spanish Harlem', but while we wait for that, UK Atlantic have brought out the 'B' side of her last single as an 'A' side, coupled with an American hit from last year that wasn't issued here at the time. 'Brand New Me' shows Aretha veering towards the kind of phrasing that Sarah Vaughan used to do - remember 'Broken Hearted Melody'? It's a very sophisticated record, with not much melody for the listener to hang on to, and very likely to get much airplay here. 'Spirit In the Dark' is perhaps Aretha's equivalent to Ray Charles 'What'd I Say', very closely representing a church atmosphere. The lyric is deliciously ambiguous, and the whole performance very good-humoured.

Credence Clearwater Revival. Sweet Hitch Hiker. United Artists 3261

A year ago this was my favourite group, the only one that could be relied on to bring a great dance beat, interesting lyric, and exciting vocal. It all seems to be there again, but somehow the bits don't hang together and Credence wind up sounding like their imitators, straining for effect.

The Eagles. You're The Reason Why / Sexy Ways. CBS 7384

Surely one of the pop's most big hits, when it was first issued in 1967. The song has one of those irresistible choruses that seduce listeners into believing they can sing too, although Benny hits notes with such precision no amateur could expect to match him. It has a neat dance groove too.

**Home Growth**

Lennie Hayton. 'Forgive Me God, we hang the hangman' upset some, but a less conventional form, with Andy's voice skimming over a swift backing dominated by strings. He's more of a craftsman than the Bretts, most of whose virtues stem from the air of happy amateurism that pervades their work. Andy Roberts is from Liverpool, a guitarist who writes his own songs and was for a while a member of the Liverpool Scene. With a light voice of the same quality as Paxton and Donovan, he has quietly made a name for himself. 'Na Na Na' lacks, a musical personality of his own. The influences are clear - Jansch's playing, the songwriting of all those we and he grew up listening to - but he has built from them a style to express his own feelings. And they are as unremarkable and important as your own: separation and loneliness, contentment, the search for home.

Because he doesn't go in for self-dramatization like some of the superstars who share the same themes, Andy would probably be overlooked by the people who write the thick black headlines in music papers. But don't let this deter you from finding a copy of his record to listen to. 'I never knew what kind of day it's been on my battlefront of ideas' begins the main song on Roy Harper's Stormcock album, and that's a fair sample of the lyrics of the four items on the record. He pines up lines long, part of whose tension lies in whether he can control the transformation to an 'A poes' cabaret than illuminating in his choice of images. The songs are very much in the manner of Dylan's 'It's Alright Ma', but Roy Harper as prophet hits the target less often than Dylan did. Compared to the earlier Paz Baroque and Berserk, whose songs were both more personal and pointed, this album is a failure, save for one, with Roy's high voice echoing eerily against the vibrant guitar chords and occasional bursts of strings.

**Credence Clearwater Revival. Sweet Hitch Hiker. United Artists 3261**

A year ago this was my favourite group, the only one that could be relied on to bring a great dance beat, interesting lyric, and exciting vocal. It all seems to be there again, but somehow the bits don't hang together and Credence wind up sounding like their imitators, straining for effect.

**The Eagles. You're The Reason Why / Sexy Ways. CBS 7384**

Surely one of the pop's most big hits, when it was first issued in 1967. The song has one of those irresistible choruses that seduce listeners into believing they can sing too, although Benny hits notes with such precision no amateur could expect to match him. It has a neat dance groove too.

**Aretha Franklin. A Brand New Me / Spirit In The Dark. Atlantic 2001-127**

Aretha's next American single will be 'Spanish Harlem', but while we wait for that, UK Atlantic have brought out the 'B' side of her last single as an 'A' side, coupled with an American hit from last year that wasn't issued here at the time. 'Brand New Me' shows Aretha veering towards the kind of phrasing that Sarah Vaughan used to do - remember 'Broken Hearted Melody'? It's a very sophisticated record, with not much melody for the listener to hang on to, and very likely to get much airplay here. 'Spirit In the Dark' is perhaps Aretha's equivalent to Ray Charles 'What'd I Say', very closely representing a church atmosphere. The lyric is deliciously ambiguous, and the whole performance very good-humoured.

**Credence Clearwater Revival. Sweet Hitch Hiker. United Artists 3261**

A year ago this was my favourite group, the only one that could be relied on to bring a great dance beat, interesting lyric, and exciting vocal. It all seems to be there again, but somehow the bits don't hang together and Credence wind up sounding like their imitators, straining for effect.

**The Eagles. You're The Reason Why / Sexy Ways. CBS 7384**

Surely one of the pop's most big hits, when it was first issued in 1967. The song has one of those irresistible choruses that seduce listeners into believing they can sing too, although Benny hits notes with such precision no amateur could expect to match him. It has a neat dance groove too.

**Aretha Franklin. A Brand New Me / Spirit In The Dark. Atlantic 2001-127**

Aretha's next American single will be 'Spanish Harlem', but while we wait for that, UK Atlantic have brought out the 'B' side of her last single as an 'A' side, coupled with an American hit from last year that wasn't issued here at the time. 'Brand New Me' shows Aretha veering towards the kind of phrasing that Sarah Vaughan used to do - remember 'Broken Hearted Melody'? It's a very sophisticated record, with not much melody for the listener to hang on to, and very likely to get much airplay here. 'Spirit In the Dark' is perhaps Aretha's equivalent to Ray Charles 'What'd I Say', very closely representing a church atmosphere. The lyric is deliciously ambiguous, and the whole performance very good-humoured.

**Credence Clearwater Revival. Sweet Hitch Hiker. United Artists 3261**

A year ago this was my favourite group, the only one that could be relied on to bring a great dance beat, interesting lyric, and exciting vocal. It all seems to be there again, but somehow the bits don't hang together and Credence wind up sounding like their imitators, straining for effect.

**The Eagles. You're The Reason Why / Sexy Ways. CBS 7384**

Surely one of the pop's most big hits, when it was first issued in 1967. The song has one of those irresistible choruses that seduce listeners into believing they can sing too, although Benny hits notes with such precision no amateur could expect to match him. It has a neat dance groove too.

**Aretha Franklin. A Brand New Me / Spirit In The Dark. Atlantic 2001-127**

Aretha's next American single will be 'Spanish Harlem', but while we wait for that, UK Atlantic have brought out the 'B' side of her last single as an 'A' side, coupled with an American hit from last year that wasn't issued here at the time. 'Brand New Me' shows Aretha veering towards the kind of phrasing that Sarah Vaughan used to do - remember 'Broken Hearted Melody'? It's a very sophisticated record, with not much melody for the listener to hang on to, and very likely to get much airplay here. 'Spirit In the Dark' is perhaps Aretha's equivalent to Ray Charles 'What'd I Say', very closely representing a church atmosphere. The lyric is deliciously ambiguous, and the whole performance very good-humoured.
UNFURNISHED flat or room needed urgently by theatre director in Deptford or nearby. Contact Noel Greg, 9, Clifton Road, Bromley. Phone 0733 2956.

OFFER to share flat or use room & give to howsoever or housekeeper or flat-mate - S.E., London. Also kit available. Box 1610.

6th person to share home, North London. Near 7 Sisters tube. Share a big room for only £3.67. No petty restrictions ring Ian at 704 4018 late evenings/weekends.

ULTIMATE Trip - into the Future. Palm Analysis, EVE Union, phone 794 4720 (3-9pm).

GUY, 21, seeks chick for instant marriage with no hang-ups or conditions except substantial gain - phone Chris 727 8972.

CONTACTS unlimited: 4 dates for £1. For details and rates phone 7121 (24 hrs) or write to G T Marlowe Street, London, W1.

SEXUAL TECHNIQUES - happiness Club special feature. For information phone parties. Countyside membership £1. A.R.C.V, London NW2 5AG.

NAKED YOUNG MALES superbly photographed in full colour, black and white, Alex, from all angles. Over 70 pages, £1 11s 6d, bound with full colour, back-to-back cover, entitled SONS OF THE ZODIAC: Price £5 including postage. Send for free brochure showing 7 sample pictures to: L. A. Publications, 15 Clifton Gardens, London, W1. (Limited offer: order now quoting No. 8-41 and this superb book will by yours for only £4.25 post free, excluding cheques, cash or P.O.)

THE HOMOSEXUAL HANDBOOK only 72p "Some Boys" £2.25. Many novel ideas. Send stamp for list (free) with order to Paperback Centre, 150 Merton Road, Wimbleden, W19.

"This is a guide" needs work (160 pages and will work best for the right company - considered anywhere in London. Phone Watson-On-Thoms 2326.

YOUNG KAYA in trendy London boutique. BOX 1600.

GUY, 16, needs Saturday job beginning September. Experience of shop work, amateur photographer and waiter. Will travel for good wage. Phone 753 2889.

Services

LIGHT removals 727 1877. BLACK chick needs work urgently from 9.8.71. Anything interesting considered. Can type, model etc. Phone 540 1940.

SPECIALS


ALL kids with their backs up to the wall and who want to write/draw for their liberation contact Vin at 01-722 7957.

WANTED

ARTIST/designer - needs work. Anything considered (including painting, decorating and carpentry). Phone 373 5784.

UNIVERSITY outcast interested in politics and environmental social issues desperately needs a good job. Has secretarial skills, but hates being a secretary. Please contact Dinah Bolton, Flat 1, 79 North Road, London, W2.

UNUSUAL girl needs work (16-21 years) to share flat or use of rooms anywhere in London. BOX 1600.

Photography - Our darkrooms are available at reasonable rates for processing and printing and we also have a fast, professional, b & w processing service.

Also available freelance photographers. Contact Keith Bailey 836 5843 or 836 9370.

For information on:

Editorial matter Ed Victor 836 8395.

Litster 229 4623.

General INK business Pete Steedman 836 7875.

MANTRA, the mystical magazine with the New Age philosophy. First issue now available. 50p by post from Mantra P.O. Box 725, London, W3 4BN.

For Sale

For Sale

SALE Sita £40, Tables £20. Eximian Machines & Table £50 - phone 370 3343.

MALE nude Magazines. Finsen EXHIBITION help for Trade Fair required to travel with Sales Models. 01-942 3759, 9-5 Mon-Fri. Phone 3493 0035.

AMERICAN Rogers Drums for Sale - Cases, cymbals etc., Bargain at £170 - phone 625 3697.

DO YOU HATE CENSORSHIP? Would you like to choose the type of magazines, films and books that you want to have? Write for our illustrated brochure of all things erotic. Send no money, just clip this advertisement and send it, together with your name and address, to World Wide Sales, 4Y Cardew Yr 14, Copenhaghen, 1760 V, Denmark.

ANGRY BRIGADE badges: 5p plus postage, Ian Purdie and Peter Jessop Design Group, c/o IT, 11a Berwick Street, W.1.

UNIQUE stereo LP of Bhuddist hymns and chants recorded under the supervision of the Dalai Lama in Tibetan monasteries of Northern India. Available in the UK only through Leaky at 55, Twyford Avenue, London, W3 or 01-992 1452. Individual or quantity prices.

Mantra, the mysterious magazine with the New Age philosophy. First issue now available. 50p by post from Mantra P.O. Box 725, London, W3 4BN.

Travel

GIRL wants to join weekend trip to India around September. Box 1699.

INK, OZ - NORMAL SERVICE WILL BE RESUMED AS SOON AS POSSIBLE

As announced elsewhere in the paper, INK as a weekly tabloid will not be produced during the months of August and September. INK Publications Ltd will operate from 19 Great Newport Street, WC2.

Subscriptions - Letters will go out to all subscribers within the week and subscriptions will continue as normal, so ONK goes back into production.

Classifieds - All money received for ads not printed will be refunded and any correspondence relating to ads or box numbers will be readaddressed. For further information ring Paul Bream 836 8397.

Advertising - Advertising will carry on as normal in October. Contact Harvey Matsuow 836 6114 or 836 8666.

As announced elsewhere in the paper, INK as a weekly tabloid will not be produced during the months of August and September. INK Publications Ltd will operate from 19 Great Newport Street, WC2.

Subscriptions - Letters will go out to all subscribers within the week and subscriptions will continue as normal, so ONK goes back into production.

Classifieds - All money received for ads not printed will be refunded and any correspondence relating to ads or box numbers will be readaddressed. For further information ring Paul Bream 836 8397.

Advertising - Advertising will carry on as normal in October. Contact Harvey Matsuow 836 6114 or 836 8666.
London
Thursday, 5 August
FOLK/ROCK: Tir Na Nog, National Head Band and Nicky James - 7.30, 10pm at the Masons Arms, Old Compton Street, Soho, W1.
FILM: Flesh - 1.40pm, 4.35pm, 7.40pm, 10.10pm, 12.50pm, 4.00pm. NFT2. Kensington and then bus to Stockwell, Clapham Road, SW9 (437 2375).
FILM: Sullivans Travels (1940) - 2.40pm, 4.00pm, 6.15pm and 8.45pm. NFT1.
FILM: Salford's Strong Women - 11.15am and 2.15pm. NFT1.
Jazz: Count Basie - 7.30pm, 100 Club, 100 Oxford Street, London W1.
FILM: Personal and The Hour of the Wolf (Bergman) - 11.15pm, Classic, Erith. Ticehurst 368.
CHURCH: Hiroshima Day; Feast of the Transfiguration. Kensington Town Hall, 35 Kensington High Street. The Week.
Jazz: Count Basie - 7.30pm, 100 Club, 100 Oxford Street, London W1.
FILM: Personal and The Hour of the Wolf (Bergman) - 11.15pm, Classic, Erith. Ticehurst 368.
Jazz: Count Basie - 7.30pm, 100 Club, 100 Oxford Street, London W1.
FILM: Personal and The Hour of the Wolf (Bergman) - 11.15pm, Classic, Erith. Ticehurst 368.
FILM: Slow Run (Kardish) - 7.30pm, 100 Club, 100 Oxford Street, London W1.
Jazz: Count Basie - 7.30pm, 100 Club, 100 Oxford Street, London W1.
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MOTHERS