

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Coercion is the central principle of government.

LORD ARMSTRONG

Vol. 16, No. 9

February 26th, 1955

Threepence

RESTORING THE BALANCE OF POWER

H-BOMB (Made in Britain)

TWO days after the Government's statement that in the next ten years 12 Atom Plants would be built to produce electric power came the announcement that Britain was to develop and produce thermo-nuclear weapons, which include the hydrogen bomb. The timing of the announcements may have been a mere coincidence, and certainly, to judge by the reaction of the Press to this H-bombshell, it might well have been. We are told that the Power plants will involve an expenditure of £300 millions over a period of ten years, but no indication as to how many more millions will be added to the present expenditure of £1,500 millions per annum (or £15,000 million in the ten years in which a mere £300 million are being spent on peaceful (?) uses of atomic energy) on cold war preparations.

For those people to whom the news may bring "a sickening, sinking feeling" the *News Chronicle* offers the reassuring pill that

"we shall be most exposed to the risk

"ANTI-SOVIET LIES"

(Malenkov About to Resign)

VIENNA, FEB. 10.

The *Arbeiter Zeitung*, organ of the Austrian Socialist Party, had its latest issue confiscated by the Russian occupation authorities to-day, for the third time in four weeks. As before, no explanation was given, but it is assumed that exception was taken to a cartoon showing Mr. Malenkov ordering his secretary to cancel his subscription for *Pravda* and open one for the *Arbeiter Zeitung*, "so that I can find out in time what is going to happen to me."

This was an allusion to two leading articles, for which the newspaper was confiscated by the Russians on the previous occasions, assessing internal Russian politics and the likelihood of Mr. Malenkov's political eclipse by Mr. Khrushchev—articles which were designated at the time by the Austrian Communists as "anti-Soviet lies."

—The Times.

It seems the *Arbeiter Zeitung* knows more of Soviet politics than the Austrian Communists, or any other eager students of the Russian Way of Life. Have they a spy in the Kremlin, a clairvoyant on the staff, or simply a little intelligence in their interpretation of published news?

TEACHING THE TEACHERS

ONE of the most anarchistic of non-anarchists is A. S. Neill, the best-known pioneer of progressive education in this country. One can hardly speak of free education ('free' that is in approach to the child, not in the sense of being paid for out of the rates) without reference to the tremendous influence his work and his school, Summerhill, have had in the development of a more enlightened attitude to education.

Perhaps the recent publicity in the Press to cases of teachers being sued for beating children may make it appear that an enlightened attitude has not spread very far, but the very fact that such cases can command the publicity they do shows that corporal punishment is certainly not taken for granted in our schools any more, and more and more people are coming to agree with A. S. Neill's words: 'Anyone who spans a child whether at home or school is a coward and a nasty one.'

This was one of the points which helped Neill to win headlines for his oration during London University's Institute of Education Foundation week. Another was his evaluation of religion: 'There is none at my school. The children are too busy living to worry about God.'

How many of Neill's audience of university students and staff, however, will

of war when we are weakest, and best protected against that risk when we are strong enough to make an attack on us manifestly unprofitable".

The H-bomb, declares the *Evening Standard* is conceived not as a weapon of attack nor of defence but "as the weapon of prevention". It is "The great deterrent" declares the *Standard* echoing the government White Paper—presumably as the hangman's noose is the "deterrent" to murder?

★

WE are assuming that the Government has not already reached an advanced stage in the production of the H-Bomb, though it would come as no surprise to us to be told, on the eve of some International Congress or other in the near future that Britain had her H-Bombs all ready for delivery except for the label. On the first assumption however, Russia and the United States are at present the only two Powers in the world to possess the H-Bomb. We have furthermore, the assurance of the American Secretary of Defence that "there is no atomic stalemate with the Soviet Union because the United States is out ahead" (*New York Times* 16/2/55). From a military—and, in 1955, political—point of view Russia has only superiority over America in the "conventional" weapons of warfare. And neither Britain nor America are taking steps to achieve parity in this field. Obviously Britain could not and Western Europe will not; only America could but does not. Why?

Perhaps the answer is political and unconnected with purely military strategy. That is, a question of power politics. Let us examine the implications of Britain's decision to make the H-Bomb. As matters stand at present, in the event of war Britain will be, as America's European Formosa, the launching platform for the H-Bomb attack on the enemy, and will therefore have access to more H-bombs than she could produce herself (quite apart from the ones she will receive in return from the enemy). The decision

to produce the H-Bomb cannot, in the circumstances, be viewed, or the expense justified, on military grounds.

Thus so far as Britain is concerned the addition of a made-in-Britain H-Bomb can be explained away neither as a deterrent—for the Americans declare that they are "out ahead" of Russia in these weapons, and there is no reason to suppose that they lack the technological and productive capacity to remain "out ahead"—nor on military grounds since, in the event, they will be at the delivering (and receiving) end of all the H-bombs they want. There can only be one other reason—the political one.

★

NOW it is significant that, whilst America is prepared to supply this country with H-Bombs in the event of war (the least they could do, some would say, in view of the fact that they have established their bases on these islands), they

Continued on p. 2

Love on the P.A.Y.E.

LOVE laughs at locksmiths' claimed an old saw, probably dating from the time that chastity belts were compulsory wear for grass widows.

It also laughs at the management of Synthetic Jewels Ltd., of Motherwell, Lanarkshire, who announced last week that none of the girls in their employ would be granted leave of absence to get married. For the immediate answer by the seventy potential brides of Synthetic Jewels Ltd. was to come out on strike against this downright inhuman, unromantic and uneconomic decision.

The firm's management want all girls getting married to do so at a recognised holiday period, which means in effect the Glasgow Fair fortnight in July, since that is the only holiday of the year long enough for a girl to have a proper honeymoon.

Love, and all its implications and complications, however, cannot be regulated like that. Not everyone can wait till July, and in any case there is a very sound economic motive for marrying earlier. The most popular week for weddings in the whole year is the week before the Budget in April. Couples marrying then qualify for the married income tax allowance for the whole financial year. Cupid and P.A.Y.E. (for our overseas readers, Pay As You Earn is the

British way of extorting income tax from workers' pay packets before they even see them), Cupid and P.A.Y.E. conspire most forcibly to further the cause of romance in Britain, when April's here.

Anyway, 70 girls (and 30 of the weaker sex) went on strike for the right to marry and have a honeymoon when they want it. And quite right, too.

WHAT IS OBSCENITY?

AN ambiguous contribution to the controversy about defining obscenity was made by a Smethwick bookshop proprietor who is being summonsed for selling allegedly obscene publications, when he said 'apart from what I read in the newspapers, I have no way of knowing what is obscene'.

The hearing of the summons has been adjourned for six months because the magistrates maintained that 'to have to read enormous numbers (in this case 104) of these books—if it is going to be done at all conscientiously—is a time-absorbing process'.

The clerk helpfully pointed out that it was not necessary to read the whole of any particular book. 'If you come to a line which you think is sufficient to make the book obscene that is enough!'

The Stool-Pigeon Pecks its Masters

(From our Correspondent)

NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 11.

THE most startling news of the week is the public emergence of a new variety of "I-Was-A", this time "False Witness". To gain prestige by a display of just how rotten you were last year is an acknowledged way of showing how decent you are this year. Spy, Nazi, Communist, Agent for the F.B.I. and a number of private and public occupations have been seen before but "False Witness", the title of a forthcoming book by Mr. Harvey Matusow, is a new one.

Mr. Matusow once joined the Party. After several years without promotion he went to the F.B.I. He went back to the Party and in due time was expelled. In the last two years he has been doing useful work for the F.B.I. and has at last attained some prominence as a member of that new social category the portable witness, an expert witness against communists and anti-communists on trial for conspiring to overthrow the United States Government by force or for committing perjury under oath by denying that they were conspiring to overthrow the government. In either case the neces-

sary proof is supplied by expert witnesses who are sent round on loan by the F.B.I. to the different courts and it was on this circuit that Mr. Matusow was well paid for travelling (extra well paid, as was revealed in another case last week from Fordham).

And so, by how reliable testimony it is impossible to tell, the First-string communists, and last year the 13 Second-string communists, were committed to long terms in jail, and many people have been pronounced "security risks" by committees and courts and even, so a *Reporter* article discloses this week, by private detective agencies hired by commercial firms wishing to avoid the government security checks. Some of the informers have shown occasional lapses in testimony that have raised the question of unreliability or perjury on their part, but on the whole the system has worked well, as far as obtaining prosecutions goes.

Now a Mr. Albert Kahn announces that his publishing firm is going to bring out Mr. Matusow's "False Witness". Not only is the author involved in the false witnessing but notable figures like Senator McCarthy's friend Roy Cohn, who is going to be described in plotting a faked piece of testimony. On a television news programme to-night Kahn said he was told by Matusow that he not only committed perjury directly but had several other tricks he could use. One of these was to work in a piece of information calculated to mislead although not actually untrue.

An example took place last year in the trial of one of the "13". Matusow was

asked by the prosecuting attorney, "What is your address?" He refused several times to answer and finally turned to the judge and said, "Your Honour, may I explain?" The explanation was this: "Last month I gave out where I lived and that night my father was beaten up. Now I am afraid for my wife and children." The defence attorney objected to this being admitted as evidence and the sequence of questions and answers was withdrawn from the record. Matusow said to Kahn, according to Kahn to-night, "Of course I knew the prosecuting attorney knew where I lived but the point of refusing to say was to create the impression that the Reds had beaten up my father. Actually he wasn't beaten up but had his shop broken into by burglars. It put a strong feeling on the minds of the judge and jury, all the stronger from the fact that the communists' lawyer insisted on the evidence being struck out. That always makes a big impression on them."

Before Kahn, Matusow himself was on the television film. He looked younger than his newspaper photos showed him to be and could be taken for a football star, except that instead of saying, "Uh-huh the team played pretty well," he said, "Uh-huh, I committed plenty of perjury for the government." The interviewer said, "I see, now Harvey, could you tell us a little bit about your methods?" He replied speaking like a scientist to an unscientific but vastly interested audience, apparently unaware of the storm centring about him.

The Attorney-general is reported to be

Continued on p. 3

THE CRIME OF GENOCIDE

THE treaty put forward by U.N.O. called the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide has been ratified by all the major world powers with the exception of the U.S.A. and Great Britain. The Convention makes genocide a criminal offence and outlaws the destruction of national, racial, and religious groups. It is over four years since a sub-committee of the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations committee made a favourable report on the Convention, but in spite of pressure from many non-governmental groups no action has yet been taken.

What is holding the U.S.A. back? Not twinges of conscience about the treatment of their native Indians? There was little hesitation by either the U.S.A. or Great Britain in ratifying the Universal Declaration of Human Rights or in signing any of the other morally uplifting pacts of 1919-39 (in this connection see 'Preventing War' in *FREEDOM* for Feb. 5).

These treaties are unlikely to have any practical effect: if it is expedient in the cause of 'suppressing terrorism' or 'implementing a new agricultural policy', racial or national groups may be destroyed in spite of the genocide convention, just as the allies in the last war used 'saturation' bombing tactics in violation of the Geneva Convention.

THE NATIONAL COAL BOARD RESHUFFLE

Mr. BOWMAN ARRIVES

MUCH has been made in the Press about the close connection some members of the new National Coal Board have had with the 'dust and heat danger of the pits'.

A highly critical report by an independent committee recommended changes in the Coal Board, and the Minister of Fuel & Power, Mr. Geoffrey Lloyd has had a good shake-up in its members, 'accepting the resignation' of four.

Most publicised of the new men is Jim Bowman, the new vice-chairman, for ten years vice-president of the National Union of Mineworkers, and tipped to have an illustrious future ahead on top of the trade union movement. In 1949, however, Mr. Bowman suddenly ducked

out of his high-ranking job in the N.U.M. for a relatively low-ranking job as chairman of the Northern district Coal Board—a decision which caused some consternation and puzzlement among trade unionists.

Now we can see what Mr. Bowman was after. As vice-chairman of the N.C.B. he receives £5,000 per year. He is tipped to succeed Sir Hubert Houldsworth, present chairman, when he retires. The chairman of the National Coal Board receives £8,000 per year.

Mr. Bowman has boxed very cleverly; and has progressed far from the 'dust and heat and danger' of the pits. He is still only 56 years old, and retired from the pits at the early age of 36. He's come a long way in 20 years.

ORWELL AND ANARCHISM

WHEN I reviewed the first of the first of the two recent books about George Orwell, a reader wrote to express surprise at my quoting, in a way that implied I disagreed, V. S. Pritchett's description of Orwell as an anarchist. Our correspondent had no doubt that Orwell was a 'natural' anarchist, and I suppose this is true in the usual sense of the phrase since Orwell developed in childhood, and never lost, a hatred of authority. But anarchism is a word which has come to mean more than that, even though it can mean anything from an economic individualism not easily distinguishable from the views of Sir Ernest Benn or even Sir Waldron Smithers, to the economic collectivism of Kropotkin which can roughly be described as 'socialism without the State'.

I don't believe that there is any point in setting out to 'prove' that Orwell was an anarchist, in the way that the Communists claim William Morris and other unlikely people who are dead and can't answer back. The way this kind of argument goes is this: "X is well-known, admired and had a lot of the right ideas. We have the right ideas too. Therefore X is one of us, and by linking his name with our ideas we will make them well-known and admired as well." This is false in logic and dishonest in intention.

All the same it is interesting, and not without value since his political ideas have been widely misunderstood, no trace, through quotations from his own writings, the evolution of his social and political attitudes. He was the child of Anglo-Indian parents in the 'lower-upper-middle class' and his education began at a fashionable preparatory school from which he won a scholarship to Eton. At his first school he felt, by the standards that prevailed there a sense of guilt and inevitable failure, but

Even a creature that is weak, ugly, cowardly, smelly and in no way justifiable still wants to stay alive and be happy after its own fashion. I could not

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

OPEN 10 a.m. to 6.30; 5.0 SATURDAYS
Our latest list of second-hand and remaindered books is now ready. Let us know if you want it. All books are now sent post free so please get your books from us. We can supply any book required, including text-books.

- New Books . . .**
Towards a Science of Peace
Theo F. Lenz 12/6
A. Moravia 12/6
Ghost at Noon
The Rose Tattoo
Tennessee Williams 10/6
The Einstein Affair
Reich Publication 32/-
- Remainder . . .**
Towards Industrial Freedom
Edward Carpenter 3/6
- Bargains . . .**
The Sexual Revolution
Wilhelm Reich, a few at 25/-
(new edition will be £2)
Character Analysis
Wilhelm Reich, a few at 35/-
(new edition will be 64/-)
- Second-Hand . . .**
The Culture of Cities
Lewis Mumford 16/-
Behind the Moscow Trials
Max Shachtman 3/-
Politics of the Unpolitical
Herbert Read 4/-
George Gissing 2/-
Demos
The Irrational Knot
Bernard Shaw 2/-
Maxim Gorki 2/6
Through Russia
The Future of Taboo
Archibald Lyall 2/6
The Fruits of Enlightenment
Leo Tolstoy 2/6
Physiology of War: Power and Liberty
Leo Tolstoy 2/6
My Father's House (Oneida)
Pierrepoint Noyes 5/-
Prison Anthology
(ed. Reginald Reynolds) 5/-
Rolling in the Dew Ethel Mannin 3/-
- Periodicals . . .**
Nimbus, Winter 1954 2/6
Perspectives, No. 10 2/6

Postage free on all items
Obtainable from
**27, RED LION STREET,
LONDON, W.C.1**

invert the existing scale of values, or turn myself into a success, but I could accept my failure and make the best of it. I could resign myself to being what I was, and then endeavour to survive on those terms.¹

This led him to rebel:

At the time I could not see beyond the moral dilemma that is presented to the weak in a world governed by the strong: Break the rules, or perish. I did not see that in that case the weak have the right to make a different set of rules for themselves; because, even if such an idea had occurred to me, there was no one in my environment who could have confirmed me in it . . . My situation was that of countless other boys, and if potentially I was more of a rebel than most, it was only because, by boyish standards, I was a poorer specimen. But I never did rebel intellectually, only emotionally. I had nothing to help me except my dumb selfishness, my inability—not, indeed, to despise myself, but to dislike myself—my instinct to survive.²

When Orwell was at Eton at the end of the First World War, Mr. Christopher Hollis tells us,³ "those of us who were then senior in the Sixth Form, and in a position to impose our will on policy, introduced at that time what we thought of as a new and liberal régime of no punishments . . . There was a fashion of anarchy running through College at that time. We all of us went about questioning the laws of God and Man, and Orwell was well in that fashion. Indeed he was one of the notable leaders of it . . . in his rebellion against authority there was a kind of obstinate and puritan sincerity . . . It may be—I do not know—that some of the masters felt that he was a serious danger, where the rest of us were merely silly nuisances." To this period belongs Cyril Connolly's celebrated remark,⁴ "I was a stage rebel, Orwell a true one". Orwell himself wrote:

. . . at the age of seventeen or eighteen, I was both a snob and a revolutionary, I was against all authority. I had read and re-read the entire published works of Shaw, Wells, and Galsworthy (at that time still regarded as dangerously 'advanced' works), and I loosely described myself as a Socialist. But I had not much grasp of what Socialism meant, and no notion that the working class were human beings.⁵

Thus he felt a 'shock of astonishment' when in the following year he

saw, on the ship taking him to Burma, a sailor sneak off with a half-eaten custard pudding from one of the passengers tables:

. . . do I seem to exaggerate when I say that this sudden revelation of the gap between function and reward—the revelation that a highly-skilled craftsman who might literally hold all our lives in his hands, was glad to steal scraps of food from our table—taught me more than I could have learned from half-a-dozen Socialist pamphlets?⁶

IT is hard to imagine how Orwell ever thought that to be an Imperial policeman was a suitable occupation for him. When he was in Burma his mind was divided, "between my hatred of the empire I served and my rage against the evil-spirited little beasts who tried to make my job impossible".⁷ His ultimate reaction is well-known:

I watched a man hanged once; it seemed to me worse than a thousand murders. I never went into a jail without feeling (most visitors to jails feel the same) that my place was on the other side of the bars. I thought then—I think now for that matter—that the worst criminal who ever walked is morally superior to a hanging judge.⁸

His emotions led him to anarchist conclusions, which his reason rejected:

In the end I worked out an anarchistic theory that all government is evil, that the punishment always does more harm than the crime and that people can be trusted to behave decently if only you will let them alone. This of course was sentimental nonsense. I see now as I did not then, that it is always necessary to protect peaceful people from violence.⁹

The decision, when he returned, to share the sufferings of the very poorest has been explained to us by literary critics as anything from sheer masochism to the influence of Eastern mysticism or a lack of the historic sense, so it is worth while to quote again his own explanation of it.

When I came home on leave in 1927 I was already half determined to throw up my job, and one sniff of English air decided me. I was not going back to be a part of that evil despotism. But I wanted much more than merely to escape from my job. For five years I had been part of an oppressive system, and it had left me with a bad conscience. Innumerable remembered faces—faces of prison-

ers in the dock, of men waiting in the condemned cells, of subordinates I had bullied and aged peasants I had snubbed, of servants and coolies I had hit with my fist in moments of rage (nearly everyone does these things in the East, at any rate occasionally: orientals can be very provoking)—haunted me intolerably. I was conscious of an immense weight of guilt that I had got to expiate. I suppose that sounds exaggerated; but if you do for five years a job that you thoroughly disapprove of, you will probably feel the same. I had reduced everything to the simple theory that the oppressed are always right and the oppressors are always wrong: a mistaken theory, but the natural result of being one of the oppressors yourself. I felt that I had got to escape not merely from imperialism but from every form of man's dominion over man. I wanted to submerge myself, to get right down among the oppressed, to be one of them and on their side against their tyrants. And chiefly because I had had to think everything out in solitude, I had carried my hatred of oppression to extraordinary lengths. At that time failure seemed to me the only virtue. Every suspicion of self-advancement, even to "succeed" in life to the extent of making a few hundreds a year, seemed to me spiritually ugly, a species of bullying.¹⁰

FEW writers have made so close and continual a study of poverty as Orwell in his early books, but as he says, "I had at that time no interest in Socialism or any other economic theory. It seemed to me then—it sometimes seems to me now, for that matter—that economic injustice will stop the moment we want it to stop and no sooner, and if we genuinely want it to stop the method adopted hardly matters". And it was not until 1936 that he set out to make clear his own feelings about political socialism. He writes that his experiences in Burma and among the 'submerged tenth',

. . . increased my natural hatred of authority and made me for the first time fully aware of the existence of the working classes, and the job in Burma had given me some understanding of the nature of imperialism: but these experiences were not enough to give me an accurate political orientation. Then came Hitler, the Spanish Civil War, etc. By the end of 1935 I had still failed to reach a firm decision.¹¹

This was the time when Victor Gollancz commissioned him to write a book about one of the distressed areas of the north of England. The second half of this book was devoted to an attack on the shallow-

ness and hypocrisy of the attitude of many English socialists, from 'escaped Quakers' to "parlour Bolsheviks".

Socialism, at least in this island, does not smell any longer of revolution and the overthrow of tyrants; it smells of crankishness, machine-worship and the stupid cult of Russia. Unless you can remove that smell, and very rapidly, Fascism may win.¹²

Fascism, "a world of rabbits ruled by stoats" he says is what we have got to combine against. But anti-Fascism is not a positive aim. What can we combine for? Orwell answered in 1936:

The only thing for which we can combine is the underlying ideal of Socialism; justice and liberty. But it is hardly strong enough to call this ideal "underlying". It is almost completely forgotten. It has been buried beneath layer after layer of doctrinaire priggishness, party squabbles and half-baked "progresivism" until it is like a diamond hidden under a mountain of dung. The job of the Socialist is to get it out again. Justice and liberty! Those are the words that have got to ring like a bugle across the world.¹³ C.W.

By the time these words were published Orwell was in Spain. In our next issue we will describe the effect on his ideas of the Spanish revolution and the Civil War.

- SOURCES:
1 and 2: *Such, Such Were the Joys* (Partisan Review, Sept.-Oct. 1952).
3: B.B.C. Third Programme (1/3/1954).
5, 8, 9, 10, 12 and 13: *The Road to Wigan*
4: Cyril Connolly: *Enemies of Promise* (1938).
6: *Tribune* 3/1/1947.
7: *Shooting an Elephant* (New Writing No. 2, Autumn 1936).
11: *Why I Write* (Gangrel No. 4, 1947).

TV and the Peasant

THE effects of television are not necessarily as harmful as some of the guardians of our culture would have us believe. 'A new medium of mass communication—the viewer is merely a passive on-looker—just a drug for the mind—dulls the critical faculties' and so on and so forth. The arguments are familiar—but precisely the same things were said about wireless when it was first used to purvey entertainment (see, for instance, some remarks by D. H. Lawrence in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*). Few people would condemn radio in such terms now.

Television undoubtedly has its evils but it can also provide welcome entertainment and instruction. A report on a UNESCO research project into the effect of television in rural areas, which appeared in *The New York Times*, provides a case in point.

'Each of the [French villages] studied boasts a tele-club, of which France has 180. These are organizations built around co-operatively owned television sets. Such co-operation represents the only way that most Frenchmen can see television, since sets cost 100,000 francs (about \$286) or more.'

In the village of Le-Coudray-St.-Germer, M. Samson, the schoolmaster 'bought a small television set for his own use. But twice a week he carried it into the main classroom of the school and invited the villagers in. By charging 30 francs for adults and 10 francs for children he had taken in 29,000 francs by the end of the year. With this he established a fund for a community television set.'

The balance of the necessary money was lent by the villagers and a new set with a larger screen was bought.

'The tele-club took over the classroom in which Mme. Samson had been holding her primary classes. Now, about twice a week, ten to forty persons crowd into the tiny salon for the only entertainment they can get in their village.'

The director of the project concludes 'that television can break down rigid cultural and economic patterns and can prepare young people for modern life.' and 'that community television, as evidenced in the teleclubs, is a promising technique in adult education that can be put in practice throughout the underdeveloped areas of the world.'

THEATRE

THE NIGHT OF THE BALL

[The following Theatre Review was sent to us by Douglas MacTaggart shortly before he died.—EDITORS].

THE NIGHT OF THE BALL, by Michael Burn (at the New Theatre) is an interesting drama of reality and illusion, the conflict of opinions, ideals and the past, the tragic in love. The scene throughout is laid in a private room at a Ball given by Sir Richard Alleyn on a summer evening. Sir Richard is trying to recapture the atmosphere of past times, and he also hopes to announce his engagement. But there is conflict between Sir Richard and his nephew, Julian Lovell, who has turned his country house into a home for ex-convicts where they can begin to regain happiness and dignity in life: Julian knows what it is to feel that one does not belong. He remembers his lonely childhood as an illegitimate child, he and his father at dinner, each at the other end of a long table, trying to find something in common. Sir Richard disapproves of Julian's ideals, he wants to preserve everything as it is.

But everything "fixed" kills the living reality of human lives and emotions; Julian accuses his uncle of always thinking of appearances, never feeling about anything. The word kills: the infinitely little have pride infinitely great. To Julian the traditions and convictions of the upper class are prisons: men of rigid principles are of no account whatever in regard to all real ideals of value or of non-value. Julian is filled with hate and pity by all the cruelty and injustice, Sir Richard is indifferent. And yet in the world there is truth in the remark of Margaret to Julian that we are in danger of becoming like those we say we hate.

Ideals can so easily become corrupted by vanity or fear: charity is the sterilized milk of human kindness, and philan-

trophy is often only a way of being unkind to others, or interfering with their lives. A humanitarian can be a cold, empty egoist, whose benevolence is assumed to conceal his own inadequacies. Reality arrives as the uninvited guest at Sir Richard's Ball: life is a game of chance, a game of death—woe to him who succeeds in his quest for truth! As Lady Yarmouth says, "Bliss it was to be alive in that dawn, I don't think."

Sir Richard talks to her of his failure and his isolation: he has learnt that Margaret was once the lover of Julian. Margaret will not marry Sir Richard, because she wants to be truly herself, to give all of herself, and she could not achieve this in a conventional and stuffy marriage. And so Sir Richard is alone at dawn, after all the music and gaiety. The off-stage music seems to convey the vanity of human wishes. Not that the things we wish for are not in themselves pleasant, but that we forget that, as in nature every substance has its peculiar animalcule and infestings, so every blessing has, minute to be seen at a distance, its parasite troubles. Sir Richard and Julian do not fight a duel as they might have done a century before. The world brooks no heroics now; there are reserves. Men cultivate a thick skin—nature's buff-coat—in which, with little pain and small loss of blood, the modern man-at-arms rides cheerily through life's battles. As one of the characters says, "Nowadays people are more concerned with death duties than death."

Julian faces a great deal of misunderstanding which is, in part, due to his misunderstanding of himself. A young girl, touching and vulnerable, is in love with him, but innocence is killed. Disillusionment, not love, takes its place. Where love grew, no other grows; no bloom restores the lost dream. And what are we but microscopic weevils in the mouldy crust of earth. Sufficient

unto the day is the weevil thereof. There are scenes—only momentary—so near magic and innocent beauty, so nearly angelic, that they touch us with a mysterious ecstasy and sorrow. In the glory and translation of the moment, the feeling of its transitoriness, and the sense of our unknown fate, cross and thrill us with a sense of pain, like the anguish that mingles in the rapture of sublime music.

It is significant that it is the wealthy and successful Sir Richard who is alone at the end: we cannot live in the past, nor is there any hope in continuing the mistakes and falsities of his way of life. Miss Gladys Cooper is delightful as Lady Yarmouth, who tells us that a person has been following her about as if she were a holy relic, asking what she remembers. She tells him that she sat for Gainsborough, and her mother danced with Robespierre. She makes the past seem a vague and rather absurd phantasmagoria. Mr. Tony Britton is convincing and sympathetic as the intelligent hero, troubled by his conscience. There is an excellent moment in the second act, when one of the aristocratic guests tells an electrician to go to ask for more champagne. The electrician flings down a coil of wire and tells him to do it himself. Then the lights fuse. A Left-wing journalist, Sidney Willis, M.P., is however, rebuked by another guest for being more interested in laws and legislation and for failing to see that it is people who matter and who must change. If there is to be a new world, love and humour and kindness are the spells that will create it. We will never get out of life alive, so why are we so serious? It is so easy to be gentle and tolerant, why do we take the trouble to do anything else? We should sing and speak no more, and then the dawn will be delight, and we will dance with dread and there will be no more fear. D.M.M.

Have you renewed your
Subscription to
FREEDOM?
If not why not do so
NOW?

CLOSED SYSTEMS

Restoring the Balance of Power with the H-BOMB

Continued from p. 1
are no more prepared to supply this country with information on their production than they are to Russia! As the *Manchester Guardian* (18/2/55), in a most understanding editorial on American reluctance in these matters, points out:

"The mood of Congress is not towards closer alliance but away from it, as support for the Bricker Amendment has shown. That mood is probably a fair reflection of American feeling. Besides the American Service Departments—not least the Air Force—are distrustful of the British."

But with all its understanding the *M.G.* adds that in the "hydrogen age" it is "senseless" from the point of view both of America and Britain that the latter should "spend such enormous sums of money" and "devote such great resources to duplicating American efforts" for "each partner is denied many fruits of the other's knowledge. Each is wasting money and technical manpower which could be saved". However, if that is America's attitude, concludes the *Manchester Guardian* then "the main British decisions [to produce the H-bomb] appear sound."

To our minds the operative word in the *Guardian's* argument is "partners". FREEDOM has never taken the view that America and Britain were "partners" in the game of power politics. Let us put it this way. Britain's rôle as a first class power has in the past depended on the fact that she has been the exponent *par excellence*, of the political strategy known as the Balance of Power. With it she has divided the world, Europe and individual nations, her technique being the fostering of national, racial, economic or religious antagonisms, wherever they suited her ends. When in post-World War I Europe France's dominant rôle (followed by the Franco-Russian alliance) threatened the European balance of power, Britain championed the re-emergence of Germany under Hitler and was openly hostile to France; and when later, Hitler threatened, Britain was once again the friend of France and of democracy!

But Britain emerged from World War II as a second-class power. Politically Russia was the strongest force in the world in spite of the Americans' Atom Bomb, and, irrespective of any ideological reasons, Britain's logical place was alongside the United States. But to-day the rôles have been reversed. The United States has become the foremost world power, economically, militarily and politically, with Russia (probably still the dominant force in Europe), taking second place. Britain's rôle is clear. She is a "partner" where it concerns the re-armament of Europe, for there Russia is the dominant power; was a half-hearted "partner" in the Korean venture, and now makes it quite clear that she is not prepared to join the United States in the defence of the off-shore islands of China which, if not strategically important to the defence of Formosa, are nevertheless declared to be of importance to the "fighting morale" of America's ally Chiang Kai-shek. Britain is obviously much concerned with the United States' Pacific defence perimeter, and that country's potentially dominating rôle in Far Eastern politics, but can at present do little about it. Power politics is hardly disturbed by the "prestige" of a Churchill or the "moral" pressures of a Nehru. So Britain is building her own H-Bombs . . . and then there will be three!

A CLOSED system as described by Arthur Koestler in his autobiography "Arrow in the Blue" is a universal method of thought which claims to explain all phenomena under the sun, and to have a cure for all that ails man. Once you enter into the magic circle you are deprived of all your critical faculties. Examples must be familiar to all. Our own favourites are Roman Catholicism, Marxism, Orthodox Freudianism, and Reichianism. Any suggestion of an alternative solution of a particular problem is met with the appropriate stock answer which renders further discussion impossible.

To an orthodox Freudian, to doubt the existence of the so-called castration complex is to demonstrate that your arguments are rationalisations of an unconscious resistance which betrays that you yourself have such a complex. To doubt the reality of the class struggle to a marxist is to expose your petit bourgeois background. And to a follower of Wilhelm Reich it is your character armour which prevents you appreciating the significance of orgone energy. Although such systems do produce some valuable ideas and theories, the

HIGHER PERSONAL INCOME IN THE U.S.A.

PERSONAL income in the U.S.A. for 1954 reached a new record level, the Dept. of Commerce announced recently. The figure for the whole nation was \$286,500m.; although this is \$400m. more than the 1953 figure, the total for wages and salaries only was actually lower, but this was more than offset by the increase in income from dividends, interest, and rents. Thus those in the lower half of the income bracket get a little less, while those in the top half get a little more, and providing there is an overall increase this is called a 'prosperous economy'.

A news item in the *New York Times* shows what this shift in the distribution of wealth means to some communities—AMSTERDAM, N.Y., Feb. 3—Desperate campaigns are being waged along the lower Mohawk Valley to stave off depression and possible permanent industrial decline.

Mayors, town councils and chambers of commerce are fighting the threat of fleeing industry.

Business men and union leaders have been brought together by unemployment. This has passed 15 per cent. of the labour force in cities in this area. Soon it may exceed 20 per cent.

Representatives of the state Departments of Labour and Commerce are touring upstate New York, taking inventory of industrial facilities and co-ordinating programmes of self-help.

If the campaign succeeds it can establish a broader, sounder foundation for upstate economy. If it fails the results could be the sort of industrial leukemia that has ravaged much of New England. . . .

The Stool-Pigeon Pecks its Masters

Continued from p. 1
studying ways of trying him for perjury. Even granting him a genuine wish to prosecute you can foresee some snags, because a self-confession of perjury in court must be substantiated by a witness and there can in the nature of the case be no one to testify that Mr. X was not in secret a member of such and such a group when Matusow had testified that Mr. X told him himself that he was. Further, Matusow is not likely to condemn himself by swearing in a court that in another court he did commit perjury. He will probably simply swear that all his testimony was true, leaving his book to tell the "real" truth. The government will be unable to avoid being made a fool of, and the public will know which truth is true, and in spite of the denial of perjury in court will question the fairness of the trials of some of the communists and the validity of the information and therefore the justice of the charges against some of the people condemned as security risks (in these days no joke).

What will perhaps in the future be seen as the significance of the Matusow move is that, however tricky his motives, he may still be following the trend of the I-was-a-group away from the unpopular across to the popular or socially approved side, and that we may now be seeing the beginning of a revulsion against the present method of conducting political trials, shared by a group wider than the liberal minority. For all its propaganda the government may find Americans less easily fooled that it thought.

atmosphere in which they are developed impedes free discussion and experimentation, without which no accumulation of knowledge and its subsequent assessment and appreciation, is possible.

Viruses and Man

VIRUSES, smaller than bacteria and only made visible by the use of ultra violet light and electronic instruments, are capable of growth only within the living cell of a susceptible host. In the laboratory white mice and chick embryos are used. Their story is told in the Pelican book "Viruses and Man" by F.M. Burnet. Although knowledge of their natural history is limited, something has been gained from the study of bacteriophage (a virus which attacks bacteria), and influenza, the two that have received most attention. While antibiotics are bringing the bacterial diseases under control we have as yet little protection from the viruses and they are becoming increasingly important, being responsible for such conditions as influenza, the common cold, poliomyelitis, yellow fever, and many plant and animal diseases.

In the last two chapters the author tackles problems of more general interest. He asks whether it is worth while continuing the study of the natural history of the virus which causes Dengue fever, a very unpleasant, though not dangerous disease when it could be eliminated simply by preventing the particular mosquito which transmits it from breeding.

He suggests that scientists should consider the human and social implications of their work, directing their attention more frequently to the solution of human problems, rather than making exhaustive studies in limited fields, which may bring an international reputation for the successful investigator, "but one can wonder whether there will be any other use made of the facts than to help in forging some new weapon for the hands of those in a position to dominate their fellows."

It is perhaps significant that biological research was until World War II practically synonymous with medical research, but the greatest recent practical application of enzyme chemistry has been, not the treatment of disease, but the synthesis of a group of specific enzyme poisons, anti-cholinesterases to the biochemist, "nerve gases" to the man in the street.

In recommending this book we cannot do better than quote his final paragraph. "Famine, pestilence, and war are the three great evils from which men have always prayed to be delivered. Within a hundred years the second of these evils has been removed almost in its entirety by the work of a few thousand men guided by the ideas of six men of genius: Koch, Pasteur, Ehrlich, Theobald Smith, Dubos, Goodpasture.

"Only a medical bacteriologist who has seen with understanding the last

twenty-five years of that greatest of social revolutions could be expected to dream that one day war might similarly be dealt with. Human behaviour is as much a subject for scientific study as influenza or yellow fever, and sooner or later an adequate understanding of the processes by which one man dominates another will emerge. That understanding represents the only substantial hope of curbing the malignant concentration of power that seems to lie ahead of us.

"I believe that there is no other approach to effective knowledge than the scientific method, and I believe that only knowledge can counter evil that makes use of knowledge."

Soviet Science

FREEDOM of scientific enquiry which is becoming increasingly restricted in this country and America is now to be encouraged in Russia. Previously it has been limited by the rigidity of the dialectical materialist philosophy but now *Pravda*, according to the *Manchester Guardian*, has given official sanction to a more "liberal" attitude. This change is already reflected in the attendance of Russian scientists at a conference on meteorites in Manchester, and philosophy at Zurich. *Pravda* now admits that labelling scientists as hirelings of the monopolies, capitalist cannibals, and quacks, is not conducive to the development of scientific ideas, and recognises that creative co-operation between the scientists of various countries would be more fruitful.

Those British marxists who took up Lysenkoism because it could make wheat grow within the arctic circle may be interested to learn that the present official view is that the Lysenko school ignored many firmly-established scientific facts. It is now implicitly admitted in the Russian press that some party-supported scientific authorities have resorted to fraud in proving the correctness of their theories. Experiments have been distorted and a claim to have transformed antibiotics into living moulds and fungi has been shown to be pure nonsense.

We do not anticipate any fundamental change of attitude by the Russian auth-

orities although they do seem to be motivated by a genuine concern for the progress of Soviet science. Its isolation from the rest of the world, and its domination by the monopoly schools, that have until now laid down the law for each branch of science, has resulted in a considerable falling off in its standards of achievement, and admitted charlatans into positions of repute.

This new freedom of scientific enquiry may lead to a revival of trends contrary to the Marxist-Leninist world view, and the Russian authorities themselves seem to doubt whether the Philosophy of Marxism could withstand the fresh air of free discussion and modern scientific enquiry. It may be that this trend will come to an abrupt end as did the debate on freedom in literature when it became apparent that the writers were reaching out for more than the party was prepared to grant them.

This is a fundamental dilemma of totalitarian societies. Science is in a sense anarchistic in that scientific enquiry needs an atmosphere free from coercion and restraints to function successfully, but the rulers of a totalitarian society need the fruits of scientific research to retain their power.

"Bios".

The Other Side of the Picture 'CREEPING DEMOCRACY' IN YUGOSLAVIA

MILOVAN DJILAS, former Vice-President, and Vladimir Dedijer, a former member of the Central Committee, who were convicted last month of 'subversive propaganda', have now petitioned Tito to be allowed to form a second political party. The party will be based on 'Socialist principles'.

According to a report in *The Manchester Guardian* they have been assured of support from a number of Communists and some fairly influential non-Communists.

It may well be in Tito's interest to 'democratise' his régime a little more, while he is still receiving financial aid and some military protection from the Western powers. The most successful dictatorships are those which are not obvious and an opposition party could provide a useful screen.

Douglas McTaggart

IT is with a feeling of deep sadness that we write of Douglas Muir MacTaggart. He left home four weeks ago. Last week his body was recovered from the Thames near Windsor. He was only twenty-one years old and his tragic end, just when he should be beginning to live, fills us with a sense of loss which numbs the brain and prevents us at present from saying all that we should wish about him.

Douglas MacTaggart was a complex personality, a lonely and somewhat diffident young man who revealed more of himself in his writings than through the personal contact we established during the eighteen months he wrote for FREEDOM. His writings were forceful and uncompromising but, sometimes perhaps, in his eagerness to express the ideas that were on his mind at the moment, would use the play or book he was discussing simply as a start-

ing off point for the exposition of these ideas, thus confusing, rather than enlightening, some of his readers. Many must have found his articles not only uncompromising but also dogmatic; and indeed one could not help feeling that for him life was either black or white, without any relieving shades of grey. Yet because he was intelligent and sensitive, he would have eventually come to see this, just as by his own efforts he had come to his ideas on militarism (he went to prison as a Conscientious Objector), and on society at an age when most of his contemporaries have not even started thinking and are being swept up in the mad preparations for war and destruction.

But Douglas did not give himself time. And the more we think of his tragic end the more do we see it as a last despairing protest against the society into which he was born.

. . . seen by the Local Newspaper

Part of the complex personality of Douglas MacTaggart is revealed in this account published in the local paper *The Windsor, Slough and Eton Express* following the announcement of his disappearance.

Until just over a year ago, Douglas MacTaggart, lanky, flaxed-haired young student, was unknown to the public.

True, he had been sentenced by the magistrates' court to three months' imprisonment for refusing to undertake his National Service, but that was purely his personal gesture of defiance of the law.

Then, towards the end of 1953, MacTaggart decided to publicly state his views. He booked the Labour Hall in Slough, painted his own posters and stuck them up, paid for advertisements in the local Press and distributed leaflets.

THE START

He left three admitted anarchists beaming with satisfaction and one overwhelmed reporter.

When he had exhausted Windsor, Slough and Eton of audiences, he joined the Slough Youth Forum and speedily became a star attraction.

When he wasn't speaking in public he took time off to write to the *Express* and his views probably incensed more readers than any other letter-writer in the history of the paper.

He turned his attention to other methods and hit national newspaper headlines when he was ejected from the House of Commons after hurling anarchist leaflets down on the Members and shouting slogans about a slave State.

ROTTEN EGG

He was at the receiving end of a rotten egg thrown by an Eton boy. And it was typical of him to tell a reporter that if he had the right to present his ideas to the Eton boys, they had the right to throw things at him.

Men like MacTaggart rocket up from the ordinary mass of the people once in a hundred years. They are scorned, laughed at, insulted and ignored by the many.

REMAIN ENIGMAS

They are lauded, envied and copied by the few. To most, they remain enigmas, too far divorced from everyday life to be even remotely understood.

But they are men who have the courage of their own convictions.

A WORKER DIES

A RAILWAY chageman was refused permission to use a hut near work he was supervising, and so had to walk a mile along the track to another hut for his meals.

While walking to the hut he was killed by a train.

At Birmingham yesterday a coroner's jury decided that Frederick Giddings, 64, of Bushby, Wolverhampton died accidentally. Said the coroner:

"If he had been allowed to use the hut near his work he would have been alive to-day."

News Chronicle 17/2/55.

We hope that whoever wielded his petty authority over Mr. Giddings will think twice before taking such decisions in future.

More Discrimination

AT the time of writing the 450 bus workers of West Bromwich have just put their "Saturday strike threat" into action and, they say, will continue to strike each succeeding Saturday until the Indian trainee conductor, Bhikha Patel, employed by the Corporation, has been removed. The striking men make the plea that his employment is "opening the door to coloured labour generally". Neighbouring Corporation bus workers have given the unofficial strike their tacit support by not operating routes normally covered by the Bromwich buses.

It would seem that these bus workers cannot even make the excuse that their jobs are threatened by the employment of coloured labour, since Alderman George Jones, Chairman of the West Bromwich Transport Committee, has said that there are a hundred jobs available and recruitment of labour is very difficult.

We have found it necessary in the last few months to protest against the increasing discriminatory measures against coloured workers, and these "white spots" have been particularly noticeable in the Midlands area where the official leadership of the Transport & General Workers' Union (in spite of the claim that there is no official colour bar) has been willing to pander to the unhealthy prejudices of some of their members.

We are totally opposed to discrimination on the basis of colour or race, and while we support workers in their struggle for higher wages or better conditions we reject the irrational motives which lead to divisions between workers of different races.

We recognise that economic reasons do engender real fear in the white worker, but we consider that it is quite unreasonable to suggest that a handful of coloured workers in a working population of millions is a threat to full employment for the white man. His fear springs from ignorance of the real issues involved between capital and labour, but the willingness with which the excuse of "possible recession" is grasped by the apologists for the colour-bar does little to lessen this fear.

The reasons for prejudice are deep-rooted and often too complex to be tackled by the 'layman', but in the case of the Indian trainee conductor the motives seem to be fairly straightforward. Bhikha Patel is a graduate of Bombay University. He has been a

member of the Transport & General Workers' Union for two years, although what his job was is not made clear. But if the usual pattern of employment for coloured men is any guide he was probably in the "unskilled" class. As a trainee conductor, he now becomes a "skilled" worker and is viewed in a different light by fellow members of the union. The men are quoted as having said that Bhikha Patel is "very intelligent and good at arithmetic". This may well indicate the reason for resentment. As an unskilled worker Patel was "in a class below" and could be treated with tolerance as long as he remained there. The situation now is that a coloured man with a better education than his fellow white worker is now in a position to work with them on the basis of equality.

Our job, together with other enlightened people, is to spread libertarian ideas, and so help to undermine this fear and stupidity which leads to so much misery.

Job Bribes

ANOTHER report from the Birmingham area—Balsall Heath—points to a new aspect of the colour-bar. It is reported that the head of a valve manufacturing firm has asked the Labour Minister for an enquiry into "bribe" charges which, it is claimed, are being made to coloured men seeking work. The cases he cites involve six coloured workers who were accepted for employment in a factory after a sum of money had been handed over as a bribe, the sums involved ranging from £2 to £20. It is also reported that difficulties are then put in the way of the coloured man forcing him to leave his job, which may then be "sold" to someone else. If these allegations are true, then there will be another reason for resentment by the white worker, but even stronger reasons for bitterness by coloured workers, the unfortunate victims of this squalid trickery.

Position of Employer

One other point which arises out of this is the position of the employer. We are not unaware that both public and private employers stand to gain from conflict and competition between workers. It is often said that the capitalist is more internationally minded than his workers, because race and colour are no bars to negotiations as long as capital is safeguarded. Many employers are now taking up the cudgels in defence of freedom of employment for the coloured man, and we might do well to examine the motives. We must remember that many

employers are always too eager to undermine organised labour and if the "colour problem" can be exploited by the employment of unorganised labour, his grip on the worker will have increased.

From an anarchist point of view the only solution to the unhappy division between white and coloured workers would be for them to organise on a basis of equality to protect their working interests. But this can only spring from a sense of unity in the recognition that their interests coincide.

In the meantime several attempts are being made to encourage a more rational attitude to the problem. The Mayor of Lambeth recently held the first of his mixed socials attended by several hundred which was quite widely publicised in the Press. Some people felt that this was rather a naive approach to the problem of integration, but experiments like the one in Lambeth of pleasures shared may help to encourage the idea that ordinary folk are much the same the whole world over.

There is too an Association of Coloured Peoples with its headquarters in the East End of London. It is almost entirely working class and although there is no colour-bar its membership consists only of West Indians and Africans. It is the only Association of its kind in London, and we hope in later issues to give more details of its functions.

LETTERS

THE CONQUEST OF ART

MR. ARTHUR W. ULOTH in his article, "The Conquest of Nature", (Dec. 4, 1954) is opposed to the war on nature. He must therefore, in effect, support a war on man; there is no other alternative. He says the world is not man's enemy. Well, just what is the enemy? There is only man and the world, man's environment. Man can do one only of two things—wage war on the world outside himself, or wage war on himself. And since Mr. Uloth won't have war on the world, we can only assume that he accepts war on man.

But, of course, Mr. Uloth does not accept the necessity for any war—he does not see man as a war-like animal. He hates destruction. This means he must hate anarchism. He could not agree with Bakunin's statement: "The urge to destroy is also the creative urge." It is easily seen where Uloth is wrong: he thinks as do so many others that destruction is in itself a bad thing. But we know that the value or otherwise of destruction lies solely in what is destroyed. If we destroy what is evil, what is inimical to man, destruction is obviously a good. And the same applies to war—if we are waging war on evil, war is good. The question for all of us is not, are we going to be war-like, destructive?—but, are we going to wage war on, and destroy things outside man which are inimical to him, or, are we going to wage war on, destroy man? Every anarchist has the answer: man is innately, naturally good; and we must wage war on things, circumstances outside man which conflict with him. The trouble with Mr. Uloth and so many others is that they are unable to discriminate between, in the first place, man and the external world, and secondly the things in that world. In his article Mr. Uloth uses the generalities, Nature, the World, Space, etc., as interchangeable, sometimes co-extensive, sometimes mutually exclusive, but almost always in a vague and contradictory manner.

To restrict ourselves to his main term, nature: he is quite right to disclaim the value of attacks on sexuality, on human nature; but he does not discriminate between human nature and—"nature" as a whole. He would extend this tolerance apparently to animals, plants, etc., and disavow any conquest over these. He would not dream of destroying any of these. But before we achieved the

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 7

Deficit on Freedom	£105
Contributions received	£138
SURPLUS	£33
February 11 to February 16	
Spokane: R.F.W. & T.H.	£5/5/0; Birmingham: B.S. 10/-; London: Anon.* 5/-; London: Anon. 9d.; London: J.S. 3/-; Glasgow: S.M. 1/6; Birmingham: A.W.H. 6/6; Northwood: E.H. 2/6.
Total	6 14 3
Previously acknowledged	131 17 3
1955 TOTAL TO DATE	£138 11 6

AN action was brought recently against the Metropolitan Police by a Mr. Hamshere of Holland Road, London, W. Mr. Hamshere's case was that he had been stopped and questioned by a police-constable at 7.30 a.m. on a Sunday morning and had thus suffered 'grave injury to his reputation'. He claimed £5,000 damages. The judgment went against him with costs for the Police.

It was admitted that Mr. Hamshere was stopped because he was 'of somewhat striking appearance'—he had a 'luxuriant' beard and was rather shabbily dressed—and because he was carrying a rucksack. It turned out that he was on his way to do some gardening. If he hadn't been carrying the rucksack he probably wouldn't have been stopped, but the constable thought 'it might contain stolen property'.

The Judge commented: 'I shall have to be very careful next time I do my gardening and cross the road to post a letter'.

Mr. Hamshere has learnt to his cost that 'shabbily dressed' and 'suspicious' are synonymous terms to a policeman.

It seems that under the Metropolitan Police Act officers on duty in the early morning are required to pay particular attention to persons carrying bags and parcels, and if necessary to stop them and ask for an explanation. In the sub-

domestication of the animals we had to oppose and destroy their behaviour patterns. No matter what suasion, kindness, or subtlety was used, the animals enlisted in man's cause represent man's conflict with the conquest over parts of nature.

But Mr. Uloth does not like the word conquest—he cannot dissociate it from human military conquests. He prefers co-operation. He says: "... it is not by conquering, but by co-operating with nature, that agriculture, and hence civilization, has been developed." This is utterly wrong. We have had to fight "nature" (those parts of it not obviously allied to man) every inch of the way, until it learned to do our bidding, until it learned to co-operate with us,—until it learned to operate for us. Bees, ants, tapeworms—innumerable living forms are adjusted to, and at peace with their environment; man is at war with, and adjusts his environment to him. This ecological balance of loving-kindness is a supine surrender of everything that makes man great, everything that makes man good, everything that makes man god. This is not to say man does not co-operate (with what is good in his surroundings). Nor is it contending that man's conquest of nature is necessarily conducted in a callous manner. All we mean, to paraphrase Bakunin's statement, is that the urge to conquer is also the urge to co-operate—on our terms. The only peace with our surroundings, unless it is that peace which issues from victory over them, lies in enslavement to them, in death.

Man is a warrior, a destroyer. And he is this because he is a—creator, that is to say, an artist. As artists we destroy—but we do not destroy men, as politicians, militarists do; we destroy certain natural forms, in order to create and replace them with new, artificial forms. Our sciences are the strategies of our incessant war with raw materials. Our scientific "laws" are really laws, attempts to legislate for, to dictate to our materials. Or, if the word dictatorship is too strong to apply to our natural surroundings, attempts to extend a benevolent protectorate over them. Certainly attempts with us as sensitive humanitarians to extend our sympathies to all living beings... But here again, Mr. Uloth and others fail to distinguish between living and non-living, between the human and non-human environments. Mr. Uloth is so much in love with "nature" and so much opposed to "war" that he decries the conquest of space! He deprecates the artefacts of aviation, in the interests again of "nature". Well it is natural for animals to crawl on the earth on all fours; but we, men, are "unnatural". We are artists, and therefore, if the word has any meaning, artificial. We are artificers, makers, creators—and therefore fighters, conquerors. And Mr. Uloth, for all his undisputedly good intent, for all the partial truth in his arguments, to the extent that he favours external nature—to the extent that he opposes our conquest of nature, must stand for a victory for nature—for its conquest over art.

Sydney, Jan. 31. HARRY HOOTON.

SUSPICIOUS POLICEMEN

division of Kensington police station alone 1470 people were stopped in 1953 and about 1200 in 1954. Arrests were just under 5% of those stopped. Now according to the Act a policeman should not stop a person unless he has 'reasonable grounds for suspicion': but 19 out of every 20 persons thus suspected in this sub-division turned out to be innocent—which figures suggest that if policemen are abiding by their regulation (which implies that a criminal can be recognized by his appearance) their judgment is deficient; or if they are not, they are stopping persons without 'reasonable grounds'.

One can only conclude that everybody has 'reasonable grounds' for suspecting any policeman.

The Money Goes Around . . .

And who pays if an action against a policeman is successful? Not the policeman but the Receiver of the Metropolitan Police whose funds come from the Treasury. The Treasury's funds come from taxes and nobody needs telling where taxes come from.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

LECTURE-DISCUSSIONS
Every Sunday at 7.30 at
THE MALATESTA CLUB
155 High Holborn, W.C.1.
(Nearly opposite Holborn Town Hall)
FEB. 27—Emile Boin on
TAOISM AND ANARCHISM
MAR. 6—Tony Weaver on
MATERNAL CARE AND MENTAL HEALTH
MAR. 13—H. McLaughlin on
WILL MACHINES RULE THE WORLD?
MAR. 20—Bob Green
(Subject to be announced).

INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS

Every Thursday at 8.15.
OPEN AIR MEETINGS
Weather Permitting
HYDE PARK
Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

N.W. LONDON

HAMPSTEAD
at 27 Christchurch Hill,
Hampstead, N.W.3.
Discussions Meetings Mondays
at 8 p.m.
Correspondence to:
Alan M. Bain, 8 Riffel Road,
Cricklewood, N.W.2.

GLASGOW

INDOORS
at 200 Buchanan Street
Every Friday at 7 p.m.

The Malatesta Club

155 HIGH HOLBORN,
LONDON, W.C.1.
YOUTH GROUP ACTIVITIES
Saturday, Feb. 26, at 9 p.m.:
Anarchist Film Festival.
Dancing Every Saturday from 9 p.m.
(Guest charge, 6d.)

★
LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP
Informal Discussions Every Thursday,
at 8.15 p.m.
Lecture-Discussions Every Sunday
at 7.45 p.m.
(See Announcements Column)
ALL WELCOME

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

JIBES AND FLYING SAUCERS

USUALLY one is tempted to ignore derogatory remarks made about prominent people, especially when one understands the mechanism and motive behind these remarks. But one cannot help noticing the similarity between "fascist" thinking and argument, and the method of degrading people who one feels stand opposed to one's cherished concepts. One need not argue on the basis of one's beliefs in the U.S.A. If one is a communist or even a true democrat it is only necessary to call you a "Commie" to remove any intelligence, sincerity, or rationality your argument may possess. In the U.S.S.R. one has only to be named a "Cosmopolitan", "petit bourgeois", or "Trotskyist" to class you as the nearest thing to an idiot or reactionary. In Nazi Germany if you were a "Jew" you simply could not say or do anything but the lowest of the low.

Of course in FREEDOM when one cannot be outrightly crude or insulting one can always water down one's crudity with whimsy but the basic pattern still persists. I am referring to two recent instances in two different articles in FREEDOM. The first, an otherwise interesting article by Bob Green was ended by an unnecessary reference to Freud as "Daddy Freud". Daddy, in this case was intended as a ludicrous old man, of funny old character, and naturally a ludicrous or funny old man can't have anything important to say. Rational people who have studied Freud and choose to disagree still maintain a healthy respect for the man's work. In this case B.G. found it easier to ridicule the author than to understand his case.

The second instance was the science review by "Bios", when he commented on the "flying saucers" and discounted the rumour (no doubt created by himself) that the occupants did not look like Wilhelm Reich. Here again the attempt was made to lump Wilhelm Reich with the supposedly ludicrous idea of the "flying saucers".

It is quite obvious that Bios has not read any of the evidence (apart from newspaper cuttings), on flying saucers, and chose to quote one funny instance of a farmer in France mistaking a tractor for one of the flying machines. The mass of evidence on the subject plus the fact that the U.S.A., France, England, South Africa and Australia each have whole departments in their respective Air Forces concerned only with the phenomenon of the "Flying Saucers", suggests it to be a little more real than most people imagine. But to "Bios" it is ridiculous to assume anything not officially stated, and to lump Wilhelm Reich with "Flying Saucers" in the manner he did is to attempt to kill ideas held by Wilhelm Reich by trying to destroy, in this case by ridicule, the vessel that contains them. Apart from that, neither of the instances achieved the humorous intent the authors intended.

London, Feb. 14.

S.F.

SELECTIONS FROM FREEDOM

Volume 3—1953

Colonialism on Trial

230 pp. paper 7/6; cloth 10/6

Still available:

Vol. 1.

MANKIND IS ONE

Vol. 2.

POSTSCRIPT TO POSTERITY

NOTE: The paper editions of the three volumes are offered to readers of FREEDOM at the special rate of

FIVE SHILLINGS

per volume by ordering direct from F.P.