In this Issue :
Book Reviews - - p. 2
Human Life is Sacred - p. 3
Socialist International - p. 2

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"A great part of what is called government is mere imposition."

—THOMAS PAINE.

Vol. 15, No. 20. May 15th, 1954 Threepence.

Science, the Bomb & the Public

THE hydrogen bomb has once more brought into public discussion the rôle of the scientist in public life. And just as the moral implications of the bomb present the scientist with a dilemma, so the social use of science faces a dilemma—for on the one hand the public turn in horror and fear from the science which has brought us nuclear fission, while on the other it still looks to science to solve problems of food supply, of disease, of civil production.

FREEDOM has never thought it very profitable in such a world to condemn scientists out of hand, still less science. The problem is too deep for that and it lies behind not merely the bomb, but war itself and poverty and the general defeat of human hopes for happiness. The real problem is the world which makes scientists, often after soul-tearing self questioning conceive it their duty to work on atomic bomb projects.

The private and public dilemma of nuclear scientists was discussed with candour and sincerity by Dr. J. Bronowski in an article entitled "Scientists and the Bombs" in the *Observer* of 9/5/54, and also in the remarkable introductory essay to his prize-winning radio play "The Face of Violence". Bronowski is an altogether remarkable figure. His scientific work has given him a place as technical adviser to the Coal Board and he was a member of the commission of investigation which went out to study the effects of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombs in 1945. That is one side of his activity: another is expressed in "The Face of Violence" a work of poetic penetration into the human causes of the world's cruelty, and in his revealing book on Blake. He was also one of those who spoke on the platform organized by Freedom Press to protest against Franco's political persecutions, and on that occasion his speech made the most profound effect on the meeting by its sincerity and its emotional and intellectual profoundness.

With this background Bronowski's presentation of the atom scientists' moral problem was bound to be unusually significant. It certainly has all the candour of sincerity and deep moral earnestness as well as extraordinary clarity in presenting the essentials. And in achieving this it also reveals the weakness of Bronowski's own arguments where he accepts contemporary social conceptions. For these reasons, his article merits examination in detail.

Bronowski describes the distress of the Los Alamos scientists when they learnt late in July 1945 that the atomic bomb was to be dropped on Japan. "They sent a round robin to President Truman urging that the scale and implications of the bomb were too grave, and should be demonstrated in some less deadly way." The then Secretary of State of War in the United States has since given the military reasons why their scruples were overruled. Alas, history has not been kind to his name over tactical reasoning."

He shows that the scientists were by no means irresponsible in their acceptance of work on the atomic bomb. "When the physicists went to Los Alamos, they had, of course, no doubt of their duty. They guessed that the Germans were working on nuclear energy: they believed that such work would lead to a bomb: and they feared that the bomb—a monopoly of the bomb—would inflict instant defeat. *This is the heavy gist of the letter which Einstein, after a life- time of pacifism, wrote to President Roosevelt a month before the War.* And in all these guesses the dutiful scientists were right."

The reaction of public opinion six years later after Hiroshima, was horror-stricken and Bronowski quotes the succinct comment to the Mass Observation Survey—"Scientists—I'd like to drown the lot". FREEDOM does not share the anti-science recoil from the bomb, but there seems little doubt that many anarchists do substantially endorse the comment to Mass Observation. There is a tendency among radicals to denounce in a sweeping way all intellectualism, all careful and thorough preoccupation with the details of a problem. Isaiah Berlin (another man of brilliance who from outside the world of affairs, has yet managed to illuminate the contemporary scene in a most penetrating way), Isaiah Berlin in his broadcast talks on the enemies of freedom traced this tendency, which anarchists and socialists share also with fascists and other mass-reactionaries, to Rousseau.

The problems of the bomb and the men who have created it are not to be solved, by rejection but by analysis and understanding—imaginative understanding, that is, not mere intellectual probing and clever-clever stuff.

Horrified by the bomb, the public has turned on the scientists. The public sense of guilt over the Japanese bombing "vents itself on the figure of the scientist, powerful yet fragile, a scapegoat for a world that fears and conspires its own destruction". Yet it is here that Bronowski's argument begins to reveal its weaknesses. He continues: "For, of course, the scientist, anywhere in the world is only the scapegoat for the nations that set him to his task . . . " Of course it was not the nations, but the governments, which set him to his task. Even so, while making the point, anarchists should not press it too triumphantly. Bronowski clearly implies that the governments expressed the will of the nations: and despite the public reaction, there is much truth in this, for if the public know nothing, as Roosevelt did, of the conceptions and fears of an enemy atomic bomb, yet they supported the "effective prosecution of the war", that blanket phrase that covers all and every means without moral distinction.

Bronowski goes on to declare that "the community has no right to protest that 'they ought not to invent such things.' To ask the scientist not to make, or not to tell us, the

☛ Continued on p. 3

F.B.I. PROBES U.S. ANARCHIST

A reader in Seattle, Washington, U.S.A. writes:

"About the time when I would have sent a money order I was summarily dismissed from my job. It took me several weeks to find another, which luckily I managed—but as you can appreciate I had thoughts of little else other than getting myself re-employed as quickly as possible—particularly as meanwhile I was going more and more into debt.

"Ostensibly this was as a result of my job dissatisfaction and the knowledge that I had been looking for other work. However the night before leaving the boss told me that as a result of my name appearing in 'Individual Action' had been investigated for about two months by the F.B.I. who had pronounced me a 'subversive'.

"I am not certain that this was the basic reason behind dismissal—though it is possible—and I feel honoured if it were so to be in such good company. During the last war I was investigated by the F.B.I. for 9 months because of my C.O. stand so it is not a new experience.

"I will do my best to send something before the month is over. The paper has been displayed regularly each week, and such copies as are unsold are always distributed throughout the districts of Seattle together with the 'Industrial Worker", etc., by a Comrade—so they are never wasted.

"Despite such incidents as mine America is not a Storm-trooper rid country—though so it may seem cumulatively to you comrades abroad—but the picture by contrast with some years ago is a shameful one and the arrogant and fear-ridden stupidity of the officials in power make one ashamed to live in America to-day.

"Will write again as soon as I can. Meantime every good wish to you and FREEDOM."

. . . INTO PLOUGHSHARES

There are more than 46,000 tractors in use on Scottish farms according to the biennial census of agricultural machinery, taken at February 18 by the Department of Agriculture for Scotland. This is 4,000 more than two years ago, and nearly double the 1946 figure. Tractor trailers have increased since 1952 by about 5,000 to over 44,000, and combine harvesters from 785 to nearly 1,250.

Socialist Discipline

THE revolt of the 65 Labour members including three of the party whips has brought into prominence the whole conflict between discipline and conscience in the political manifestation of mass socialism. The politically minded with Morrison as their typical spokesman argue that unity is the source of strength and that that unity must be enforced. The older view that the strength of socialism lies in its moral sincerity and earnestness is now only faintly voiced in the ranks of official Labour.

Morrison's view was put forward in the now famous article in "Socialist Commentary". "The man or woman who is truly on the Left is the man or woman who gets things done—gets things changed for the better. The man or woman who is on the Right is the man or woman who does not get things done and improved but plays into the hands of the Tories and"—and here speaks the Fabian Society and the whole philosophy of reformist socialism —"and helps us lose elections."

The need for discipline is chiefly felt by leaders needing to impose this policy on the rank and file. The leaders of the Labour Party simply rejected the advice of the working party who had been studying the hydrogen bomb, that members should abstain, without getting that rejection ratified by the Parliamentary Party. Hence the revoluting members and the whips may well have felt that they were not endorsing a majority decision arrived at by democratic procedure.

A Whip's Recantation

But the dilemma of the Party member is even more sharply defined by one of the rebelling whips who recanted and so was received back into the fold. In itself there is something distasteful in the mitigating of punishment for those who recant and ask for forgiveness. Mr. Taylor—the whip in question—wrote to the Chief Whip in these terms:

"I have received your letter (*i.e.* of dismissal) of last night with the very greatest regret and I fully appreciate the reasons for it. The principle involved is whether a Whip should, on any occasion, no matter how strongly he feels, depart from a decision reached by those to whom his colleagues have given the responsibility and the authority to make decisions. I agree that he should not do so, and that you are entitled to be sure that he will not do so.

"Therefore I hope I make it clear that I have no feeling of rancour or ill-will . . . In this clash of loyalties my greater one should have been to you and the department . . . "

If there is any hope for the Labour Party it lies rather in the defiance of another of the Whips, Mr. Royle, who is reported to have declared:

"I believe profoundly that I was in the right in the issue before the House. I have no regrets about my action, and I feel very strongly on the manufacture of the hydrogen bomb. My only regret, as one who has tried to serve the party for more than four years as a Whip, is that a minor incident is being 'worked up' as a party split. It is no such thing."

This incident shows that on an emotional issue as strong as the hydrogen bomb, even case-hardened party members are restive in the party strait jacket.

The point surely is this: that majority decisions arrived at after full and *general* discussion are all right if the majority do not feel very strongly about it. But where a minority are vehement in their feeling that a particular course is wrong, the fact that a majority is against them, becomes of no importance and it is quite wrong to commit any body of men to a policy where such divided opinion is evident. This is the way in which all small executive groups work, but such common sense methods have no place in such a massive, disciplined, political organization like the Labour Party.

American Trade Recession Halted ?

AMERICAN sources report that the end of the trade recession is in sight. So far as one can ascertain, it means that the fall in production and the increase in unemployment are apparently halted but not that there is a likelihood of an increase of consumption to absorb the energies of the 4 milion unemployed in industry and agriculture. Actually in April unemployment did drop by 260,000, but this figure is below the normal seasonal increase in jobs.

According to the American government departments concerned as well as from the reports of many industries and investment houses the following is the general conclusion: that the post-war hunger for consumer goods, the inflation caused by the Korean war, and the economic decline which set in after the Korean truce, are definable and finished periods.

A question of perhaps less academic interest is to know whether the process is to be repeated in the case of Indo-China.

★

Worldover Press reporting on the recent Inter-American Conference at Caracas, the Venezulian capital, quotes a "prominent International Official" as saying:

"There is a great resurgence of the common people of these republics, which cannot be stopped. They are determined to cease living on twenty cents a day. If the United States will not buy their products at a price that will give them improved living conditions, they will sell to those who will do so. This means that they will sell to the other great market, the Communist. That is the great unchangeable fact that all the resolutions in the world will not affect."

Now the United States is vitally interested in Latin America, and the two topics discussed at the Conference—Communism and trade—reflected this. Dollar Imperialism (and its stranglehold on a people can be more effective—and profitable—than the old-fashioned British variety of trying to physically occupy large tracts of Africa) in Latin America has assumed huge proportions. Investments in 1952 totalled almost $6,000 million (£2,000 million) which is about 39% of the total in the world. The net income from these investments amounted to $600,000,000 (£200,000,000), more than 40% of the total in all areas. Export and import trade between the U.S. and Latin America in the same year amounte to $7,000 million (2,400 million).

This (profitable) relationship between the Americas was summed up in these noble words by the American Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles:

"The unity which generally prevails between us (American republics) . . . exists because of a harmony of the spirit . . . We believe that man has his origin and destiny in God. We believe that this fact requires human brotherhood. We believe that nations, like men, are subject to moral law."

And we had always thought that alone among the world's politicians, the Americans could be relied on to call a spade a spade . . . or a dollar a dollar, without dragging God into it!

Death of a Prisoner

A MAN named Ernest Robinson, imprisoned in Wandsworth, died after being transferred to a hospital with haemorrhage from the stomach. The Coroner's jury stated that they thought that the fact that he was not sent to another hospital sooner than he was accelerated his death.

The Chief Medical Officer at Wandsworth, Dr. James Murdoch, denied in evidence that Robinson had complained that he had been told that there was nothing wrong with him and that he should get dressed.

"Mrs. Marjorie Robinson," according to the *Times* report, "said in evidence that Robinson told her the day before he was admitted to St. James Hospital that the prison doctor had told him there was nothing wrong with him and that he should get back to work. He said that the authorities threw his clothes at him and told him to get dressed."

Now it is difficult to see why the man's wife should lie in this circumstantial way, and it seems clear that the jury were not satisfied with the official point of view. (The prison Governor "investigated" Robinson's complaint by asking the prison doctor who told him there was no truth in it).

Those who have been in prison know that all too often complaints about illness are treated as malingering and this case will not seem to them very exceptional. But despite the jury's finding, it shows just how difficult it is to get the complaints of prisoners recognized outside the prison walls.

Pakistan - U.S. Arms Agreement Opposed

KARACHI (WP).—While it has been widely reported that the recent elections in East Pakistan showed a substantial political revolt against the Karachi government, it has not been as well known that the scame area has been manifesting strong disapproval of the Pakistan-U.S. arms agreement. There have been several enormous public gatherings to condemn the pact, one of them, at Dacca, drawing almost 50,000 people.

"Mr. Thompson of Cork"

***William Thompson: Britain's Pioneer Socialist, Feminist and Co-operator*, by Richard K. P. Pankhurst. (Watts & Co., 15/-).**

THE kindness and eccentricities of William Thompson are still current talk among the old folk of Glandore and Rosscarbery, near Cork. Relating the memories of their parents and grandparents, they speak of him as the best landlord and employer they ever had. To students of early 19th century socialism, however, he is remembered for other reasons: for his devastating critique of competitive capitalism; for his vigorous assertion of the right of the producers—'the industrious classes'—to the whole produce of their labour; and for that briliant feminist pamphlet *Appeal of One Half the Human Race, Women, against the Pretensions of the Other Half, Men.*

Thompson's position in the movement of protest against the inhumanities of rising industrial capitalism has for too long been overshadowed by the colossal figure of Robert Owen. He has been dismissed as one of the group of Owenite writers from whom Marx obtained several of his leading concepts—notably the doctrine of labour exploitation. In point of fact, as this excellent biographical study makes clear, he was an important figure in his own right. Intellectually the superior of Owen, his great achievement was to synthesize the utilitarianism of Bentham with the libertarian ideas of Godwin and the co-operative programme of Owen himself.

Born at Cork in 1775, the formative years of this member of 'the Idle Classes', as he styled himself, coincided with the violent political and social upheavals associated with the French and Industrial Revolutions. His early interest in educational experiments led to a friendship with Jeremy Bentham, the 'father' of the Utilitarian school of thought. But, although Thompson took over from Bentham the formula that the object of social science was the promotion of the greatest happiness of the greatest number, he rejected the fashionable middle class *laissez-faire* economics of Bentham's other followers. Starting with the Ricardian doctrine that labour was the source of all value, he proceeded to develop it to its revolutionary conclusion: that the producers of wealth were entitled to the full produce of their labours. Unlike his contemporary, Thomas Hodgskin, and anticipating the arguments used later by Kropotkin against the 'individualist' anarchists, Thompson realized that the new methods of machine production rendered impossible the return to each *individual* of the full value of his work. It was at this point that Owen's idea of self-supporting co-operative communities came into the picture. By joining together in associations and voluntarily abandoning their individual property rights, the workers, Thompson argued, could in one step free themselves from the bondage of landlord and capitalist and secure *collectively* their full rights. At the same time they could agree to share their products on an egalitarian basis according to need.

These ideas Thompson elaborated in his book *An Inquiry into the Principles of the Distribution of Wealth*, 1824, and in his shorter work *Labor Rewarded*, 1827. The *Inquiry* represents a landmark in the development of working class economics: until it was superseded by Marx's *Capital*, it was regarded by social revolutionaries as the workers' equivalent of Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*. The influence of Godwinism on Thompson is less direct but nevertheless unmistakeable. It is true that Thompson criticized what he considered to be the somewhat 'airy' intellectual speculations of Godwin and that he never rejected the principle of government as such but he had little faith in political action. He wanted a government reduced to a form of 'simple representative institutions', a government purely civil in character, based on persuasion alone and financed by voluntary taxes. The American Republic, the Moscow of the political radicals of his day, found little favour in his eyes.

In this respect Dr. Pankhurst, anxious to emphasize the importance of his subject, tends to place too much weight upon Thompson's sympathetic references to political reform and to his influence on the Chartists. Thompson was interested in political reform only in so far as it was likely to foster his community projects. His Chartist successors, on the other hand, staked their all on political reform. And it is from Chartism that stems, in this country at least, the doctrine which was almost the complete antithesis of Thompson's: State Socialism.

A more accurate conception of Thompson's work is obtained if one regards it as the economic supplement to Godwin's *Political Justice*. How near to Godwin's anarchism and how far from State Socialism were Thompson's ideas is evident in the three fundamental principles which he argues for in the *Inquiry*: (i) All labour ought to be free and voluntary as to its direction and continuance; (ii) All the products of labour ought to be secured to the producers of them; and (iii) All exchanges of these products ought to be free and voluntary—principles which are as valid to-day as when he first stated them.

'Mr. Thompson of Cork' was not only the profoundest thinker that the early co-operators produced, he was also an essentially practical man. The publication of his books placed him at the head of the growing band of co-operators in the late 1820's at a time when Owen himself was involved in the ill-fated community experiment at New Harmony in America. Conscious of the hazards of community building, Thompson published in 1830 his *Practical Directions for the speedy and economical establishment of communities on the principles of Mutual Co-operation, United Possessions and Equality of Exertions and of the means of enjoyment*. Not all his directions, it must be admitted, were of equal practical value. A firm advocate of birth control and of a stationary population, he deprecated what he called 'the one pillow system' of couples sharing the same bed and advised that 'the gentle motion of mere walking immediately after intercourse will prevent completion of conception'! But in other respects his book might still be read with profit by our latter-day communiteers.

A great merit of Dr. Pankhurst's book is that it brings out clearly for the first time the important cleavage of opinion that developed among the early co-operators between the 'Owenites' and the followers of Thompson. Owen's original plan for 'Villages of Co-operation' had been put forward on the assumption that it would be initiated by the Government or financed by loans from philanthropic capitalists. When the Government turned down his project and he had forfeited, through his out-spoken views on religion, the support he had obtained among the influential, he proceeded to invest—and to lose—his own fortune in the New Harmony community. He made little or no attempt to appeal to the working class direct. In fact his attitude to the working class was that of a benevolent autocrat who had little faith in the ability of the workers to manage their own afairs. When he returned from America he was surprised to find a flourishing movement of working-class co-operators eager to start a community in this country. Conscious of the immense personal sacrifices which he had made for the cause, he set himself up as their leader and assumed that they would naturally defer to his views. The co-operators themselves, however, had other ideas. Owen at this time was beginning to display signs of the megalomania which affected his later years. His plans became more grandiose every time he elaborated them. He now estimated that it would cost £240,000 to start a community. Such a sum could only mean one thing: that the workers would have to rely on the Government or on the philanthropic capitalists whom Owen assumed would be only too eager to invest in communism at 5%—provided that an experienced businessman like himself was in charge.

Thompson, profoundly sceptical of such a possibility, proposed the more realistic plan that a start should be made on a small scale with an 'incipient community', financed and organised by the workers themselves. He was repelled by Owen's autocratic outlook and insisted that the workers should have full con-

☛ Continued on p. 3

BOOK REVIEWS

Its all yours and you can keep it

***ENGLAND YOUR ENGLAND*, by George Orwell, (Secker & Warburg, 12/6).**

THIS collection of essays comprises those published in "Inside the Whale", a book now long out of print, to which have been added several others from various papers and magazines, plus some extracts from the "Road to Wigan Pier"—a fact I deplore because it looks as if this latter book is not going to be published in full in the "Collected Works". Still, it can still be seen occasionally on second-hand bookstalls.

This is an interesting, and (as they say) a "thought provoking", book. Unfortunately the thoughts provoked are sometimes that the author is being superficial and unfair in order to score off people, parties, and things that he does not like. His prejudices are too strong for him to be fair to his opponents, and there seems to be a continual war in his mind between his Tory past and his Socialist present. He could neither rid himself of one or the other, nor could he reconcile them in a typically English "compromise" as others have done.

The result is that he portrays most socialists as fools or hypocrites. If you are a supporter of the existing system you are wrong, but if you oppose it you are wrong again. In fact nothing you can do is right.

After reading right through the book it is impossible not to feel that the author hated his own side almost as much as he hated the capitalists, reactionaries, and Stalinists. He is a passionate defender of the oppressed, but he does not seem to have much use for the rest of the Left. He may well have sympathised with the anarchists but he clearly had no belief in anarchism. Among the brickbats flying about there are several especially aimed at anarchists " . . . take the fact certain jobs are absolutely necessary and yet are never done except under some kind of coercion."

No doubt many of his criticisms of the Left are just, but he is so denunciatory that one begins to fear exaggeration. Possibly in a way we are lucky who grew up during the war. We know only war. We have not seen the rise and fall of two great revolutions, the Russian and the Spanish, and all the disillusion, attempts at self-deception, and so on that have followed.

We live in an age of defeat, and having no hope we do not have so much cause to despair. But for a man like Orwell, who once must have had hopes of a better future, the disintegration of our society, and its dive towards totalitarianism, would naturally turn him more and more to pessimism. We on the other hand know that things are not yet so bad that they may not get worse, but we expect them to get worse, and so, whatever else we may suffer from, we are not likely to suffer disillusion, or to betray ourselves as many Socialists did in the inter-war years, by trying to pretend to ourselves that Soviet Russia was the paradise of to-morrow.

The longest part of the book is the essay dealing with Henry Miller, entitled "Inside the Whale". In this Orwell maintains that Miller's philosophy of life is one of acceptance, like Whitman's, even though Miller's world is not optimistic, expanding nineteenth century America, but Europe with its poverty and degradation. Miller is in the belly of a transparent whale, or, if you like, a womb with a view. He watches our society flow by. He does not fight it. He simply swims with the current, and meanwhile records everything impartially as it happens to him.

Miller himself claims that his books, particularly "The Tropic of Cancer" which is the one Orwell deals with principally, should give the reader courage. Personally I have tried hard to like Henry Miller. A great friend of mine, whose opinions I sometimes respect, told me that he was wonderful. I have read several of his books conscientiously trying to find the wonderfulness of them. And I only liked one, "The Colossus of Maroussi", that is so innocuous and respectable that it is published in the Penguins. To me his books seem to be mainly one long string of human misery, but there is no relief and no hope. I suppose I cannot get into the whale. Orwell would no doubt have liked to have done so. It is significant that when he passed through Paris on the way to Spain to fight in the Civil War he met Miller and found him quite uninterested in the struggle.

The title essay "England Your England" is another of those all-too-numerous pieces of patriotic apologetics. It consists to a certain extent of the kind of defence that is simply a matter of saying, "Though there may well be bad things here, look how much worse things are abroad." Orwell maintains, as have many before him, that the English are an exceedingly gentle people.

"And yet the gentleness of English civilisation is mixed up with barbarities and anachronisms. Our criminal law is as out of date as the muskets in the Tower. Over against the Nazi Storm Trooper you have got to set that typically English figure, the hanging judge, some gouty old bully with his mind rooted in the nineteenth century, handing out savage sentences. In England people are still hanged by the neck and flogged with the cat-o'-nine-tails. Both of these punishments are obscene as well as cruel, but there has never been any genuine popular outcry against them. People accept them (and Dartmoor, and Borstal) almost as they accept the weather. They are part of 'the law', which is assumed to be unalterable.

"Here one comes upon an all-important English trait: the respect for constitutionalism and legality, the belief in 'the law' as something above the State and above the individual, something which is cruel and stupid of course, but at any-rate *incorruptible*."

Well of course there may be something abnormal about me, but there are two things which I have never been able to share with my fellowmen even when I was still a conservative in every way: one is a genuine love of country, and the other is indignation at the thought of adolescents having sexual intercourse. The fury that unpatriotism, and unchastity among youngsters, rouse in my fellow citizens has always bewildered me. It still does. Orwell writes earlier ("Notes on Nationalism" p .41) of the extraordinary way a person's reasoning capacities become upset by his loyalty to some form or other of nationalism. But he seems to be perilously near becoming an example of this himself. He clearly approves this English attitude he describes.* It is no consolation to me if the man who orders me to be flogged is as incorruptible as Robespierre. Hitler too was incorruptible according to his lights. Certainly most of the worst and most efficient dictators have not been men to take bribes. Slavish men, and Orwell certainly was not one, tend to admire incorruptible dictators, who are often the cruellest of the lot.

But Orwell in despair sought the lesser evil. Unfortunately the lesser evil has a habit of turning quite rapidly into the greater. If we are to have any patriotism let it be to the free society that we intend to make if we can. As far as I am concerned I am prepared to make a free gift of my England to anyone who wants it. They are welcome to it—exploitation, Empire, Borstals, hanging judges, "our noble police", and the Sun Goddess herself. All of it.

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

*EDITORIAL NOTE: *We feel that our reviewer has here misunderstood Orwell, who certainly did not approve all this. It is true that compared with Continental or American systems, English law is incorruptible in the sense that it cannot be bought off with bribes. At the trial when the affairs of Stanley were being examined by the Lynsky Tribunal many Continental newspapers could not understand what was objectionable.*

PROGRESS?

ONE of the excuses made for the British Empire is that it has helped to raise the standard of living of the colonial peoples. However:

"To this day Belize, the capital, has no running water, not even any sewerage. Hawks and catfish are the drainage-men of Honduras. Eight hundred years ago, under the Mayas, there were ten times more people than to-day." (Belize is the capital of British Honduras).

News Chronicle, 1/5/54.

Theatre

The Manor of Northstead

"THE MANOR OF NORTHSTEAD", the new comedy by William Douglas-Home, is an indirect sequel to his famous stage and screen success, *The Chiltern Hundreds*. It has the same characters, only in this play the setting is an island in the Hebrides, and once again the author subtly satirises democracy, political parties, parliamentary candidates, campaigns and elections—the whole absurd paraphernalia and mystic mumbo-jumbo of the religion of the ballot-box. An elector is one who enjoys the sacred privilege of voting for the man of another man's choice; a politician is one who undertakes the management of your affairs in order to further his own interests. But people have lost their faith in gods only to put it in governments. There is always quite a lot of unaccustomed candour in the plays of William Douglas-Home; *The Manor of Northstead* is a delightful comedy, with, as one expects, a deliciously amusing performance by A. E. Matthews as Lord Lister. The Listers are the guests of their butler and his wife at the latter's fishing-lodge in the Isle of Whisk. In the first act we hear a radio announcement that the sitting member for the division has probably been drowned. If only this would happen to all politicians and rulers! Lord Cleghorn, the Labour peer (what sardonic mockery of freedom and equality such a thing is!), has no difficulty in persuading himself to be nominated for the vacant seat. The butler, who is a passionate Conservative, has no difficulty in persuading the Labour peer's wife to stand in the Conservative interest. Neither of them knows that the other has done this, and they are very indignant when the truth is revealed. Sir Ronald MacRonald, the sitting member, staggers into the lodge at the end of the second act announcing that he has been wrecked. They keep him locked in the cellar until eleven o'clock the next morning, when it is too late for him to put in his nomination for the general election. Lord Lister's unambitious son is goaded by his energetic American wife to stand as a Liberal. There is a diverting climax in which the rival sponsors listening to the general election results on the wireless are awarded by Lord Lister a glass of brandy for every gain made by their respective parties. They are too drunk to realise that their parties have won an exactly equal number of seats and that the single Liberal returned for the Isle of Whisk has the fate of the country in his hands. Naturally when they hear of this unprecedented situation the following morning they are very perplexed and dissatisfied with it.

★

Marching Song

"MARCHING SONG" (at the St. Martin's Theatre) should not be missed by anyone who wishes to see a thoughtful, intelligent play of quite unusual interest—exciting, uncomfortable and queerly impressive. Mr. John Whiting is one of the most interesting playwrights in the London theatre to-day; his earlier play *Saint's Day*, showed that his was an outstanding new talent. It is to be hoped that he will enrich our somewhat poverty-stricken theatre with even more brilliant plays in the future. His characters have that mixture of the true and the overdrawn that is the very stuff of the drama, and they are presented in the confident way that lifts you along with them into his dramatically conceived world. *Marching Song* is a play for which we should be deeply grateful; its principal theme is that of the crushing of the individual by the forces of organised society. It has several scenes of terrible irony and bitter disillusionment.

D.M.M.

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 15, No. 20. May 15, 1954

SCIENCE, THE BOMB AND THE PUBLIC

☛ Continued from p. 1

discoveries which we as a nation have commissioned from him, is to go back on our word. The responsibility for having research done on uranium or hydrogen, the responsibility for having research done on death is a communal responsibility. We cannot shift it to the shoulders of the man we depute to do it."

Significantly enough, scientists themselves recoil from work on nuclear fission. Work in this field offers an exciting field for young physicists, "yet there are signs that some young men, at least in America, are now reluctant to enter this cloistered work, and are moving to other sciences. There are older men who worked on these matters during and after the war who have since left them. *They cannot lose their old secrets, but they can refuse to make or share new ones.* Each such choice is individual, an objection to war-work on grounds of private conscience."

But have Russian scientists such individual rights of withholding their ability? Can one see such a right officially upheld in the America of McCarthy—where Oppenheimer who argued against the hydrogen bomb was "charged for his pains with having been disloyal"?

The public at large cannot avoid responsibility for the work of the scientists even though they do not initiate it or see it unfolding. But insofar as they are ready to delegate the organization of affairs to the State—in this and in many other fields—Bronowski is right to face them with responsibility, even though he is wrong to imply that the State speaks for the nation.

The State remains the executive committee of the ruling class, and one must not be too harsh about the responsibility of men and women generally, since the State uses every kind of trick of misrepresentation, propaganda and downright lies, to make men and women believe that it acts in their interest. This gigantic apparatus for hoaxing, cajoling and threatening and intimidating the ruled is continually discussed and analysed by anarchist propaganda, and our movement knows better than any other just how difficult it is for ordinary men and women to see affairs clearly through the mists of official newspapers. Nevertheless, while we reject the too simple fastening of responsibility on to "the nation" which Bronowski seems to accept, we are very far from denying that ultimately responsibility must lie on the shoulders of every man and woman participating in society. If scientists would see more clearly the moral obliquity of governments (their general distaste for public affairs is an instinctive reaction to it) they would themselves achieve more profound responsibility. Einstein was no longer content to accept a purely pacifist attitude that it did not matter what "the other side" did, and anarchists traditionally are dissatisfied with such an acceptance. But anarchists, in rejecting the bomb and all the rest of the "lesser-evil" philosophy in public affairs must of necessity work out a practical alternative—practical—that is in the real sense, not in the narrower sense of the East-West conflict and the economic drive towards war, but in the achieving of a world where men and women can live and develop their creative powers, and children can grow up without distortion of their character and functioning.

In this wider and revolutionary conception, the atom bomb becomes just one more symptom of the old world along with war, poverty famine, socially created unhappiness and frustration.

Human Life is Sacred

IN an article which appeared in FREEDOM some time ago, under the same title as this, but put in the interrogative form, Arthur W. Uloth reasoned out that people who consider human life as sacred do so because of a social taboo which is due to the fact that there is in man (or some men) a strong desire to take other people's life away. I do not purpose to discuss the existence, depth and range of such desire nor to argue with Arthur W. Uloth's line of thought, which I have oversimplified, but I wish to point out that the fact that something is strongly desired is not sufficient to account for the existence of a taboo. Generally, if a taboo is imposed to counter a desire, and not for some other unaccountable or disputable reason, it is necessary that the satisfaction of the desire should be considered harmful. In the case of human life this is obvious. If killing human beings was of no consequence either to the persons killed or to those most dearly attached to them the taboo would never have been imposed.. It is thus owing to the sorrowful effects of being suddenly deprived through murder of a person dear to one, or by an act of imagination showing to one how one's life could easily be terminated, that a tacit or explicit compact took place in a society to banish murder from it. This interpretation is also in keeping with the insufficient and badly formulated but widely shared view that all feelings of pity for others or moral injunctions that take other people's rights into account are based on self-pity and consideration for the rights of one's dear self.

But there is more to the sacredness of human life than a question of selfishness and taboo. Human life is a value. It is a value for us, whose ideas are steeped, whether we like it or not, in a long Christian tradition, and I am probably correct in stating that it is a value in the same sense also for those so-called primitive people from whom the concept of taboo has been derived.

Values come before reason, and if there is any biological connection between it and man as an organism, reason is in their service. When forgetting the organism reason either finds new values in an alleged anchoring in God or becomes the destroyer of values because pure reason, being essentially antinomic as Kant analysed, cannot yield values. It can in other words, and in all circumstances, prove a thing and its opposite or leave them equally unproved. A rational system of values is not, however, an impossibility, if reason is bent as closely and steadily as possible on looking for the most universal and basic human promptings. Choice is free, but the need to choose is not, and the conditions under which a choice is made are given together with human existence. Reason becomes itself a value when its choice never forgets the need and conditions of choice. It cannot choose being free from the organism unless it becomes indifferent to its destruction. Such is the reason of the Stoic and, on paper at least, of the godless existentialist. A believer, on the other hand, may persuade himself that his reason is thus free and at one with God, as did a Saint Augustine and a Malebranche, but he is soon reminded that it cannot be long and quite at one with God just because of the organism. Whether it can be anything when the organism is no longer we shall be able to tell for sure only when dead. According to the religionist God and values come first and living and reasoning afterwards, but whatever is meant in this case by before and afterwards, I think that no religionist will have qualms in conceding that as a matter of human experience life and reason come first, and then come the idea of God and any system of values. Of God as distinct from the idea of God it is, to say the least, hazardous to talk, while the greatest systems of values based on the idea of God do not substantially disagree with the conclusions reason can reach without the idea of God when looking for a solid criterion by which to establish and scale values.

Such criterion, I have suggested, is primacy and universality. For men the most primary and universal value is human life. If it is not nothing else can be. It is sacred in the sense that it is the source and condition of all values which also are sacred thanks to the life-serving irrational element which they all contain. Life comes before reason, and all reason depends on it, even the reason that should decide or prove that it is not sacred at all.

The concept opposed to that of value is the concept of power. Value is creative and power destructive. With any increase of power there is a decrease of value. Values are the effort of human wills and attachments to save man from the power of man. Anarchism, if it is anything at all, is a continual defence of values against power, and it would be a strange anarchism which did not consider life as sacred, which would not, at least inwardly, protest against a power destructive of human lives. It would also be a strange love of freedom, of freedom as a value and not as the power of doing what one likes, which would not flinch at the killing of a human being, as though that human being could be free and killed at the same time.

Freedom as value and freedom as power are quite often confused, if not in anarchist thought itself, in the anarchist's expression of his thoughts. It is by favouring or contriving this confusion that an opponent can usually hold his own, and more than his own, in an argument against the anarchist. The confusion is all the more likely to occur as values have power, and powers tend to pose as value. In the case of freedom power and value can actually be identical not only because the individual may find nothing but his power to oppose the power of others when the latter claims to monopolize all values, but also because freedom, as the power to choose, is equally the support and the foundation of all values.

Once, however, the subjectivity of others has been recognized, then the renunciation of power and the choice of value logically follow. In practice one is seldom, if ever, all given to values and never resorting to power. But the resort to power cannot be raised to a universal maxim, and all social living is made possible by a partly spontaneous and partly enforced renunciation of power. Freedom as power is the freedom of the strong to tread on the weak, the freedom of the exploiter to exploit, and of the government to govern. The current anarchist formula of freedom for everyone providing it does not impinge on the freedom of others still regards freedom as power, and it is hardly worth worrying, certainly not worth fighting, about. What matters most to a human being is his relationships with others, and these are not possible without impingement upon or renunciation of power. Only when freedom is a value, and a sharing in values do human relationships become positive and fertile, entailing no sacrifice.

To return to the sacredness of human life as the prime value a criterion is given by which to judge of all other values. It is a safe principle, which, but for a few exceptions, is shared by all anarchists, that a value is spurious, that is a non-value, that is a power disguised as value, when it is claimed that in its name human lives can or must be sacrificed. Such false values can be the State, the fatherland, society, even the happiness of all mankind.

When the sacredness of human life is denied, not for the sake of an argument, but with some practical application in view, it is the life of others that one has in mind. It is, in other words, to sanction murder. Since all people must die anyhow, there is nothing wrong, it is said, in killing some people off for a good cause, that is in order that some other people may more pleasantly live. But it is just because death is an integrant part of life that no man has the right to bring it to another. Man has the power to kill, but he has not yet the power to restore to life. Life and death are before and beyond the power of man. That is why they have always been regarded with awe. Awe, or its objectification, God, have always been the most effective counters to the power of man. The history of human emancipation is often given as the progressive reduction of the part played by awe and the fear of God in individual, social and intersocial life. It culminates with the motto of the Assassins, quoted by Nietzsche, that God is not and everything permitted. That is considered as the acme of human freedom and as the greatest affirmation of man's power. So it is. But this power, so exalted by Sartre and his school, is sheerly destructive, it is the power to do evil, the power to kill. It is the power ending all values, ending freedom itself as a value. But shall we doubt of this value as the choice not to do evil, as the choice not to kill?

GIOVANNI BALDELLI.

HOLY VIRGIN!

A PAPAL encyclical praising virginity in women and chastity in men has just been issued.

"One should not abstain from marriage for reasons of self-interest nor from fear of assuming its responsibilities, nor because of a Pharisaic pride in the integrity of the body, but in order to consecrate oneself more freely and fully to the service of God and neighbour . . .

"The majority of great works of the Church, such as hospitals, schools, orphanages, social works, not to mention religious orders vowed to apostolate and the missions, have been founded and directed by priests, religious men and women.

"Such prodigious activity would be rendered practically impossible by solicitude for the home or family cares."

The Pope also says that too much importance is given to sexual life in the search for a balanced way of living, implying I suppose that "sex is an overrated pastime". There exists a school of thought whose bible is Dr. J. D. Unwin's book "Sex and Culture", in which it is argued that sex-repression is necessary for the development of culture and civilisation. There is certainly no doubt at all that there is a correlation between Puritanism and energy, of a kind. But it usually seems to be the kind of energy that while it drives men to do constructive work usually drives them to do so by enslaving their fellows. The beneficial works to which the Pope refers have all been done, and better, by people enjoying a sex-life, but there can be no doubt that a person who voluntarily abjures sex gains an impulse to dominate, if he is naturally of an energetic temperament in the first place. The Jesuits, the various missionaries sent out to the far corners of the earth, the seventeenth century Puritans, the Spartans, and the Templars are all good examples of the energy that sexual repression can engender. They all did much harm, from which a little good may perhaps be extracted, I do not deny, and was that good worth all the rest? I doubt it.

I cannot help adding, though I think that it is a false alternative, that if we have to do without sexual freedom in order to have civilisation and progress I would prefer to sacrifice civilisation and progress.

A.W.U.

'Mr. Thompson of Cork'

☛ Continued from p. 2

trol of their own affairs. They were not, he said, prepared to change one master only for another. Much to his chagrin and despite his attempts to sabotage Thompson's plan, the 'benevolent Mr. Owen' was outvoted at the Co-operative Congresses of 1831 and 1832.

Before any progress could be made, however, Thompson succumbed to tuberculosis and died in the Spring of 1833. With his death the early co-operators lost the one man who might have succeeded in leading them into the Promised Land of community. Owen's leadership was never successfully challenged again. In his hands the co-operators—or socialists, as they began to call themselves—degenerated into a sect until they finally dispersed, disillusioned with the failure of their last great attempt at community, Queenwood in Hampshire, 1839-46, where Owen's benevolent despotism had once again bedevilled the hopes of his working class followers.

Although one may quarrel with the sub-title of his book—Thompson was not a socialist *and* a co-operator: in the brilliant dawn of the first workers' movement, co-operation, socialism and communism were practically synonymous terms, none of which had anything to do with the travesty later known as State Socialism—Dr. Pankhurst has performed a notable service in resurrecting the ideas of this remarkable Irish thinker. One lasting impression will be left on his anarchist readers. While 'socialism' has progressed and anarchism has succeeded in leaving no significant mark on the British working-class movement, we remain as far away as ever from the fulfilment of Thompson's ideal of a society based on the principles of 'mutual co-operation, united possession and equality of exertions and of the means of enjoyment'. It is more clear than ever today that the anarchist movement remains the repository of the hopes and aspirations of such pioneers as Mr. Thompson of Cork.

O.

The Chocolate Judge of Darmstadt

IN any other court, it might have seemed that the bench was having a little joke, but District Judge Karl Holzschuh of Darmstandt, Germany, meant every word he said. The defendant in the case was a 17-year-old boy who had just been convicted of stealing a motorcycle and roaring about the streets. The judge, however, had no intention of clapping him in jail. "You will never know the beauties of nature," said he, "if all you do is drive through it like a madman." The boy's sentence: a year-long membership in the local walking club.

In the past two years, Darmstadt has grown accustomed to such unorthodox punishments meted out by Karl Holzschuh. A kindly man of 46 with a fringe of yellow hair about his bald head, he is known throughout the district as the "Chocolate Judge" because he once sentenced a little girl, convicted of stealing chocolate, to donate a candy bar each week to an orphanage. More respectful Germans, however, have another name—"The Solomon of Darmstadt"—for the man chiefly responsible for cutting the local delinquency rate by 40%.

The theory behind the judge's sentences is a simple one. Except for obvious criminals, says he, most young people "have simply gone astray and must get another chance. They must perform some good deed related to the bad." Before each trial, Holzschuh tries to get to know the defendant. He makes the accused talk about his interests, asks him about the books he reads. Then, when the judge has heard the case, he makes the punishment fit the crime. Among the cases he has handled:

¶ A baker's appentice who stole a small sum of money from his employer. Sentence: to bake a batch of Easter bunnies for the children in the Darmstadt hospital.

¶ A 16-year-old boy convicted of robbing a younger boy in a swimming-pool locker room. Sentence: to help the younger boy with his school lessons for one year.

¶ Two boys who had "borrowed" two motorcycles. Sentence: to buy a year's subscription to *Die Bruecke*, a magazine for released convicts, and to take it each month to the Darmstadt prison. "Each time you go there," said the judge, "just think how terrible it would be if the big gates closed behind you."

¶ A 17-year-old employee of a Communist newspaper who was arrested for disturbing the peace in a Communist demonstration. Sentence: to read one "neutral" book each month and submit a report of it to the court. Result of the case: one new recruit to the anti-Communist cause.

Time, April 19th.

LUNAR POLITICS (OR FIRST THINGS FIRST)

I AM grateful to Arthur Uloth for exploding the scientific myth in his article "The Static Society" (FREEDOM, 10/4/54) and would like to reply, from what I believe is his point of view, to his critics Messrs. Wilson and Leadbitter. Incidentally, is it not somewhat paradoxical that Comrade Wilson should welcome Uloth's articles in general as "down-to-earth" yet cry shame on his lack of enthusiasm for space travel?

Science as the great emancipator is "a bit flyblown" because it was originally greeted with the enthusiasm accorded towards a new god whereas it should have been recognised as a mere tool in the hand of man capable of being used for good or evil. Man has become the tool and the fool and may not have much longer to live. Like Uloth I want to live a dull life of happiness.

Time has shown that science, with the earth and all life upon it, can be properly used or abused, that the moral sense of man has not been strong enough to make a right use of science and put first things first. Thus we have the H-bomb while starving and underfed millions go almost entirely unrelieved.

Granted science might make a possible anarchist society more efficient (horrible word) but this is supposition and entirely dependent on the realisation of such a society with perfect men to sustain it. Dealing with the present, as things stand, surely the task of anarchists and all thinking men is not to unselectively support all scientific enquiry and experiment but to choose for their praise and publicity that work of scientists (I use the word in its broadest sense) which is most likely to promote, or be conducive to the promotion of, the wealth and happiness of all men here and now.

So Comrade Uloth's anarchist society is dull because it is unadventurous although it is of course a happy one? True happiness is not dull and, as relatively very few people have it, why discard it in advance before achieving it for society as a whole? Our happiness now must be to work for our ideal of the society to provide happiness for all; when this has been achieved then will be our opportunity to commit lunarian suicide if we wish.

There can be no progress without experiment and adventure à la Christopher Columbus. The facts are that this world in which we find ourselves could provide for all when it is not doing so at present. That men could be at peace, with an integrated communal life, but they are not. That we know the desirable but unachieved end, that we have the means but not the wholehearted and common spirit to attain that end. Where is this spirit? It is not in the curiousness, restlessness and escapism-prompting journals to take us imaginatively to the Moon. This is true "lunacy" and suggests an analogy with that system of agriculture which exploits and devastates land and then moves to other places. Such a thing anarchists deplore, recommending a right and proper use of land obtaining the fullest possible present benefit compatible with retaining its future potential. What has man done but to exploit and devastate the earth, its creatures and his fellows? He now pauses to think, for the end is in sight. But this stop is an artificial halt sign which he has put before himself and which he has prematurely and unnecessarily erected through his social and economic systems, his lack of co-operation with his fellows and reverence for life. The answer is not to be excavated with delight from the bowels of the deepestmost crater of the moon. Science has done but little towards solving the real causes of the problems of humanity and obscures the view towards the ultimate truth that the fault is within men themselves, inside me and inside the readers of this. The philosophy and teaching of the sages of all time has been to this effect and the greatest of their thoughts continue to survive the test of time although they are never very generally popular. We must keep this heritage alive.

"If man becomes satisfied with his environment and no longer wishes to advance in any way, he withers." But we are a long way off from being satisfied surely? Even if I am, there will always be others far from content and part of my happiness must inevitably consist of acting alone or in association with others on anarchist and altruistic principles in order to create the conditions conducive to the happiness of all. Shall I "wither" if I pursue these aims and principles to the end? I think that it is only if I pursue this course will my life rise superior to that of an animal and will I have thrown off the encumbering chains of the Law of the Jungle.

Truly, the urge which causes mankind never to be entirely satisfied is one of the most valuable we possess, and from the anarchist point of view it is our last defence against the conception of the perfect State. It is the things about which we are never entirely satisfied which count and I suggest it would be extremely worthwhile to draw a sharp definitive line between those ideas which are, or are not, prompted by genuine altruistic impulses by means of and through our capacity of receptivity. For our affairs of conscience in this world are more important than any conceivable affairs we could have in other worlds, or the eternal one.

CORRIGIBLE.

Socialist International a Flop

THE poverty of social democracy has been well demonstrated by the "Socialist International" conference in Vienna last week.

It is perhaps unnecessary to point out to readers of FREEDOM that the ganging-up of West European Labour Parties has nothing to do with either socialism or internationalism. This "Socintern" is simply a cold-war answer to the Comintern—or Cominform as it now is—and as such exists to serve the interests of the Western capitalist governments in their struggle with the Eastern capitalist governments.

Doing As They're Told

How tied they are to their governments—which are anything but socialist or international-minded—is shown by the fact that when their masters have no clear-cut policy on any issue—neither have the "Socialist" parties.

Indo-China is the current example. At Geneva the official representatives of capitalist nationalism have foundered without a coherent policy; at Vienna the representatives of socialist internationalism have done the same.

According to a *News Chronicle* (10/5/54) report:

"The crisis in Indo-China, and in the Far East generally, has proved too much for the leaders of the Socialist International.

"Their conference here has not produced any clear policy, although its prime purpose was to spend three days shaping one.

"In fact, having decided to decide nothing on Indo-China, the conference wound up its business in half the time. No resolution was discussed. None was proposed.

"The only official action was a vaguely worded communique, unanimously agreed by the ten West European Socialist parties and Israel, which hoped that the Geneva conference would bring a cease-fire in Indo-China with freedom and independence for its peoples.

"The communique spoke also of the danger from new Communist expansion in the colonial territories of Asia. The Socialists are opposed both to the spread of Communism and to colonisation. But the conference seemed baffled by the whole problem and gave no hint how to tackle it.

"Why did the conference flop? One reason was that the French Socialist Party—key group in the discussion—gave no lead on detailed proposals for establishing peace in Indo-China.

"Yet probably the most important reason was that there was not one Far East Socialist Party delegate there."

More probably, the most important reason was that the delegates had not been given a lead by their respective governments.

Safe Decisions

On one or two other matters, however, our socialist internationalists were able to arrive at some conclusions—all perfectly safe, perfectly innocuous and perfectly useless.

The proposals on which they were agreed included direct talks between Israel and the Arab States for a Middle East peace settlement; and that the need for general disarmament under international control was now more necessary than ever.

They backed Mr. Morgan Phillips's appeal for top level talks between the Great Powers on the H-bomb and world peace.

Social-democratic parties represented were from Austria, Denmark, France, Germany, Britain, Italy, Holland, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland and Israel.

MALATESTA CLUB - THE LAST WORD

THE Malatesta Club opened—almost on time—the weekend of May 1-2.

On Saturday evening the members gathered with their friends for a "club-warming", to which had been invited those who had contributed to the foundation fund. Because of the varied way in which those contributions had been received, however, it is possible that some regrettable omissions were made in sending out invitations. For this we apologise most deeply and can only plead that in the initial stages such mistakes are almost inevitable.

If anyone who had contributed was not invited, will they please write to the Secretary so that their address can be checked?

On Sunday evening the first public lecture-discussion was held by the London Anarchist Group. It was a capacity meeting, the room filled to hear F. A. Ridley speak on the Revolutionary Tradition in England. The chairman welcomed the audience, explained the nature of the Club, and thanked comrade Ridley for coming along to give the place a good send-off. His lecture was very well received, but clearly the scope of the subject—F. A. Ridley took us from Magna Carta to the 1926 General Strike—was too much for one lecture, and comrade Ridley has agreed to give a whole series of lectures during the next winter session.

Last Sunday, May 9, John Bishop gave the first lecture of a fortnightly series on Aspects of Anarchism. By the end the room was again full, and the discussion was lively and provocative.

After the meetings, coffee and sandwiches are served, and we have now been able to test our kitchen equipment and our ability to cope with demand. It is quite impossible, however, to estimate just what regular demand there is going to be on the catering side. But only experience will teach us that. Of the comrades who have undertaken to do the catering work, only two have had any similar previous experience. Their experience is proving most valuable, and encouraging to the rest of us.

All the work in connection with the day-to-day running of the Club is, of course, being done on a voluntary basis. A rota has been agreed for kitchen duties, and basic meals and refreshments will be available every night, while each team can offer any speciality they feel they can best prepare.

We are hoping, naturally, that the catering will contribute to the covering of the overheads. Our policy is to provide as good food as we can for as low a price as we can, keeping in mind the need to cover overheads. The Club is not open to the general public; to be so would necessitate catering licenses and all sorts of formalities—but visitors are, of course, welcome, even if we have to go through the formality of having their refreshments bought for them by a member!

★

So much for day-to-day running from now on. The smaller problems will sort themselves out as we go along; the major problem—that of providing the place—has now been overcome, thanks to a great number of people.

On behalf of the members of the Club, I should like to thank most heartily all those who have contributed so generously to our foundation fund. Our original target of £100, which was found to be inadequate, was easily surpassed, as the total shows. Particularly fine, in our opinion, has been the response from provincial comrades (and, among the provinces, we include New York!) who, in the nature of things, will not be able to use the Club regularly. Their expressed sentiments, however, have been that they are pleased to know that such a place exists.

On the side of the physical work involved in fitting our premises to our purposes, I should like to mention the amount of work done by some comrades. There was Comrade H.N. who did all the electrical wiring, for lighting (which has been much approved!) for heating and the cooking appliances: Comrade B.C. who concreted a floor; those who turned up to paint chairs and scrub floors, to distemper walls and put up wall board. Thanks to H.S. for advice and help in colour schemes and other work, to R.S. for many jobs well done, to M.S. for solving the lighting problem and helping in its construction. And a special mention for D.R. who was there night after night (and until 4 a.m. the night before opening) who by his unfailing good humour and willingness to work helped tremendously all the time. Thanks to all those who helped in taking on a pretty grim task and transforming a filthy basement into a civilised meeting place.

The London foundation members have been meeting every week during the formation period, and Comrade M.C. should be mentioned for her efficient work as Minute Secretary.

A special word of appreciation must be given to FREEDOM, in the columns of which the idea was first mooted, and whose Editors have given generously space for discussing the project, for Progress Reports and for acknowledgments for funds. More important, we should realise, is that it is through FREEDOM that contact is maintained throughout our scattered movement, and that without that contact, and the good name of our paper as a responsible journal to give confidence to supporters, the whole project would have been well nigh impossible.

★

It's been quite an experience, and the results, I think, are such that the Anarchist movement can feel proud. For the rest—it is up to those who want to see the Club continue. The spectacular transformation and act of creation has been achieved. From now on it will be the humdrum tasks and the steady devotion that will keep the place going. Apart from the catering and physical management, responsibility will fall upon our Treasurer, Edwin Peeke, who has already impressed us with his efficiency—and whose stern sense of economy ensures the best use being made of the funds—and upon our Secretary, John Bishop, whose work is only just beginning, and to whom all correspondence, apart from money matters, should be addressed.

We still need the financial support promised by our original guarantors. Even more do we desire to see the Club *used* as a place for meeting and eating, for social contact and discussion, to make of it a lively centre of interest and activity for libertarians in London.

★

We print below the last contributions to the Foundation Fund, and a Financial Statement up to May 1. From now on we shall acknowledge contributions to a new Fund—the Maintenance Fund—from time to time. P.S.

★

We acknowledge with thanks the following gifts:

J.H.: Large folding table, kitchen sink and draining-board.
B.S.: Small folding table.
P.A.: Washing-up basin.
Anon: Cutlery.
L.G.W.: Many useful items too numerous to list.

★

CONTRIBUTIONS RECEIVED:

London: K.M. 10/-; W.K. 2/6; A. & D. McK. 10/-; A.E.B. £1; E.F. 10/-; W.E.D. 5/-; R.W. 5/-; P.Q. 1/6; K.D. 4/-; G.N.O. 2/-; *Glasgow*: S.M. 3/6; *Brentwood*: N.D.B. £1.

	£	s.	d.
Total	4	13	6
Previously acknowledged	130	10	9
GRAND TOTAL	£135	4	3

RECEIPTS

	£	s.	d.
Contributions	135	4	3
Subscriptions	41	3	0
	£176	7	3

EXPENDITURE

	£	s.	d.
Rent	22	0	0
Rates		13	8
Postages		10	1
Light & Heat		5	0
Printing & Stationery	1	17	5
Sundry Expenses	3	1	4
Repairs & Decorations	57	13	7
Furniture & Fittings	35	13	11
Hire-purchase account: Cooker and Water-heater	3	2	3
Catering Stock	5	0	0
Catering Equipment	15	12	7
London Electricity Board: Deposit	10	0	0
Cash at Bank	15	8	7
Cash in Hand	5	8	10
	£176	7	3

SUMMER SCHOOL 1954
AUGUST BANK HOLIDAY WEEK-END

Comrades who intend coming to the Summer School (to be held at the Malatesta Club) are urged to contact us at once re accommodation and food requirements. So far only two applications have been made from Scotland. But even anarchist Summer Schools need a certain amount of organisation! and if applications for accommodation are left to the last minute we will be able to offer only (with the permission of the L.C.C.) London's park benches. Romantic perhaps, but very uncomfortable.

A programme will be available very soon with lectures, prices, etc., the latter of course cannot be fixed until we know how many comrades will be coming.

Offers of accommodation from comrades and friends in the London area, will be welcome.

Write to:—
R. MILTON, (c/o Freedom Press),
27, Red Lion Street,
London, W.C.1.

PUBLIC LIBRARY REVERSES DECISION TO BAN "FREEDOM"

'"FREEDOM" is to go on trial at Slough Public Library from to-day.

'The library committee, who in January declined an offer by 20-year-old Douglas Muir MacTaggart to present them with a free copy each week of the Anarchist Weekly, have reversed their decision.

'"It will now go in the reading room along with the others and we will have to try and tell how much interest has been shown in it by the state it's in at the end of each week," said Miss G. P. P. Knowles, the librarian.

'"If it's in ribbons," she added, "then we'll know people like it."

'Miss Knowles added that she thought it was a question of how much the library should "give way to minority views".

'She presumed the committee had reversed their decision because they had decided that minority views were important.

'As far as she knew no other magazine had ever been "on trial" before. Most of the publications the library stocked were "accepted and established" journals which were bought.'

Slough, Eton & Windsor Observer, 30/4/54.

THE MALATESTA CLUB
155 High Holborn WC1

(Nearly opposite Holborn Town Hall)

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

MAY 16 Arthur Uloth
THE AGE OF ANNIHILATION

MAY 23 S. E. Parker
ASPECTS OF ANARCHISM
(2) THE STATE

★

Informal Discussion Every Thursday at 7.30.

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

OUTDOORS

(Weather permitting)
MAXWELL STREET
Every Sunday at 7 p.m.
Speakers: Hugh McCutcheon
Mark Kramrisch.

INDOORS

at Workers' Open Forum
50 Renfrew Street, Glasgow.
Every Thursday at 7 p.m.

MAY 13.—Robert McKean *on* INDUSTRIAL UNIONISM

MAY 20—Robert Lynn *on* SEX & THE WORKING CLASS MOVEMENT

MAY 27.—Hugh McCutcheon *on* THIS I BELIEVE

Printed by Express Printers, London, E.1. Published by Freedom Press, 27 Red Lion Street, London, W.C.1.