

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"The only real safeguard against tyranny is the creation of a type of mind to which it is detestable and intolerable, and which can never rest comfortably in its presence."

—CHAPMAN COHEN.

BAN THE H-BOMB?

THE news of the explosion of hydrogen bombs and, more particularly, the publication of facts about their powers and range of destruction, have led to a new spate of petitions appealing for a ban on atomic weapons.

This is a natural enough reaction. "There ought to be a law against it" is a phrase heard often enough on the lips of those who, presented with something they don't like, turn to authority to do something about it. This is natural enough—in the world of to-day, where the vast majority of people have been deprived of their responsibility. But it is essentially a servile attitude and a repressive one, for those who express it show that they are concerned with repression rather than understanding, with effects rather than with causes.

The news of the H-Bomb and its frightening power has jerked out of their complacency thousands of people who are usually not at all concerned with the forces which control their own destinies, and of which the H-Bomb is only one factor.

For Anarchists, however, who have consistently opposed war, the H-Bomb does not present a new problem, but only an extension of the old. The question is not how to prevent atomic weapons being used in war, but how to prevent war?

A More Urgent Issue

All that the H-Bomb has done is to give a new urgency to this problem; to give an impetus to the struggle against war itself and to the form of society which produces it. For if the world is subjected to an atomic war, the results will be so awful and wide-spread that none of us could escape its baneful effects.

This makes an anti-war campaign a more urgent issue for more people than ever before. But the H-Bomb does not raise any moral questions that have not been present in every war and in every authoritarian society. There is no moral distinction between the use of the H-Bomb or the bayonet. They both kill. You are just as dead disembowelled by one as disintegrated by the other, and you may be just as guilty or innocent of the causes of the conflict in which you are caught up.

The arguments that so many innocent civilians would be slaughtered by atomic war is beside the point. None of us are innocent of the horrors of war if we accept blindly and without protest or action that which causes it. Every harmless citizen who tut-tuts about the burning of a single African in Kenya—and then turns the page of his newspaper to read the sports gossip, is responsible for the development and eventual use of atomic weapons. For such expressions of man's inhumanity to man are but expressions of the sickness of our society—the authority of man over man.

An Act of Servility

And this, your "harmless" citizen accepts. Further—and here's the rub—those who petition against H-Bombs accept it too. The very act of petitioning a government means that you accept its authority. You recognise the fact that you have given it your power and your responsibility—that the Government is re-

sponsible and you are irresponsible. To petition a government is an act of servility which is invariably treated with the contempt it deserves.

What lies behind the H-Bomb petitions? Clearly the conception that governments will keep to international agreements. But have previous international agreements prevented war? And if a major war starts, will either side hesitate—especially if it looks like losing—to use all its weapons and resources?

There is only one factor that might discourage use of the H-Bomb and that is fear of retaliation. Fear is a bad councillor, but, supposing it is strong enough for this purpose, it will act as a deterrent whether there have been international agreements or not.

Fear the Deterrent?

Those who petition governments obviously think that fear alone is not a strong enough deterrent; there must also be a legal, binding, agreement. But the only motive behind such an agreement would be the governments' fear of each other! This is what "negotiation from strength" means, and if each side fears the other's strength sufficiently there is no need for agreements. If on the other hand, each side is not afraid of the other, they will not sign agreements. And even if they do—what guarantee is there (except fear!) that they will keep them?

The petitions currently circulating—and Communist and non-Communist organisations are separately running them—appeal to the Government to Ban the H-Bomb. This is rather like asking the tiger to ban tooth and claw—but what are its implications?

It is futile to ban the use of H-Bombs in war without banning their actual production; futile to ban production without provision for adequate inspection by both sides and precaution to see that neither side is secretly producing bombs. (For these signatories will not trust each other!)

Are either of the two sides of the cold war prepared to tolerate inspection by the other? Will America, with her professed lead in thermo-nuclear devices, welcome Russian inspection? Will Russia, secretive and suspicious, lift the iron curtain to American inspection? It seems unlikely. The subordination of power to interests other than their own is not a noticeable habit among governments.

Society May Collapse

The prospect is truly fearful. The H-Bomb and other ghastly means of destruction are in the hands of groups of men for whom power and property are all-important. The only thing which may restrain their use of H-Bombs is the fear that they may lose their power and their property.

The scope of destruction of the H-Bomb is such that in a full scale atomic war (and once atomic weapons are used it will become full-scale) the whole fabric of modern society may fall apart.

The destruction will not worry our rulers so much. Capitalism depends upon destruction to such an extent to-day that providing our rulers save their own skins they will regard the opportunity of rebuilding our shattered cities as so much profitable enterprise. War is a profitable business, and while it remains so, capitalism will do nothing to abolish it.

More serious for governments is the loss of power. And this they are guarding against now by laying the foundations for totalitarian régimes in the West. Whatever the slogans under which atomic war is launched, the effect will be a totalitarian post-war world.

Can the People Act?

All this presumes inaction on the part of the ordinary people. Whether they can bestir themselves to act in time remains to be seen, but the simple fact is that they are the only force capable and with interests in taking the necessary action.

Only one thing can remove the threat of H-Bombs; only one thing remove the threat of war altogether. That is the abolition of the crazy political and economic systems that produce these horrors. To do this, petitions, voting, begging to governments with constitutional cap-in-hand, are all equally futile, servile and ridiculous.

The peoples of the world must take power out of the hands of governments. This will not be done by pleading with governments to relinquish, or even limit, their power. The ordinary people in the street, the workshops and the home must be made aware of their danger—and of their strength. By encouragement, exhortation, education and example every individual who feels the crying need of our time and sees his responsibility for it, should endeavour to wake up the sleeping giant of the working class.

Our very survival depends upon it. Either we destroy the State, or the State will destroy us.

THE PETROV AFFAIR

IF international agreements were in the smallest degree affected by such human emotions as indignation or concern for ordinary morality, the Geneva conference could hardly have opened in less auspicious circumstances. For the Petrov affair and the business of Khokhlov and the cyanide cigarette bullets have filled the newspapers with sensational headlines and sensational photographs of an almost unprecedented kind. Fortunately, for those who believe in agreements between the representatives of States (the question-begging ambiguity of words like 'agreement' or 'representative' in such a context almost makes the ink laugh), fortunately, for these hard headed believers, relations between States are not affected by indignation or hampered by morality.

Peculiar Features

There have been some peculiar features in the Petrov affair. Petrov is said to have been the head of the Russian secret police (M.V.D.) network in Australia, a position he can hardly have gained without some pliability of scruple regarding the rights of individuals or what we call civil liberty. Why should such a man suddenly be impressed by the Australian way of life? (At the same time it will not do to be too cynical about such "conversions", for there must be strains of conscience even for secret policemen, even if their work inevitably blunts such qualms).

It is sometimes said that when British soldiers have "gone over to" the Russian zone, they have usually been in some trouble and have gone over in order to avoid punishment. The Russians have then represented them as rebellious against capitalism.

Some defections from the Soviet régime have in the past shown similar mundane aspects. General Krivitsky, another M.V.D. convert for example, escaped to the West in 1939 because he judged he was due to be purged. The Russian Embassy in Australia first denounced Petrov's walk out as a kidnapping, and only later declared that he was a criminal who had peculated Embassy funds, thereby robbing this implied explanation of much of its force. But even if one doubts or discounts this story it does not follow that Petrov may have been in some other kind of trouble, doctrinal for example, or connected with some failure to carry out instructions. Or he may have felt endangered by the general reshuffling of the M.V.D. which has followed the unseating of Beria.

Usefulness of Escapees

This brings out another aspect of these sensational cases. One of the most significant developments of the end of the war was the refusal of very large numbers of Russian prisoners-of-war, especially Ukrainians working in labour units in France, to be repatriated to Russia. Revolutionists who had studied the Rus-

Continued on p. 4

Mass Deportations & the Concentration Camps

ELSEWHERE in this issue are discussed a number of brutalities conducted by the Russians. In America the march of McCarthyism is not stayed simply by the Army's interrogation of the Senator. In China the totalitarian wheels grind on. Who cannot see that such a universal advance of the militant reaction we call totalitarianism must have world-wide causes? It is therefore with further revulsion, though not with surprise, unhappily, that we turn towards Africa, to see the same scene, the same trend. The following items followed each other in the columns of last Sunday's *Observer*. They speak for themselves:

NAIROBI, April 24

Nairobi to-day was a city without headquarters of its proletariat. From first light the 50,000 male Kikuyu, Embu and Meru tribesmen in the city were surrounded in their homes by police and troops of the Buffs and Inniskillings, and interrogated by Swahili-speaking policemen and men of the Kenya Regiment.

If any man failed to produce his identity card or proof of employment, if he was recognised and denounced by an up-country screening team, if he came from a bad area which had repeatedly refused co-operation with the police, or

if he showed a truculent attitude to his interrogators, he was marched off to Langata Camp, whence he awaited the south-bound train to the newly staffed detention camps.

Police expect to detain some 5,000 in this way. The operation should be complete in about 10 days.

POLICE FAILURE

"Operation Anvil," as it is called, marks the admission of the complete failure of police methods in Nairobi, where screenings have been more frequent—fuller and more brutal than in any other affected area.

Information has been harder to come by here than in the reserves or settled areas. Unable to apprehend criminals, the police have decided to arrest all unemployed.

Public opinion agrees, however, that this is the right course. Although the crime wave cannot be linked for sure with Mau Mau, it is extraordinary, say the police, how consistently criminals are members of the Kikuyu tribe.

JOHANNESBURG, April 24

For the first time since the inception of the scheme of Dr. Verwoerd, the Minister of Native Affairs, which involves the wholesale removal of 57,000 non-Europeans from a suburb of Johannesburg, a Government spokesman has admitted the possibility of collective opposition by the residents.

Interrupting a succession of reassuring statements claiming strong African support for the scheme, Dr. Verwoerd's chief information officer says that "some elements" are planning organised resistance against the wishes of those Africans who, he maintains, are eager to leave the "black spots".

Underlining these remarks, the Nationalist organs here strike a menacing note. They denounce "flagrant exploitation of ignorance and systematic sowing of suspicion" by agitators, including the United Party, and give a warning of the dangers of inciting the Africans to defy authority under the present inflammable conditions.

The ruling United Party majority in the Johannesburg City Council are themselves at sixes and sevens on this issue. The liberal wing, backed by the decision of the party's parliamentary caucus, advocate an absolute boycott of the scheme. The rest are prepared to co-

operate and permit several councillors to take their seats on Dr. Verwoerd's resettlement board, which is given full powers to implement the project and override all obstacles.

Deportations such as these, no less than those from the Baltic States into Russia, presuppose also the existence of concentration camps for the reception of the human herds rounded up. They also mean interrogators, men whose job it is to break down those brought before them. Third degree methods are already widely practiced in Kenya as recent criminal proceedings have shown. If interrogations become a regular thing, if the object—the breaking down of the victim—is regarded as important enough, the methods will of necessity be refined on the Russian model, now made familiar to us.

The Nairobi deportations are officially "justified" because it is said that the Mau Mau get their arms from the back streets, by robbing Europeans of arms they are not supposed to carry, and therefore do not report the robberies . . . and so on and so on. These arguments will seem cogent enough to practical men from the man in the street right up, or down, to Mr. Lyttelton. But men and women of wider vision see the picture as a whole and cannot fail to be alarmed.

FREEDOM has often made clear its opposition to nationalism in general, and Mau Mau in particular, though it has never forgotten the causes. And lack of sympathy with the Mau Mau has never betrayed anarchists into condoning governmental action in Kenya. Where a handful of white administrators and settlers attempt to keep a vast native population in a subordinate status they are bound in the end to the use of military force and the para-military police. Those who have supported the forces of "law and order" in Kenya, now find themselves, if they have the honesty to admit it, with these ghastly round-ups, the interrogations and the concentration camps to justify also.

THE MALATESTA CLUB 155 High Holborn WCI

(Nearly opposite Holborn Town Hall)

L.A.G. LECTURE DISCUSSIONS
EVERY SUNDAY AT 7.30

MAY 2nd Frank Ridley
"THE REVOLUTIONARY TRADITION
IN ENGLAND"

We regret that we inserted in last week's issue the title of May 2nd Lecture incorrectly.

MAY 9 John Bishop
ASPECTS OF ANARCHISM
(I) INTRODUCTION

★
Informal Discussion Every Thursday at 7.30.

Bowels of Compassion

THE popularity of a dictator or the hold a small minority of power-criminals can secure, often for a considerable period, over people not lacking in courage and intelligence cannot satisfactorily be explained in mere terms of intimidation and physical coercion. Psychological factors play their part, and not only on the surface. Those particular forms of evil behaviour obtain general recognition and legal, sometimes religious, consecration in a country which are most intensely cherished in desire and imagination by the bulk of the governed. So, one is tempted to say, every nation is ruled by the power, and has the type of criminals, it deserves.

Not everybody is, clinically speaking, a neurotic, but there are, in every man and woman, the germs, as it were, of a particular form of neurosis rather than another, and if this predisposition is found to be present among the people of a given country or race a classification of peoples in psychiatric terms is a possibility worth considering, and has been seriously attempted by Geoffrey Gorer in his studies on the Russian, Japanese, and American peoples.

My contention is that if peoples can be thus classified we are likely to find in their leaders and dictators a concentration and exacerbation of their typical traits, be it in their crudest form, as character armour or sublimation. So Stalin, for example, exhibited in a very marked degree the manic-depressive features which Gorer described as characteristic of the Russian people. Inversely, the phallic-narcissistic type to which, according to Reich, Mussolini belonged, would be the most prevailing or most forcefully represented among Italians. I cannot recall any authoritative labelling of Hitler and the Nazis, if not the German people, but perhaps the term phallic-sadistic could be a fair description.

In spite of the work Abel Miroglia has stimulated with the founding at Le Havre of his "Institut de Psychologie des Peuples", to whose review I contributed a couple of essays, the psychology of peoples is still in its infancy, and my generalizations are therefore to be taken with the greatest caution. To prove them false, however, will require far more thought, observation and training than I possess, and I should be glad to see some of it devoted to what I sense to be a problem of the deepest political and social importance. I invite the same caution also as to the following about the English people, especially as I myself, following another line of thought, have reached elsewhere different conclusions.

The English, and the people ruling their lives, then, I suggest here, are typical of the compulsive character described by Wilhelm Reich in his "Character Analysis", pp. 193-200, with this important difference, however, that since they decide what is socially healthy and normal gratification gives them such surface equilibrium, buoyancy and assurance that defeats the suspicion of neurosis that would be most apparent, instead, in the case of frustration.

About the libido development of the compulsive character Reich writes: "There was a central fixation on the anal-sadistic level, that is about the age of two or three. Toilet training took place too early which led to strong reaction formations such as extreme self-control, even at a very early age. The strict toilet training called forth a strong anal stubbornness which also mobilized the sadistic impulses" (p. 196). And two pages above: "Pedantry circumstantiality, tendency to rumination, and thriftiness derive all from one instinctual source, anal eroticism; they are reaction formation against those tendencies which played a major rôle during the phase of toilet training."

To this I wish to add the remarks that Ian D. Suttie makes on the importance of cleanliness training in his book on "the origins of love and hate". After mentioning the absence of any 'hush hush' convention in the early rearing, and the genuine interest that mother or nurse takes in the child's evacuatory function, he writes: "But a change takes place in the mother's attitude, a change which—if too sudden and unexplained—is shattering to the infant's confidence in what it has learned and to its feelings of importance to other people. The mother professes disgust for the very functions upon which the infant has relied to hold and cultivate her liking. This change in the very basis of the child's love-worthiness as felt by itself must be shattering to its confidence (a) in other people, and (b) in its own acceptability to them. This is the 'crisis of anxiety.'" (p. 56).

To put ideas in order: (1) Traits by which the compulsive character is different from others are to be found in English men and women more frequently than any traits characteristic of other

neurotic types. (2) Men holding and exercising power in England are predominantly of the compulsive type, and the standards and ideals most largely obtaining are such as derive from strict toilet training, which, furthermore, is often interpreted by the child as a sign of love-withdrawal on the part of the mother, causing unhappiness and anxiety. (4) Toilet training is particularly strict in England, part and parcel of a Puritanical outlook and of what Ian D. Suttie describes as a "taboo on tenderness". (5) If Gorer's theory that the character of a people depends chiefly on its particular methods of rearing children it should be possible to change fundamentally the character of a people by changing its methods of rearing children.

As it is natural for an individual to resist and resent any suggestion that he should change himself, thus many paladins and typical representatives of the English people will dismiss all the above as sheer nonsense and be confirmed in their opinion that the English are the best people on earth. As a matter of fact a compulsive character basis makes good scientists, scrupulous administrators and civil servants, law abiding citizens and conscientious workers. It is responsible for punctuality, reliability, self-sufficiency, self-control, and other virtues which have made the English one of the most stable and compact societies in the world, and seen them through many a critical hour. Many Englishmen, on the other hand, are unhappy and suffer from anxiety, and those among them who wish to be freed or partially relieved from the particular forms of oppression in England that stifle individual development and self-realization may fruitfully give thought both to the imprint of the compulsive character upon English society and to its probable roots in an early, too sharp and too strict toilet training.

Evacuation is orgasmic, and punishment, expressions of disgust and love-withdrawal are bound to give rise to inhibitions, complexes and anxiety that may permanently affect a child's character and prevent it from experiencing as an adult uninhibited orgasm and all those satisfactions which Reich affirms to be the apogee of the genital type. Audrey Richards speaks of some African mothers who do not subject their chil-

Theatre

THE PRISONER

AT the end of the play "The Prisoner", by Bridget Boland (given at the Globe Theatre, London), the Cardinal, who has confessed to having done all the things which his enemies in the totalitarian government were eager he should acknowledge in order to deface this "national monument", is reprieved on the morning of his execution, and is told by the Interrogator, who has shown him that the source of his finest actions were questionable and impure, because he hates his mother, and has grown up with a horror of his degraded childhood, that he is free to walk out of the prison. The Interrogator is horrified by the terrible future without hope or happiness the Cardinal faces, deprived of honour, deprived of human dignity. He offers to shoot the Cardinal, and then to explain to the authorities that he has done so in self-defence, the Cardinal having once threatened in a state near to breakdown to kill him. But the Cardinal, who cannot commit suicide himself without being further despised for what the people will regard as a final cowardice (quite unreasonably: the soldier braves the danger of death: the suicide braves death itself!) refuses to allow the Interrogator to become a murderer for his sake. And so

dren to any toilet training because, they say, "It would be so cruel. They will learn for themselves in good time". And Suttie to comment: "Where the child has not been wounded by the refusal of love or by the rejection of his own, it does not develop a character 'hard' and 'cold', contemptuous of enthusiasms and incapable of loyalties; it does not develop a defensive inhibition of and unresponsiveness to feeling" (pp. 93-94). These two last traits I consider typical of the English and compulsive character, and to link this essay with my previous article on "The idolatry of adulthood" I will end with the following query from Suttie's book: "Have we not mistaken a mere desertion or suppression of the open mindedness of childhood for maturation, manhood, and regarded this negative quality—a defensive reaction—as good in itself, very much as aggressiveness is idealized by Fascism?" (p. 94).

GIOVANNI BALDELLI

the Cardinal is really a stronger man when he suffers the final and complete humiliation of being set free from prison than he was when he entered it; he has achieved composure once more. But is the Cardinal really more degraded than the people who, we are told, are silently waiting in the Square outside the prison?—he refers to them as his victims and his judges. By continuing to live in authoritarian society, in which all one's life is a long chain of fears which bruise one's body and lacerate one's soul, in which authority rules one's whole life, the authority of the past and the present, of the dead and the living, one destroys one's soul. Possibly the ending of this sinisterly profound play is really existentialist. The Cardinal is absolutely alone in a world in which love and happiness are impossible, truth an ingenious compound of desirability and appearance, and facts, in the words of one of Luigi Pirandello's characters "are what we assume them to be; and then, in their essence, they are no longer facts, but phenomena of life that take on one or another semblance." It is psychiatry which elicits the confession from the Cardinal, who is able to resist without flinching the fear of torture and the danger of death, the interminable hours without sleep, and even the threat of madness, and this suggests that psychiatry is a worse invasion and violation of the self-respect and dignity of the individual than the use of drugs or the application of torture. Alec Guinness's emotionally restrained performance as the Cardinal is perfectly thought out and executed, and Noel Willman as the Interrogator, the only other essential character has a rewarding acting opportunity which he makes the most of. Their clash of wills is more exciting and absorbing than anything now being seen in the West End. Peter Glenville's production admirably sustains the tense atmosphere of the play. This play is scarcely likely to meet with the approval of the Catholics—a prince of the church whose heart is ice, and who pretends to have duties to Christ and the Church merely as a mask for his own pride, guilt and unhappiness. The Cardinal is exposed to the kind of Inquisition which his own Church once practised with such ruthlessness. Catholics are indignant about religious persecution in Eastern Europe, while the Pope gives the supreme order of Jesus to that murderous villain, General Franco.

D.M.M.

GODWIN AS MORALIST ?

GODWIN'S MORAL PHILOSOPHY, by D. H. Munro. (Oxford University Press, 15/-).

WILLIAM GODWIN has got the reputation of having been a typical tight-lipped moralist. He is remembered as the man who, in a fire, would have rescued Fenelon before his mother, even if he could only rescue one of them. Naturally he would try to rescue both, but since "the illustrious archbishop of Cambrai" was of more value to humanity he should have precedence. In later editions "my own mother" performed the now fashionable change of sex, and became the archbishop's valet, who was at the same time "my brother, my father, or my benefactor", but he should still be given second place.

Nobody, apart from scholars and professors, now bothers much about Archbishop Fenelon, but if we make it Einstein, or Kropotkin, we would get the proposition in correct perspective. Godwin never felt really satisfied with the position he had reached but he was not the one to shirk a difficult issue as Rousseau did. In this case he is grappling with the question of justice *versus* love, or social needs *versus* personal ones. He comes down on the side of justice, but in fact there is no really satisfactory solution to the problem, because the whole situation is fundamentally evil. We are to suppose that we cannot save both. We should try to remodel the world so that it does not

present us with such problems: in this case the remedy is better fire-fighting equipment, in the social sphere the development of humane and reasonable institutions.

The theme of Munro's book is that Godwin was not at all indifferent to human emotions, his "reason" was not an abstraction. "He believed that we do not really understand a generalisation unless we see in detail how it applies to a particular concrete instance. Since no one instance is quite like another, generalisations are only approximately true. Human beings in particular are each of them unique. We will then never understand each other so long as we judge each other by the facile conventions imposed on us by society. Reliance on these is the main cause of that lack of insight that leads to the tragedy of loneliness. Many of Godwin's novels deal with the loneliness of the individual, against whom the forces of society are arrayed.

Far from postulating an idealised abstract Man, who never existed, Godwin stresses the importance of the moulding of men's behaviour and their opinions by society. "The generalisations or conventions which hide humanity from us are very much a social product, and even a political product. It is in that sense that 'government corrupts.'" Godwin's doctrine of "natural goodness" was not Victorian optimism, but a logical part of his belief that evil and cruelty are due to a lack of insight.

Munro goes on to say, "... One reason that Godwin has been misunderstood is that he has been regarded as a political reformer, whereas he was primarily a moralist. As a manifesto or a programme his anarchism is certainly absurd; but not more absurd than Plato's 'Republic' or Rousseau's 'Social Contract'. Like Plato and Rousseau, Godwin is concerned, not with a political programme, but with an analysis of society and above all, of the causes of prejudice, or lack of insight. Regarded in this light, his anarchism, though no doubt inadequate, is not obviously absurd or lacking in reality." I do not know how far anarchists interested in

Godwin would agree with this estimate of him.

The author does not mention anarchism much, and as can be seen he is more interested in Godwin as a philosopher than as a political theorist. His opposition to authoritarian institutions is not stressed, but rather his attack upon prejudice, the tendency to make general rules instead of judging each case on its merits, and the insincerity that this gives rise to, since people try to live up to the rôles that are imposed on them, instead of being themselves.

No doubt this is a situation that could arise in any sort of society to a certain extent. In fact Godwin admits that it is impossible to escape from "the empire of prejudice" completely. Another thing for which he is remembered is for saying that in a community of truly free men everyone will be quite frank about the faults of his fellows, and the false ideas that divide men will be thus eliminated. One cannot imagine happiness and brotherhood arising from such a situation! All the same it is a question that must be solved somehow, though in a free society there would be far less reason for insincerity, conventionalism, and dangerous generalisations. (The law perhaps furnishes us with the best example of the latter, being in fact nothing but one vast generalisation. There is a saying, "Hard cases make bad law", but of course every case is a "hard case".)

At the present time there is a revival of interest in Godwin, but most of the books on him do not stress the libertarian aspect of his thought, which is a pity. No doubt in an age of anxiety such as ours there is a tendency to look around for some new Messiah, and if one cannot be found in the present, let us dig up the past and find some neglected sage! I do not know whether this is a fair estimate of the William Godwin revival that is going on, but I suspect it is. Nevertheless it is a step in the right direction, and it is to be hoped that those interested in his ideas will draw the revolutionary conclusions from them that seem to us anarchists so inevitable.

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

OPEN 10 a.m. to 6.30; 5.0 SATURDAYS

Second-Hand Books . . .

Bread and Roses	Ethel Mannin	3/6
Booming of Bunkie	A. S. Neill	2/6
The Facts of Life	Paul Goodman	2/6
The Babeuf Plot	David Thomson	5/-
Miss Lonelyhearts	Nathaniel West	5/6
The Outcast	Winwood Reade	2/-
The Trial of Theism	George Jacob Holyoake	6/-
The Road to Wigan Pier	George Orwell	6/-
Walls Have Mouths	W. F. R. Macartney	4/-
Man's Worldly Goods	Leo Huberman	3/6
The Shooting Party	Anton Chekhov	2/-
Less than the Dust	Joseph Stammer	2/6
Jewish Youth Comes Home	Norman Bentwich	2/6
The Rights of Engineers	Wal Hennington	2/6
The Feminist Movement	Ethel Snowden	2/6
The Necessity of Pacifism	J. Middleton Murry	3/-
New Worlds for Old	G. H. Wells	2/-
Liberty versus Equality	H. J. Leski	2/-

Periodicals . . .

Individual Action, Vol. 2, No. 8	3d.
The Struggle, Vol. No. 3, April	3d.
Resistance, Vol. 12, No. 1, April	3d.

Postage extra on all items.

Obtainable from

27, RED LION STREET,
LONDON, W.C.1

CORRECTION

In the article "Sex in History" the beginning of the second paragraph in the fourth column should read:

"... the reaction after the Restoration is not at all surprising.

The eighteenth century continued the revolt against sexual restraint, but it was an unhealthy rebellion . . ."

The beginning of the third paragraph should read:

"The end of the eighteenth century saw a Puritan revival . . ."

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY
Vol. 15, No. 18 May 1, 1954

ASSASSINS AT LARGE

DESPITE everything anarchism is still connected in the public mind with bombs and assassinations albeit the evidence is based on incidents that could be counted on the fingers of two hands. But these hoary old myths are nourished by that general love of melodrama that rejoices in cloaked figures—like Guy Fawkes. Other political tendencies, too, of the left have been mendaciously glad to connect anarchism with political assassination simply in order to wear an air of virtuous innocence themselves, and this is especially true of certain socialist groupings from Marx onwards.

Political assassination has, in fact, been resorted to by every shade of political belief. Schoolchildren may recall the tyrannicides of classical Greece, Harmodius and Aristogiton, regarded with respect because they aimed to slay a tyrant—a dictator as we should now say. The Jesuits of the counter reformation frequently employed people (Fawkes may have been such a one) to murder political opponents. Certain anarchists in the France of 60 years ago made assassinations of political figures who were clearly implicated in judicial killings; and certain socialist parties—the "People's Will" for example, to which Lenin's elder brother belonged, or the Social Revolutionaries who inspired Spiridonova, employed similar ethical conceptions of the right in certain circumstances to kill. Their arguments at least, had more humanity and more reason than the arguments of the State which retains the death penalty and exposes the judicial killer to no personal risk.

Latterly, political assassination has been employed mostly by nationalists in countries struggling for independence—India, for example, or Israel.

But it is not here our purpose to attempt a survey of political assassination which could be in any sense comprehensive. Rather have we sought to demonstrate the fact that such actions are very far from being a special province of anarchism. It may be stated categorically that, in most circumstances, anarchists would condemn the morality as well as the policy of almost all the political killings of recent years. Let us stress the qualifying phrases in this statement, however. Few things are more repugnant than the pious cries of "horror" which greet all such events from, for example, conservative, religious and communist quarters—the very people who are least concerned with morality. Anarchists were not afraid to state their opinion that Lucetti, Schirru and Sbardelotto, anarchists who made attempts on Mussolini's life during the heyday of Fascism, were heroes. Nor during the war could we bring ourselves to join in the "pious horror" at the killing of Darlan, the French Admiral who collaborated with the Nazis in North Africa, nor of Heydrich, the second-in-command of the Gestapo.

What a review even as brief as this does show, however, is that where individuals employ political assassination they have almost always done so after tremendous internal struggles, have suffered considerable risk to themselves, and have selected victims who were guilty of many offences, legally committed.

In contrast, there are the assassinations carried out by reactionary bodies—the Jesuits, the Ku Klux Klan, the Tzarist Secret Police, the Ochrana, which murdered many opponents of Russian reaction outside Russia's borders. Here the killers were usually criminals with no ethical concepts who merely acted as the weapon in the hand of a ruthless organization.

Just as the incendiary bombs, the high explosive and atom bombs of

to-day have made the home-made bombs of the individual assassin seem childish toys, so also is the myth of anarchist monopoly of assassination made ludicrous by the external murder organizations of the Communist régimes. These have been studied in detail by Hugo Dewar in his book, "Assassins at Large", but have received enormous publicity recently from the Khokhlov case, with its melodramatic accompaniment of silent automatics, and cyanide bullets fired from cigarette case guns. How little chance the chosen victim stands against a hired assassin backed by a State-aided murder organization! And how repellent such liquidations are compared to the ethical assassinations at the risk of almost certain personal annihilation to which people like Maria Spiridonova exposed themselves!

But almost more repellent is the attitude of the press. With their photographs of the Khokhlov murder weapons—even the *Times* had these—their raised hands and hushed horror-stricken voices announcing that this terrible crime is a "revelation" of Communist brutality. The same hypocrisy underlies the American diplomatic protest against this "outrageous and uncivilized" behaviour. Do these people expect us to believe that never till now did they know of Stalinist murder organizations? When Roosevelt was fraternizing with Stalin, did the American government know nothing of all that? Had they never heard of Willi Münzenberg or Leon Sedov, Trotsky's son, murdered in Paris? Or even of Trotsky himself, assassinated in Mexico in 1941? And these were merely the most publicized of pre-war G.P.U. murders.

Anarchists have never forgotten these things, just as they never forgot the concentration camps of Hitler, the bull-ring massacres of Franco, though politicians and pressmen managed to gloss over them. And we remember also those revolutionaries who have disappeared inside Russia—Erich Mühsam's wife, Zensl, for example, or the Italians, Ghezzi and Pedrini, who disappeared in the twenties—again to mention only a few.

The Bolshevik M.V.D. is the successor of the Tzarist Ochrana, vastly augmented. Its crimes are the crimes of its political masters, the Russian Communist government. Its victims have numbered some of the very best men and women of their generation. Despite their number, they will never be forgotten—except by politicians. Anarchists regard individualist assassinations with caution: but their outright condemnation is for governmental assassination—of Rosa Luxembourg and Karl Liebknecht, for example, or of Sacco and Vanzetti.

The Future of the Family

THE 'nuclear' family is the name given to the commonest living unit found in urbanised areas of Western Europe and the United States to-day. Although an increasing proportion of the population of this area consists of dissociated solitary individuals living in barracks, prisons, mental hospitals, concentration camps, atomic research establishments and other communal, mostly governmental, institutions typical of the present age, the bulk of the population—the ordinary producer and his dependents—still lives in families of which the distinguishing sociological feature is the departure of the children on marriage. The typical 'nuclear' family thus consists of father, mother and unmarried children, each child on marriage leaving home to set up another such family elsewhere, except where shortage of housing artificially restricts the 'natural' tendency.

This system does seem 'natural' enough to those who have never known anything different, and that means nearly everyone, for it is now only in the remoter rural districts of Western Europe and the U.S.A. that any of the older forms of family organisation survive. Though anthropologists, sociologists, psychologists and economists can all find material for an infinity of Ph.D. theses in the results, in their different fields, of the establishment in the last hundred years of this now predominant type of family organisation, it is by no means unwarding or over-presumptuous to ignore for a moment its interesting origins and present state and contemplate its fascinating future.

Professor Oppenheimer has suggested that we should try to relate—as Whitehead, Basil Willey and many others have done for past centuries—the governing ideas and new concepts of the latest developments in science, to those in other fields of study, to see how far developments are paralleled, to suggest new lines of advance, and to throw light on the fundamental presuppositions of the modern mind, if this is possible. If we take the Professor at his word, and see how far an analogy with the processes of modern physics helps in suggesting the possible future of family life, we find some interesting parallels with recent speculations by purely literary writers.

Nuclear fission is the obvious analogy (ignoring the possibilities of fun which might be had from the idea of particles of indeterminate velocity encircling a central mass) and the development it suggests is fairly obvious. The disintegration of the small family group was forecast most vociferously in the 1920's, when the idea of individuals having entirely independent lives, leaving the results, if any, of their temporary affections to be cared for by the crèche was widely reflected in "advanced" literature, even if it did not percolate in any degree to real life. It is however well-established in at least one country to-day in a modified form; the kibbutz system has taken firm hold in Israel, where everyone is working so hard for national prosperity and social justice as to make social harmony almost impossible.

But this is only to take the purely physical sense of fission, as the bodily

separation of the members of the nuclear family. It is arguable that in the more typical Western countries what is happening is a more subtle disintegration of family ties, by the deliberate creation of stronger loyalties which eventually destroy the mutual affection on which most families ultimately depend. This is of course easily recognisable to us in the totalitarian régimes, where the betrayal of parents by children still produces shudders of horror in those who do not recognise the same tendencies in embryo in their own society. In "1984" George Orwell has given a picture of the totally disintegrated social life which threatens to result from increasing centralisation of power, fear generated by the frightful opportunities science now offers for destruction, neurosis produced by living in cities where communal life no longer exists and by excessive specialisation in the economic processes of production, and the deadening of creative habits of mind and life by mass-produced amusement and education.

Society, as it is now before final disintegration is reached—is well described in Alex Comfort's "The Novel and Our Time" as one in which "the family is the largest coherent group, a family from which the individual members drop off as they reach maturity so that its survival is limited and seldom exceeds two generations; in which the vast majority of the population does not know the names of the people three doors away; in which local communities are exceptional; in which human activities are almost wholly restricted to techniques, and the techniques limited to the groups actively practising them—railwaymen, clerks, chemists, labourers, and so forth; and in which the common-ground activities of human life are uniformly delegated—law and order to professional police, politics to professional politicians, football to professional footballers, and sex to professional film stars. It is a society of on-lookers, congested but lonely, technically advanced but utterly insecure, subject to a complicated mechanism of order but individually irresponsible because there is no communal sanction for or against any course of action, largely devoid of artistic expression but inundated with every kind of kitsch and persisting mechanically in the routines of a morality and a social pattern which has been switched off and partly dismantled but continues to run for a while with the momentum it received during earlier periods.

So far, the analogy has not brought to light anything which is not fairly evident to an unbiased mind surveying present social tendencies. There remains to be considered the question whether the fission of the family would release anything comparable to the vast increase of energy—most easily turned to destructive purposes—which nuclear fission proper produced. There is reason to suppose that it might. It may be too simple to say that if you take a man from the comforts of his own home, put him in a barracks and subject him to all manner of discomfort, meanwhile laying the blame upon some distant people about whom he knows nothing, considerable energy will be generated in the form of hostility. But this phenomenon is not new; the Spartans had the same idea, and the monasteries of the Middle Ages de-

Continued on p. 4

Property to Community

[A reader sends us the following abridged version of a lecture delivered in Vienna in 1929 by Eberhard Arnold and published in translation in the Autumn 1953 issue of "The Plough".]

THE poisonous root of private property is disintegration, death and corruption. Private property arises through self-isolation, through the self-seeking of the covetous will. . . . Humanity lies in agony, on the verge of death, and the most obvious sign of its mortal sickness is private property.

Private property is the root of murder, the cause of war and the cut-throat competition of business life. Prostitution and marrying for money, which is no different, feed on it. It is the cause of dishonesty in business and of every lie in human relationships.

"Business is business", men say, but when business is free to form a code of conduct peculiar to itself it means in fact that egotism and private property are framing an independent code. Our entire economy is based on greed, on the profit motive, or the individual's urge to self-preservation and his craving for greater power. Christ once said, "If the kingdom of Satan were divided against itself, it would have fallen long ago." For this reason our highly developed capitalist economy does not fall, because the demonic forces let loose by greed and the profit motive work hand in glove with each other. They all follow the same line. The possessors thus become the possessed—possessed of demons. When one sphere of man's activity is permitted to frame its own laws irrespective of all other aspects of life, it becomes an idol, and man is ruled by demons. Life is rent apart and torn into shreds. That is the curse of our century, and we fall down and worship such idols, especially where money and economics are concerned. Defending their collective egotism, men say: "I don't want my property for myself, I want it for my wife and children. I don't in the least want to go to war to protect my own personal property, but I'm going to fight for all." A man who loves wife and children loves his own flesh. Not only love for one's own family, but preservation of the clan, loyalty of tribesmen or settlers one to another, defence of nation or State, and still more Civil War and war for one's cast or class, is collective egotism.

Let me speak frankly: I oppose nationalism and patriotism; I oppose the class war of the proletariat; I oppose the class rule of the property owners; and in addition I oppose the laws on inheritance. I assert that egotism raises its head wherever there is any question of protecting common interests. I oppose the party system. The whole of our public life has fallen under this curse. Why are there armed forces? Why are there law courts? Why is there a militia? Undoubtedly they exist simply for the sake of property, that isolated thing which has become detached from all the

rest, and which is doomed to death. We are lost as long as the main factors in life are man's covetous will . . . his selfish claims . . . rights and privileges . . .

Let us look at nature . . . What maintains life in us, our natural life? We are kept alive by the sun, by air, by water, by the earth and its resources, by our own power to do strenuous physical and intellectual work and to take advantage of nature's potentialities.

To whom was the sun given? To everyone. It was given to everyone. If there is any one thing that men do have in common, it is this gift of sunlight. But there are men who live their lives in the shadows. They must be brought out into the sunlight.

The old Hutterians say in their writings, "If the sun were not hung so high, it would long ago have been claimed by a few people as their private property, to the detriment of the rest who would then see nothing of it at all." The desire to own property, which takes for itself things which in no way belong to it, would not stop short at the sun . . . What of water? What of waterpower? (What of all natural resources, including men themselves?) What of the earth? Is there any reason why the earth should be parcelled out into private hands? Is the earth essentially different (in this respect) from the sun? No. Neither should the earth be private and personal property. The earth belongs to the men who live on it . . . Intended for them . . . it is to-day held by [a minority of] private individuals.

What is "private"? What does "private" mean? A private business, a private car, private property, private road? Private means to steal. Stolen property, then. Stolen from whom? From . . . mankind, appropriated from . . . Creation! The individual has taken hold of it for himself or has inherited it, which is the same thing, and each one holds fast to what he has. The fact that property is a curse ought to be plain to people on natural grounds alone, but there have to be prophetic spirits who put the facts quite clearly before men's eyes . . .

What is the true life that we should lead? What is life? A body is alive when all the organs function as a conscious unit, co-operating with each other and enabling the body to do its work. Life is coherent unity in movement . . . is inseparable from unity, unity of will, of feeling and of thought, and cannot exist apart from it. The living force within the individual depends on the extent to which humanity is united; and humanity is united only to the extent that it is lead and directed by a collective soul, by the spirit of community, through which all support and work for all.

If we want community we must want the spirit of community. For this reason I reject the co-called Communist society (which lacks the wholehearted unanimous support of a large proportion of the

FREEDOM PRESS

- VOLINE :**
Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed) cloth 12s. 6d.
- E. A. GUTKIND :**
The Expanding Environment 8s. 6d.
- V. RICHARDS :**
Lessons of the Spanish Revolution 6s.
- MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI :**
Neither East nor West cloth 10s. 6d., paper 7s. 6d.
Workers in Stalin's Russia 1s.
- SELECTIONS FROM FREEDOM**
Vol. 1, 1951, Mankind is One paper 7s. 6d.
Vol. 2, 1952, Postscript to Posterity paper 7s. 6d.
- TONY GIBSON :**
Youth for Freedom paper 2s.
Food Production and Population 6d.
Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.
- ★
Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications :
Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute cloth 5s.
Journey Through Utopia cloth 16s. (U.S.A. \$2.50)
- ★
K. J. KENAFICK :
Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx paper 6s.

27, Red Lion Street, London, W.C.1.

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS
TABOO ON TENDERNESS

I WAS very interested to read Giovanni Baldelli's article *The Idolatry of Adulthood* in FREEDOM of 10th April. To my mind this point of view, which I fully share, has never been better put than by Ian Suttie in his book *The Origins of Love and Hate* (London, 1935). In this book he largely comprehends the ideas of Homer Lane and A. S. Neill, and also anticipates the conclusions of Dr. John Bowlby and of D. H. Stott whose proofs of the fundamental importance of the early mother-relationship are so much in vogue to-day.

In his chapter on the "Taboo on Tenderness" (pp. 86-96) Suttie says:

"What we call tender feeling and affection is based not on sexual desire but on the emotional and fondling relationship with the mother and upon the instinctual need for companionship which is characteristic of all animals which pass through a phase of nurture at infancy. The brusqueness of the cleanliness training, the frequent and prolonged separation of mother and infant, and the mother's own intolerance of tenderness bring about a precipitated 'psychic parturition', attended by an anxiety, acquisitiveness, and aggressiveness which is reflected in our culture and economic customs and attitudes . . .

"We find that circumstances and certain peculiarities of temperament cause the mother unduly to accelerate the psychic parturition. One by one the attentions formerly enjoyed by the infant are withdrawn and this is appreciated by the child mind as a withdrawal of love, and more important still, as meaning that its love and itself are not wanted or welcome to the mother. The child must then either 1. develop companionships and interests in lieu of the contracting love-absorption, or 2. fight for its rights and/or 3. find surreptitious regressions or substitutes (delinquency or psychopathy), or 4. submit and avoid the pain of privation by repression (the taboo on tenderness) . . . The repression of affection seems therefore to be a process likely to be accumulative from one generation to another. The mother who was herself love-starved, and who in consequence is intolerant of tenderness, will be impatient of her own children's dependency, regressiveness and claims for love . . . This on the one hand constitutes in the children a temptation to abandon the struggle in favour of regressive dreams or to cultivate invalidism. Or, on the other hand, it may lead to a jealous competitiveness, the quest for power, position, prestige, possession. Love has now become aggressive, anxious, covetous . . .

Truly Civilized..

IN his review of "Sex in History" Arthur W. Uloth writes that "the people of Medieval Europe were licentious to a degree that is difficult for us to grasp now, nor must it be imagined that it was sexual freedom of the type the anarchists would like to see." He says that "nakedness too was not regarded with shame," implying that it should have been. But to-day the taboo against nakedness is an obstacle to a decent attitude on sex. Clothing encourages prudery by habitually hiding the body, and so indirectly suggesting that it ought to be hidden. Ours is a prurient society. But truly civilized men and women will no longer read erotic literature, nor have a "lavatory joke" attitude towards sex; they will neither be shocked by nor laugh at nakedness. In a free society people will be able to dress as they like, or wear no clothes at all, according to their individual tastes. At present all of us, soldiers and civilians alike, wear uniforms. We are compelled by the law to wear clothes, whether we want to or not. We wear the remembrances of our lost innocence, the uniform of authority—clothes. Modesty is a fault, it is truly a great weakness which will not permit us to look upon another without blushing, and without lewd thoughts and lustful emotions. We are born naked, but by being compelled to wear clothes we come to believe that it is shameful to be seen as we are.

There is only one way to avoid indecency, and that is to avoid mystery. Custom so much prevails upon our minds that we would believe anything necessary that we practice from our births. The more clothing one wears the more one's body loses its natural resistances, and the more one feels cold. The human skin is really a wonderfully adaptive organ. But we do not allow it to develop properly; we stifle it in clothes. A man who is accustomed to go heavily clad feels no warmer than one who is used to wearing little or nothing.

DOUGLAS MUIR MACTAGGART.

"Where the child has not been wounded by the refusal of love or by the rejection of his own, it does not need to develop the character hard and cold, contemptuous of enthusiasms and incapable of loyalties; it does not develop a defensive inhibition of an unresponsiveness to feeling. Another important consequence follows. The undefended, unreserved character makes a far better parent. Not having any anxious regrets for lost childhood to repress (or not repressing them) such an adult has no aversion to children or em-

barrassment under their attention and appeals. He makes effective contact with children because he has a childlike or feminine mind. There need be no lack of strength, resolution or penetrative capacity in mind, he has merely not cut out what our culture teaches us to despise. Have we not mistaken a mere desertion or suppression of the openness of childhood for maturation, manhood, and regarded this negative quality as good in itself?"

ANTHONY WEAVER.

Beaconsfield, April 19.

ATTLEE AND FEAR

MR. ATTLEE'S speech in the House of Commons on the Hydrogen Bomb (reported in FREEDOM, April 10th) was a typically "statesmanlike" attempt to solve a problem with platitudes. Nevertheless I feel there was more in it than warranted the lumping generalisation which you used to criticise it. In particular his reference to fear, "which should be encouraged to grow", contain a necessary truth, that the British people are insufficiently concerned about the danger of atomic and H-bomb warfare. Either they are lulled into a false sense of security by elaborate civil defence preparations or else they believe that the new bombs will never be used on their own homes.

When they are asked their opinion of the latest methods of destruction in Kenya or South East Asia or somewhere else equally remote, if they have thought about it at all they will reply with the usual phrases seen in the newspapers—"resisting aggression", "defending the free world" and so on. Were there the slightest possibility that the war would reach the shores of Britain or that British soldiers were being killed like Kenyans then the response might be very different. This small-minded insularity, coming when it does against problems of international significance, seems almost criminal.

When I was at the cinema recently watching the newsreel of the Hydrogen bomb explosions in the Pacific, someone in the row in front of me remarked, "doesn't bear thinking about, does it?" That is one way of escaping from the problem; another way is to retreat into a narrow parochialism which occasionally finds expression in your columns. Lack of concern in these problems may not worry Mr. Dulles and Mr. Eden who like to work and scheme unimpeded by public opinion, but it must surely alarm right-thinking people.

The only answer is to make the public

alive to the reality of the Hydrogen bomb to themselves. Unless people realise that world peace has been brought no nearer by it and that they have their own lives to lose, then the world will suffer for its apathy. "Fear" in this sense has the power of forcing one to think about things, maybe for the first time, at any rate with a new seriousness. The danger that fear will drive many into hysterical acts is less than that absence of fear will cause a general apathy as a result of which nothing will be done.

I may have misunderstood the meaning of your article, but I feel sure I have expressed what was behind Mr. Attlee's words.

Thorton Heath, Surrey P. J. HITCH.

The Future of the Family

Continued from p. 3

rived their undeniably creative power from a diversion of the normal human desire to have a home and family. It has always been recognised that the man who has a wife and children has given hostages to fortune and is less likely to be unsettled, ambitious and destructive in his relations with society. A position in the family takes something from the individual—as is recognised, for instance, in the prohibition on the marriage of priests—but it does give a possibility of satisfactory expression of personal relationships and the creative instinct entirely denied to the non-attached individual, who needs to be strong indeed to prevent deterioration, or assimilation as a 'true believer' into some mass-movement which substitutes passion for affection and obedience for creation.

It is easy to see and to label the things that are dangerous in modern society; all that is needed is to clear the mind of

MOST religions have a spring rite, connected at least in origin with fertility; and the Nordic religion was no exception. It is not certain exactly when it took place in pre-Christian times, but the evidence of witchcraft trials is that by the thirteenth century it was held on the first day of May.

Certain aspects of the pagan festival—the name "Easter" and the custom of eating eggs and hot cross buns—survive in the North-Western Christian celebrations of God's resurrection. Certain others, including the election of a May Queen, the procession of children, and the date, survive in the secular May Day celebration; a feast intended no longer to placate the supernatural, but merely to rejoice in growth, and rebirth, and the pleasant phenomena of spring.

Shortly after the foundation of the Second Socialist International, it was decided that the workers' organisations affiliated to that body should all call as big a strike as possible on a particular day each year, partly in favour of the eight-hour-day and other benefits, but mostly to show the workers' power. The date chosen for International Labour Day, as it was called, was May first. And it was appropriate that it should coincide with the spring celebration, for in the opinion of its originators, it was to symbolize and rejoice in the growth of class consciousness, and the rebirth of humane society.

The idea caught on. Industrial workers liked the idea of a holiday on that day, and May Day strikes of more or less growing success were staged in various countries for several decades.

When it began to decline (or indeed whether it has in fact declined) is a

matter of some dispute. It is frequently contended that when, at the accession of the Bolsheviks in Russia, and later the Social Democrats in Austria, it was made a State holiday instead of a strike, it ceased to demonstrate the workers' power. But the Second International saw the Workers' State as the next important development in the class struggle.

So from the Marxist point of view, a parade of the Red Army past the Kremlin, from which the Little Fathers of the working class, perched like a row of benevolent vultures, watch, is as much a demonstration of proletarian power as a strike in a capitalist country.

The Nazi régime in Germany also had a State holiday and parade on the first of May. It is an effort to think of this as a display of working class power, but hardly more than that required to think of the Moscow parade as such. It is easier to argue that May Day has declined in Britain. For in the early 1920's the date of International Labour Day was shifted, in Britain, to the first Sunday in May.

Our comrade W. McCartney represented the Catering Trade at the meeting of the (London) May Day Celebration Committee where the change was first suggested. Herbert Morrison, as Labour Party delegate, proposed, as an amendment to the motion to have a demonstration, that it should take place not on the first day, but on the first Sunday of May. The amendment was defeated, and the Labour Party left the committee. That year the May Day demonstration in Hyde Park was without Labour support, and the Labour Party had local meetings on its chosen day.

And after a couple of years the May Day Committee ceased to meet. Moderate socialism had won the day in Britain, and the growing May Day demonstrations of workers' solidarity, ceased to interfere with the working week.

The smaller Socialist Parties have since seen the wisdom, and appreciated the saving of funds, of adding their strength to the Labour Party parades. A frequent arrangement for local May Day processions since the war (greatly, but not actively, resented by many Labour stalwarts) is that the Communist Party have the noisiest banners and the Labour Party pays for the band.

Of course, there are still annual demonstrations on May the first, in Hyde Park and elsewhere. They are organised, and mostly attended by ever-smaller groups of ever-older socialists, who think back rather than forward, and for whom optimism concerning the future is replaced by nostalgia for the optimism that was.

The May Day strike should be mentioned in all histories of working-class movements; for in its way and in its time it was one of the most successful. But it is dead. D.R.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting
 HYDE PARK
 Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

NORTH-EAST LONDON

DISCUSSION MEETINGS
 IN EAST HAM
 Alternate Wednesdays
 at 7.30 p.m.

GLASGOW

INDOOR MEETINGS
 at Workers' Open Forum
 50 Renfrew Street, Glasgow.
 Every Thursday at 7 p.m.
 Sunday, May 9. 7 p.m.
 M. Kramisch, on
 Women, Propaganda and the
 Revolution

L. & P.A.

Malatesta Club

CONTRIBUTIONS RECEIVED:

London: R.H. 10/-; J.B. 2/-; Cazenove Group £1/1/0; S.F. £1; A.S. 4/-; Bromley: R.P. 10/-; Chilcompton: J.C. 9/-; Leeds: M.F. £5; New York: J.S. £1/15/0; Glasgow: B.A. 5/-; Lakewood, N.J.: S.M. £2.

	£	s.	d.
Total	12	16	0
Previously acknowledged	117	14	9
GRAND TOTAL	£130	10	9

The Petrov Affair Continued from p. 1

sian régime for years had here for the first time clear evidence of resistance on the part of Russian workers. But the powerful significance of this refusal was completely lost on the daily press, who scarcely troubled to report it. Of course, these men were only workers and peasants: they had no State secrets to turn over to the secret police of other nations.

Not even when a woman of such intellectual eminence and integrity as Professor Martin Buber's daughter Frau Buber-Neumann returned from imprisonment in Russia did the press make use of the information she could give. It was only during the Kravchenko libel case in Paris, which hit the headlines because Kravchenko, like Krivitsky and Petrov, was a high-up in the régime, and so had proportionately more beans to spill, that Frau Buber-Neumann's story became of "importance" for she was the most telling of the witnesses against the Soviet Union.

The fact is that to the press as to governments a police official of the Soviet Union who turns over his special information is worth thousands of simple workers who refuse to return to an oppressive régime. To those who have fought totalitarian régimes for years, and are most alive to the totalitarian drift in the Western democracies, there is something peculiarly revolting in the moral obliquity which embraces these policemen-turned-informers. There is something repulsive about the zeal for freedom which such men show when they come to write newspaper articles or books, when their whole position in the Russian police apparatus must be built on the denial of such beliefs.

pressed satisfaction of the newspapers—Petrov was the chief of the M.V.D. network—so he will be able to give volumes of information. Mrs. Petrov was a cipher clerk—so she will be able to reveal all kinds of secrets which passed through her hands. It is all very repulsive.

The Anti-Soviet Refugees

It is obviously impossible to access the truth of many newspaper reports, but on the face of it it does seem as if the part played by anti-Soviet refugees sheds a cleaner light on the affair of Mrs. Petrov. When Petrov decamped it was obvious that his wife would be held by the Soviet government as the use of relatives as hostages for good conduct has always been an established procedure in both the Soviet and Nazi régimes. The fact that anti-Soviet refugees in Australia congregated at the airport to protest against this practice was a demonstration of decent indignation and may very well have been the saving of Petrov's wife. One cannot completely rule out at this stage the Soviet charge that they were hand-picked and worked with the Australian authorities. But it seems very unlikely, if only because the airport officials and police assisted the Russian "diplomats" who hustled her on to the plane. One gets the impression that the Australian secret police only intervened after the indignation of the crowd had made clear that they were, by indifference, conniving at the Soviet abduction of Mrs. Petrov.

If this is so, the power of individuals to make their indignation felt is once again vindicated.

(Khokhlov—see Editorial Comment, p.3.)

Equally unpleasant is the openly ex-

FREEDOM
 The Anarchist Weekly
 Postal Subscription Rates:
 12 months 17/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)
 6 months 8/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)
 3 months 4/6 (U.S.A. \$0.75)
 Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies:
 12 months 27/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)
 6 months 13/6 (U.S.A. \$2.25)
 Cheques, P.O.'s and Money Orders should be made out to FREEDOM PRESS, crossed a/c Payee, and addressed to the publishers:
FREEDOM PRESS
 27 Red Lion Street
 London, W.C.1 England
 Tel.: Chancery 8364