

A Priestley Frolic - p. 2
 Hiroshima - p. 2
 Ends and Means - p. 3

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

The people cannot afford to be enslaved for the sake of being insured

BENJAMIN TUCKER

Vol. 16, No. 16

April 16th, 1955

Threepence

COMMUNISTS & THE BOMB

TO try to serve a government and the working class of any one country is to essay an impossibility; to serve a government and try to serve the working class of all countries is ludicrous. And if the workers were more socially conscious than, unfortunately, they are, they would see how ludicrous it is to confuse their interests with those of any government whatsoever.

But politicians of all shades have been able to get away with this for centuries, and the newest political groupings have found it even easier to do for they have spoken more volubly on behalf of the workers and have thus confused the issue even more, by the diversion of modern revolutionary thought.

We refer, of course, to the Communist Parties of the world, who speak and parade in every country as the champions of the workers, but have at the same time to consider and serve the interests of the government of Russia.

This creates a division of purpose which, as any mental conflict will, brings that familiar touch of hysteria to all their propaganda, and makes necessary the blind spots, the doublethink, without which nobody could support them.

Russia's Interest

On the little matter of the hydrogen bomb, for example, we feel that a few moments reflection would show the members of the Communist Party that their true policy should really be to support the manufacture of it in Britain. It is short-sighted and unrealistic for them to carry on propaganda against it—except of course that they will be completely unsuccessful and so in the event a policy which may eventually work to their benefit will be carried out for them by the Tories and the Labour Party.

The real struggle for power in the world to-day is not between Britain and Russia but between America and Russia. Britain's historic rôle of rejoicing third could be played out behind this conflict, as long as she could be sure that she would not be swallowed up by the 'victor'. Russia and America

Bigger Newspapers Soon?

IN normal times, the average citizen of the United Kingdom reads considerably more newspaper than the average citizen of any other country. Whether he sees the advertisements is of course another question, but it seems that a great deal of money is spent on the off-chance that he might. At the end of March, *Statistical Review* estimated the amount of revenue from advertising being lost to newspapers by the strike as:

London Mornings, £63,000 a day.
 London Evenings, £17,000 a day.
 Sundays, £162,000 per issue.

These figures do not include classified advertisements!

However, this may not be a complete loss. *Advertiser's Weekly* interviewed four important advertising men who all said they were not thinking of switching their newspaper appropriations to other advertising media, since as one of them put it, "We hope that they will use the newsprint they have saved to produce larger newspapers when the strike is over."

A question in Parliament on April 5, about the distribution of spare newsprint, received the reply that the newspapers might prefer to use it to produce larger editions.

are the great expanding imperialist powers of the 20th century, the one politically, the other economically. Britain's sphere of influence is tending to contract, but her long experience of imperialism, balance of power intrigue and ruling class tactics in general makes her still a force to be reckoned with.

It is therefore in Russia's interests to prise Britain away from America. And the way to do that is to encourage her independence, economically and militarily. The Communist line of 'more East-West trade' fits in with the first of these, but their line on the H-Bomb does not.

Economically, the vast markets of Asia are very attractive to British industry. The American market is richer; it can pay higher prices. But the Asian countries are crying out for just the kind of capital goods that Britain excels in producing, and the visits last year by Labour and Tory Party delegations, and by business men from the City of London, indicates that Britain is certainly interested in strengthening East-West economic ties. This will of course make her less dependent upon America.

Militarily, there has been one main factor which has kept Britain dependent upon America: the latter's superiority in atomic and, now, hydrogen bombs. While Britain had to rely on America's supply of these oh-so-necessary weapons, bomber bases in East Anglia were logical and, even though they made Britain a No. 1 target, desirable for the British Government. America could supply the bombs and the means to deliver them and we felt

safe and protected in the knowledge that the U.S.A. as well as God was on our side.

U.S.-British Disagreement

On the issue of recognition of Red China, however, there is disagreement between the U.S.A. and Britain—for the latter wants those markets. And the brash, inexperienced, new Western Imperialist Power, just learning to throw her considerable weight about after a traditional isolationist position, might quite easily lead the world into a major conflict over something as unimportant—to Britain—as Formosa.

Once the balloon goes up there, and Britain is still America's ally

Continued on p. 4

LABOUR PACT WITH THE STEEL INDUSTRY

THE Labour Party must have been quite relieved that there was a newspaper strike in operation last week. For a piece of news was thus kept pretty quiet that might have stirred up quite a hornet's nest among party members.

This was a disclosure that the Labour Government came to an understanding with the Iron & Steel Federation in 1947 to avoid formal nationalisation.

The disclosure was made by Sir Ellis Hunter, Chairman of Dorman, Long & Co., the giant steel firm, at the company's annual general meeting last week.

He said:

"It is quite widely known that the steel industry had negotiated an understanding with the Socialist party in 1947 which would have become law but for one of those misunderstandings which trouble the Labour party from time to

time. Had it been carried through it provided for the practical supervision of the industry much on the lines of the act passed by the Conservative Government. Presumably it represented at the time the thinking of the more responsible elements of the Socialist party. Whether it would be so if they were returned to power I don't know."

This agreement no doubt explains the delay in nationalising the steel industry, which was not taken over until 1951, two years after the nationalisation bill was passed in 1949.

It also explains the luke-warm opposition put forward by the Labour Party when the Conservatives de-nationalised iron and steel. In fact it's rather surprising there was any opposition at all, considering how 'responsible' some elements of the Labour Party seem to be. . . .

ROUND THE EASTER CONFERENCES

Oh Lor'! Another Ministry!

RALLYING valiantly to the aid of its big brother the Labour Party in its desperate search for a policy, the Co-operative Party (at its annual conference has dreamed up a new Ministry, the proposals for which, according to the executive, 'should form a very substantial part of Labour's appeal to the country at the next general election'.

The new Ministry, which should have Cabinet rank, is to be the *Ministry of Consumers' Welfare*, and would be a concentration of departments already existing in other Ministries.

The powers of the President of the Board of Trade in respect of the Monopolies and Restrictive Practices Commission, the British Standards Institution, the Council of Industrial Design, weights and measures, and merchandise marks would be transferred to the new

Minister. From the Ministry of Food he would take over the food hygiene and standards and labelling divisions together with certain responsibilities for enforcement and research.

Some of the functions of a wide range of other organisations would also be re-allocated to the new Ministry, including the issuing of the interim index of retail prices, the administration of the Shops Acts and of national mark schemes. The Ministry would have neither regional nor local offices but local authorities would act as its agents, receiving complaints and directing them to the proper quarters.

It is enlightening to notice that the Co-op Party, with its roots among the people, does not think in terms of the people coming into more control of their own welfare, but of setting up another government department over the people—for their own good, of course. (To say nothing of a few more jobs for the boys).

But as an election programme? What will the slogan be? We offer the Labour Party a few:

'Forward to the Ministry of Consumers' Welfare!' 'Whose Finger on the Weights and Measures?' The Conservatives could then counter with 'Set the Interim Index Free!' Or simply 'Up the B.S.I.'!

That should inspire the electorate.

The Teachers' Budget

AT Scarborough, the National Union of Teachers held its annual conference, and in his presidential address Mr. H. J. Nursey, of Norwich, maintained that local government finance had failed to adjust itself satisfactorily to the changing demands of the Welfare State; it had not yet accommodated itself to the fact that, with the national socialisation of so many services formerly administered locally, education was the largest and, in fact, the key service by which it would ultimately be judged.

Mr. Nursey said the Ministry of Education, the local education authorities, and the N.U.T. must work together to nurture public opinion if they were to "sell" education effectively to the nation at large. They had not yet done it.

There were few signs that the country was yet prepared to spend £500 millions annually on education, but that was a reasonable estimate of what the budget must be if the children were to receive a good education in reasonable buildings, served by a well qualified teaching profession who were accorded a professional salary.

A nation that spent 9.4 per cent. of its total income on education in 1910-11 and only 6.8 per cent. in 1953 could hardly be said to be progressing educationally with reckless abandon. It said some-

thing for the efficiency of the schools that they had done so much in such circumstances.

One rather depressing feature of the NUT conference is that, as far as one can judge from the reports available, discussion is concerned purely with administration and never with the function of education.

Teachers' salaries, budgets, school buildings, etc., are no doubt important to teachers. But how often do they put themselves up and ask themselves just what are they doing to the children?

The importance of this was not lost on the Archbishop of York, Dr. Garbett, who addressed the conference service on Easter Sunday. He said that the tremendous responsibility of keeping Britain Christian through the education of her children rested to-day upon the teachers. In the past the Church gave that teaching: it still did so far as it was able, but to-day the churches and chapels were in touch with only a minority of children. It used to be said rightly that the parents should teach children the Christian faith, but to-day a very large number of parents did not know that faith sufficiently well to teach it.

It was not so easy to teach religion in the atmosphere of our own time as it used to be. Children to-day lived in a technical world; they were mechanically minded, and almost unconsciously there was a kind of bar against the teaching of all that belonged to eternity.

It's not only the Jesuits who know the importance of catching 'em young.

Clerks & Shopworkers Criticise Leaders

AT two union conferences delegates complained that the leaderships' attitude to German rearmament was at odds with general opinion.

The action of the executive council of the Clerical and Administrative Workers' Union, which voted in favour of German rearmament at last year's Trades Union Congress and at the Labour Party conference, was criticised in a resolution, carried by 23,710 votes to 16,710 at Bridlington.

The resolution, moved by Mr. F. Hillson (Ashton-under-Lyne), said that the conference "opposes the rearmament of Western Germany and views with regret the action of the executive council in casting a vote at the conferences of the T.U.C. and Labour party without a mandate."

Mr. D. S. Thomas (Ten Acres and Storchley), opposing, said that if the resolution was carried it would mean that the union did not agree that the executive was entrusted with the responsibility of making decisions between union conferences, and Mr. D. Currie, the vice-president, said: "The conference will make a ghastly mistake if they say

SOUTH AFRICA

WITHDRAWS FROM UNESCO

IN spite of most people's opinions to the contrary, anarchism is based much more upon practical experience than upon speculation or theory.

Our attitude to international treaties and alliances, to 'Four Power Pacts' and the like, for example, is one of scepticism and doubt. Not only because our basic theoretical attitude to governments is of distrust and contempt, but because we have seen enough of alliances and treaties to know that they are honoured only just as long as they serve the interests of the contracting parties.

The pre-war League of Nations was just such a marriage of convenience, from which Hitler walked out when it suited him. The present band of hope, the United Nations, is, to say the least, not very accurately named, and those trusting folk who really expected it to be a factor for world peace would be well advised to study the nature of power-structures and their effect upon people.

Not only is the United Nations useless for solving international squabbles (in fact the cold war could not be waged so effectively without its shop-window), but the much vaunted 'Rights of Man' declaration to which its members are supposed to adhere was a dead letter from the beginning. Britain's refusal to allow discussion of Cyprus' Enosis claim made that clear enough.

Latest example comes from South Africa, whose government has just announced that she is to leave Unesco (United Nations Educational, Scientific & Cultural Organisation) because of its "interference" in the Union's racial problems. This was announced in the House of Assembly last week by the External Affairs Minister, Mr. Louw, who also stated that the Government did not propose to make a submission to the International Court of Justice, which is to consider next month the request of the United Nations General Assembly for an advisory opinion on the scope of

its authority on reports and petitions affecting South-West Africa.

Mr. Louw said that the interference by Unesco was by means of publications advertised and distributed by the South African Institute of Racial Relations. He would recommend to the Cabinet that money saved by withdrawal from that organisation—£30,000 last year and £26,000 this year—should be used for the dissemination of facts abroad by the State Information Office.

How, then, can the political innocents continue to imagine that organisations like Unesco can be used to further ends opposed by the governments which pay its expenses? America has made Unesco toe her line as far as education and cultural propaganda on the 'Western Way of Life' is concerned, by threatening to withdraw the dollars if too much objectivity was displayed.

Now South Africa withdraws her support—and is going to use the money 'saved' to disseminate its own nationalistic and racially intolerant propaganda.

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!

WEEK 14
 Deficit on Freedom £210
 Contributions received £181
 DEFICIT £29

April 1 to April 7

Falmouth: R.W. 5/-; Stroud: S.L.R. 2/9;
 Sheffield: G.P.* 5/-; Glasgow: J.M. 2/6;
 Brentwood: N.B. 15/-; Chelsea, Mass.: J.M.
 14/-; London: Anon.* 6/-; London: W.F.*
 1/8; London: D.R.* 5/-; London: J.S.* 3/-;
 London: J.H. 3/-; London: B.R. £1; Oxford:
 Anon.* 5/-; Pontardawe: W.G.G. 2/6.

Total ... 4 10 5
 Previously acknowledged ... 177 4 5

1955 TOTAL TO DATE ... £181 14 10

GIFT OF BOOKS: Preston: W.A.LoM.

BOOK REVIEW

A PRIESTLEY FROLIC

LOW NOTES ON A HIGH LEVEL, by J. B. Priestley. (Heinemann 10s. 6d.)

THE right time to read this Priestley frolic is during a period without newspapers. As FREEDOM Editorials have pointed out, away from headlines and feverish print, events are reduced to their real importance and governments, politicians, affairs of States, appear to be swollen ticks that can neatly be picked off existence and dropped down the pan. Without the mind's morning journey to Saigon and Peking, and the necklines of Jane R. and Ava G. arousing dissatisfaction and longing, one subsides into noticing one's neighbours and realising that the plainish woman in one's bed is really more pleasing than the pin-up picture over it.

This Priestley frolic, and frankly this is Priestley at his most sincere, is purposely allowed to break every rule of probability, and with no limits set on the imagination, the theme is furiously exploited. The English Broadcasting Company will only be allowed to give the first performance of a new symphony written by the world-famous composer, Stannsen, if an eccentric inventor, Dobb, can be persuaded to play his Dobbophone. This instrument, it appears, can reach the lowest bass notes ever put down on paper. The eccentric, of course, for various reasons, does not agree, and it seems that the first performance, naturally attended by every kind of celebrity, will have to be abandoned. In a perfectly acceptable manner, we are moved to another of Dobb's inventions, a new type of radio transmitter. This quickly becomes the clandestine Dobb's Freedom Radio, debunking and challenging Authority, though Dobb's romantically inclined anarchism seems to spring only from the resentment of having to pay income tax.

The connection between Dobb's Freedom Radio and the reality of the present newspaper strike, appears to rest in the challenge to certain institutions which have now achieved complete domination over the minds and habits of men. So we have newspapers, dictating life in tens of millions of homes, paralysed by a demand for higher wages, and Dobb's Freedom Radio giving another interpretation of events, each showing how easily communication between rulers and the ruled can be broken or interfered with. (Remembering the low polling in the recent newspaperless elections, what a fragile hold on the people rulers really have!)

This Priestley novel, read at this particular moment, makes one play with the idea of a complete breakdown of public communications. Combine a radio and TV stoppage with a newspaper strike, let it last for six months and then observe the changing patterns of society and individual behaviour. There is a paragraph in this novel which is hardly in the spirit of frolic but which is well worth quoting:

"Films, newspaper headlines and feature stories, radio and TV programmes, advertising campaigns, were all aimed at Enid and Bernard, who were profoundly grateful for this attention and never failed to react properly. If an advertiser said, "Watch This Space!", they watched it. If a newspaper felt gravely concerned they felt gravely concerned too. The topic of the day was always their topic. If one of the E.B.C.'s parlour games was a success, then it had undoubtedly

been a success with Enid and Bernard. If the Coronation had lasted for twenty-two hours on TV, they would never have taken their eyes off the screen, even at the risk of going blind and dotty. Always they did what they were told, Enid asking for *Shifto* the magic washing powder, Bernard demanding *Filter-Dung* the new cigarette. There might of course be some difference of opinion at times, when they had not been told exactly what they ought to think and feel. Thus, as Alan had learnt at dinner, Enid thought Albert Girding, the E.B.C.'s professional insulter, rather too rough and rude, whereas Bernard held that he didn't really mean it. But this gave variety and spice to life, inspiring many jolly arguments as they sat in their *All-cozee* chairs in front of the *Cheerie-Flame* gas-fire, before it was time for a cup of *Sleepo*, to guard against night famine, and beddiebyes."

Dobb's Freedom Radio has a short but merry life and there is much fun while the characters are cleverly manoeuvred to make sure that the Dobbophone is played, that the Stannsen Tenth is a success and that the young couple are happily married. What was, however, a false note, was the way the authorities, when Dobb and his team of radio pirates had been caught, were persuaded to drop proceedings. The argument used to persuade the authorities to take this unusually lenient course was that of a journalist who threatened, 'Half-a-dozen of us, all with by-lines in the big dailies, know what's happening here. And I might as well tell you—if you go for these two, we're going for you—that's settled already.' But in an enjoyable frolic of this kind we will accept the idea if 'the big dailies' siding with Dobb's Freedom Radio.

A common Priestley preoccupation is the subject of income tax and tax inspectors, and though we all share his hostility, the frequency with which reference is made in his writings to this specific and minor

detail would seem to cover a deeper obsession with money. It is a distasteful thought when so much of his work is idealistic and intelligent. One of the major complaints of the character Dobb is that he is not allowed to pay his taxes by way of smoking expensive cigars. Tax-paying would be a pleasure and the Government would get the money anyway. A more sensible alternative, which one can strongly recommend to Mr. Dobb-Priestley, is the forming of a limited company of writers. Mr. Dobb-Priestley's surplus and taxable earnings would then go to support a handful of struggling apprentice-novelists. The wages or salaries of writers of unprofitable, perhaps unsaleable works would then be set against the Dobb-Priestley contribution to the H-bomb and Princess Margaret's West Indian tour.

The artist's first duties are towards his conscience and his work. Never towards the unnatural and ephemeral State. The living example, however, requires more effort, ingenuity and sacrifice, than the imaginary one. C.H.

Exhibition

PICTURES OF DISASTER

THE Hiroshima Exhibition, a show sponsored by the Artists for Peace Movement and the Institute of Contemporary Arts is about to start a tour of Britain having just closed at the College of Preceptors, London. It consists of three panels four feet high and as long as the room, and a number of small drawings, by two artists called Iri Maruki and Toshiko Amatsu, whose original purpose was to make propaganda against the Atom Bomb in Japan (!). The purpose of the current sponsors is, of course, to make propaganda against the Atom Bomb in Britain.

It is a great pity that after all the well-intentioned trouble and expense of producing these panels and transporting them across the world, their propaganda value is negligible. Even had they been successful in depicting the terror and pain following the explosion in Hiroshima (which they have not), they would have almost no chance of changing anybody's mind about the bomb. The effects of the Atom Bombs are known to most people; and those who still acquiesce in their manufacture will not be converted by mere pictures of these effects. There are people who are not fully aware of the most horrible thing about the Hiroshima disaster—namely that somebody intended it to happen—and some such people may have been

moved by pictures which dealt with the cause as well as the result of the bomb. But the artists give no indication at all that the terror and pain they try to portray is intended; they might as well have been inspired by the eruption of Vesuvius or the explosion of Krakatoa.

Disregarding the propaganda content of the panels, one can see from the subject and the general expressions of the figures that they are intended to provoke horror. Their complete failure to do so may result in part from their colour. They are executed in Indian ink on rice paper, "partly" says the handout, "because the artists felt that a traditional Japanese technique should be used . . ." (Why didn't they use the clean decisive lines of Japanese tradition, instead of all that fog?) . . . and partly because they lacked funds to buy oil paints". (Be thankful; with oil paint an even foggier effect is possible).

But I think their failure results chiefly from their undoubted academic merit. Any artist's model, however horrific the pose or genuine the injuries, begins to look a bit wooden after an hour's standing still; and the very few great artists who can achieve strong emotive effects from painstaking anatomical studies do not include Maruki and Akamatus. Had they forgotten the life class, concentrated on the horror and drawn the figures with the traditionally Japanese decision which

HIROSHIMA

CHILDREN OF HIROSHIMA

Film

ON August 6, 1945, at a quarter past eight in the morning, an American aeroplane dropped one bomb on the Japanese town of Hiroshima. Some seconds later, in the twinkling of an eye, 200,000 persons died. It was the greatest massacre in history, but that was not how it appeared at the time to most people in America and Britain. Many of them, ordinary kindly people, were delighted: the long war must end now; the "enemy" could not withstand this new thing.

The war ended, and with its end went the brief jubilation. We began to have an inkling—but no more than an inkling—of how horrible that act had been. But I do not think anyone could quite

they use for the red flames on the only panel not restricted to black and grey, they might have approached even the terrifying effect of Picasso's 'Guernica'. As it is they hardly provoke a tremor.

Let it not be thought however, that these works are completely worthless. They are well drawn; they show how two artists can work as one; they have a certain decorative value, and the great designer Misha Black thinks they have a valuable new approach to the problems of mural painting.

D.R.

imagine the full horror of it. Even John Hershey's long article in the *New Yorker*, for all its careful and detailed presentation of facts, never escaped from the coldness of print.

Now, ten years later, we have the chance to see something of that singular event, not as we saw it on the news-reels, a gigantic firework display viewed from the comfort and safety of an arm-chair, but in purely human terms.

In *Children of Hiroshima* (a Japanese film now at the Marble Arch Pavilion) we see it as a thing remembered, through the eyes of a young school-mistress returned on a melancholy pilgrimage to the scene of her childhood home. Here are the ordinary people of Hiroshima on that fateful morning going about their ordinary business: mother doing the washing, father going back from leave, the children setting out for school. There is nothing inscrutable about these orientals: their feelings are written plainly on their faces. If they were not quite so polite they would be just like the people next door. We hear the radio giving the "all clear". We see the B29 flying through a tracery of clouds. We hear a clock's crescendo ticking suddenly stop. Then come desolation and bewilderment in a swift succession of images: the sudden withering of some sunflowers; fish flapping help-

Continued on p. 3

EDWARD CARPENTER'S NON-GOVERNMENTAL SOCIETY - 2

IS IT POSSIBLE?

FROM Solomon to Dr. Watts we have been advised to go to the Ant and the Bee for instruction, and lo! they are unpractical and Utopian too. Can anything be more foolish than the conduct of these little creatures, any one of whom will at any moment face death in defence of his tribe while the Bee is absolutely so ignorant and senseless, that instead of storing up the honey that it has gathered in a little cell of its own, with a nice lock and key, it positively puts it in the common cells, and cannot distinguish it from the stores of the others. Foolish little Bee, the day will surely come when you will bitterly rue your "unthrifty" conduct, and you will find yourself starving while your fellow-tribesmen are consuming the fruits of your labour.

And the human body itself, that marvellous epitome and mirror of the universe, how about that? Is it not Utopian too? It is composed of a myriad cells, members, organs, compacted into a living unity. A healthy body is the most perfect society conceivable. What does the hand say when a piece of work is demanded of it? Does it bargain first for what reward it is to receive, and refuse to move until it has secured satisfactory terms, or the foot decline to take us on a journey till it knows what special gain is to accrue to it thereby? Not so; but each limb and cell does the work which is before it to do, and (such is the Utopian law) the fact of its doing the work causes the circulation to flow to it, and it is nourished and fed in proportion to its service. And we have to ask whether the same may not be the law of a healthy human society? Whether the fact of a member doing service (however humble) to the community would not be quite sufficient to ensure his provision by the rest with all that it might need? Whether the community would think of allowing such an one to starve any more than a man would think of allowing his least finger to pine away and die? Whether it is not possible that men would cease to feel any anxiety about the "reward of their labour"; that they would think first of their work and the pleasure they had in doing it, and would not doubt that the reward would follow?

For indeed the instinct to do anything which is obviously before you to do, which is wanted, and which

you can do, is very strong in human nature. Even children, those rudimentary savages, are often extremely proud to be "useful", and it is conceivable that we might be sensible enough, instead of urging them as we do now to "get on", to make money, to beat their fellows in the race of life, and by climbing on other folk's heads to ultimately reach a position where they would have to work longer—that we might teach them how when they grew up they would find themselves members of a self-respecting society which, while it provided them *gratis* with all they might need, would naturally expect them in honour to render some service in return. Even small children could understand that. Is it quite inconceivable that a society of grown men and women might act up to it?

But it is really absurd to argue about the possibility of these things in human society, when we have so many actual example of them before our eyes. Herman Melville, in that charming book *Typee*, describes the Marquesas Islanders of the Pacific, among whom he lived for some time during the year 1846. He says: "During the time I lived among the Typees no one was ever put upon his trial for any offence against the public. To all appearances there were no courts of law or equity. There was no municipal police for the purposes of apprehending vagrants or disorderly characters. In short, there were no legal provisions whatever for the well-being and conservation of society, the enlightened end of civilised legislation." Nevertheless, the whole book is a eulogy of the social arrangements he met with, and with almost a fervour of romance in its tone; and yet, like all his description of the natives of the Pacific Islands, undoubtedly accurate, and well corroborated by the travellers of the period. An easy communism prevailed. When a good haul of fish was made, those who took part in it did not keep the booty to themselves, but parcelled it out, and sent it throughout the tribe, retaining only their proportionate share. When one family required a new cabin, the others would come and help to build it. He describes such an occasion, when, "at least a hundred of the natives were bringing materials to the ground, some carrying in their hands one or two of the canes which were to form the sides,

others slender rods of hibiscus, strung with palmetto leaves, for the roof. Every one contributed something to the work; and by the united but easy labours of all the entire work was completed before sunset."

Similar communistic habits prevail, of course, through a vast number of savage tribes, and indeed almost anywhere that the distinctively commercial civilisation has not set its mark. They may be found close at home, as in the little primitive island of St. Kilda, in the Hebrides, where exactly the same customs of sharing the hauls of fish or the labours of housebuilding exist to-day, which Melville describes in *Typee*; and they may be found all along the edges of our civilization in the harvesting and house-warming "bees" of the backwoods and outlying farm-populations. And we may fairly ask, not whether such social habits are possible, but whether they are not in the end the only possible form; for surely it is useless and absurd to call these modern hordes of people, struggling with each other for the means of subsistence, and jammed down by violent and barbaric penal codes into conditions which enforce the struggle, *societies*; as it would be absurd to call the wretched folk in the Black Hole of Calcutta a society. If any one will only think for a minute of his own inner nature he will see that the only society which would ever really satisfy him would be one in which he was perfectly free, and yet bound by ties of deepest trust to the other members; and if he will think for another minute he will see that the only conditions on which he could be perfectly free (to do as he liked) would be that he should trust and care for his neighbour as well as himself. The conditions are perfectly simple; and since they have been more or less realized by countless primitive tribes of animals and men, it is surely not impossible for civilized man to realise them. If it be argued (which is perfectly true) that modern societies are so much more complex than the primitive ones, we may reply that if modern man, with his science and his school-boards, and his brain cultivated through all these centuries, is not competent to solve a more complex problem than the savage, he had better return to savagery.

But it is getting time to be practical. Of the possibility of a free communal society there can really, I take it, be no doubt. The question that more definitely presses on us now is one of transition—by what steps shall we, or can we pass to that land of freedom?

Continued on p. 3

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP
OPEN DAILY

OPEN 10 a.m. to 6.30; 5.0 SATURDAYS
New Books & Reprints . . .

Scum of the Earth Arthur Koestler 15/-
The Verdict of You All Rupert Croft-Cooke 15/-
The Great French Revolution Peter Kropotkin (2 Vols.) the set 12/6

Remainders . . .
Are Workers Human? Gordon Rattray Taylor 2/6
(published at 10/6)

Second-Hand . . .
The New Commandment Pantelimon Romanof 2/6
The Go Between L. P. Hartley 2/6
The Lost Week-End Charles Jackson 3/-

Angels and Beasts Chamson, Duhamel, etc. 2/6
Kidder's Luck Jack Common 2/6
The Conquest of Happiness Bertrend Russell 5/-
Mother Russia Maurice Hindus 2/6

Pamphlets . . .
Anarchism and American Traditions Voltairine de Cleyre 4d.
A Talk Between Two Workers Errico Malatesta 9d.
Does God Exist? Sebastian Faure 1/-

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

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

ENDS AND MEANS

THE essay on Non-Governmental Society that is published in this and last week's issues of FREEDOM, was written by Edward Carpenter nearly forty years ago and included in a volume of essays bearing the title "Towards Industrial Freedom". The instalment published in this week's issue is much more controversial, from the anarchist viewpoint, than the first half of the essay, but because it is an undogmatic searching for the ways and means by which the new society will be reached, it is to be hoped that it will stimulate those who are more than intelligently interested in the social problem to consider what can be done within the framework of the existing social and economic structure to prepare the way for the free society so convincingly and attractively outlined by Carpenter in the first half of his essay.

Some of us may feel that Carpenter's hopes in voluntary collectivism, as represented by the Trade Unions and Co-operative Societies, have proved to be a false optimism, and his view that "the rolling up of companies into huge and huger trusts" would make "the transference of industries to public control and to public uses, daily more easy to effect" utopian rather than realistic. Obviously the economic problem, working conditions and the widespread horrors of poverty and mass unemployment in this country fifty years ago deeply influenced all progressive thinkers and one can well understand that they should lay greatest stress on solving the economic problem as the solution for all the ills, "the Fears", of society. To-day, in most of the industrialised countries, the conditions of grinding poverty, the "unworthy fear which haunts nine-tenths of the population, the anxiety for the beggarly elements of subsistence" have largely disappeared.

We are not suggesting that the economic problem has been solved, or that we are living in an era of general prosperity and satisfactory working conditions. But if our actions in the present are to be informed, we must look forward to probable developments in the years ahead, and it appears to some of us that full-employment has become as much a necessity to the health of capitalism as grinding unemployment was the means of obtaining the "cheap labour on which commercialism is built" of Carpenter's day. Mass production can function profitably (sic) only through mass markets which means, in these days of shrinking world markets, large "prosperous" home markets.

Carpenter visualised that economic emancipation would automatically bring with it a spiritual awakening and an end of "the Nightmarish competition and bitter struggle of men with each other". That his dream seems as far from general realisation to-day as fifty years ago, can perhaps be most simply explained by the fact that what was for him the means—economic well-being—has become the ends in our day.

Just as it was a fallacy to believe—as many did fifty years ago—that the social revolution would be made on hungry bellies, so is it an equally fallacious assumption that full-bellies will automatically usher in the good society. (If it were so then surely the ruling class would be in the vanguard of the struggle for freedom!)

The real dangers of reforms and reformism is when they cease to be means and become ends. Organisation was the first vital step in the struggle for the economic and social liberation of the toiling masses. The danger of Organisation to-day is that

it has become an end in itself. It is part of the State machine, a vital part of the capitalist system.

More than ever the rôle of the anarchists and libertarians seems to some of us to be that of stressing the ends towards which organisation, full-bellies and full employment will be seen in their proper perspective, as the means. Unless we can succeed in this then the mass "fear" of material security to which Carpenter so movingly referred in his day, will be solved in our time only by the creation of new mass "fears"—many already with us—not the least, the fear of freedom.

The Boy from Stalingrad

OUR American contemporary *l'Adunata dei Refrattari* in its April 9 issue in which our editorial on "The Boy from Stalingrad" (FREEDOM 2/9/55) is reprinted in full in an Italian translation, adds an editorial comment which confirms our assumption that Valery Lysikov knows something about the meaning of the word "anarchism" and of its rôle in Russian social history in spite of the Russian government's ruthless suppression of the movement and its literature.

Our contemporary quotes a dispatch to the *N.Y. Times* (25/3/55) from its Berlin correspondent in which he points out that these young "anarchists" were inspired by "a Ukrainian leader" who, Valery Lysikov knew, had fought both against the Tsarist armies as well as against the Bolshevik armies during the revolution. As *l'Adunata* points out, this reference can only be to the anarchist guerilla fighter Nestor Makhno and the peasant movement of the Ukraine in the years 1917-20, to which "his name and his anarchist and revolutionary activity are indelibly linked".

l'Adunata also expressed its concern as to the fate of Lysikov, once in the hands of the allied police and professional soldiers. Their concern was not ill-founded. He was "used" in the most shameless way, and has since returned home with his parents to face the consequences. The reason for his decision is not given but one can guess that the pressures exerted on him from all sides were more than a mere youth could stand up to. The *Manchester Guardian's* Bonn correspondent de-

ROUND THE CONFERENCES

Continued from p. 1

Executive Criticised

that when matters of emergency arise the executive have not the right to make a decision."

While at the conference of the Union of Shop, Distributive & Allied Workers, Mr. Wilfred Burke, M.P., came under fire for acting contrary to the policy of his union.

Mr. Burke is nominated by U.S.D.A.W. for a seat on the National Executive of the Labour party. He was last year's chairman of the party and on the executive he has voted pretty consistently contrary to the policy of his union. He supported German rearmament; he voted against Mr. Attlee's resolution which saved Mr. Bevan from expulsion. U.S.D.A.W. was against German rearmament, and it has more than a soft spot for Mr. Bevan.

Miss F. Dean, of Manchester said: "We have the right to expect from our parliamentary representatives certain standards of loyalty to union policy, and Mr. Burke had been opposed to our policy on German rearmament and the H-bomb, both being questions of life and death." The executive should have nominated instead someone who had really attempted to further the interests and policies of the union.

scribes the behaviour of the Americans in these terms:

"From then on [after he had met his parents the first time and had in no way been shaken in his decision to remain in West Germany] the American handling of this case seems to have deteriorated. Lysikov, who was only sixteen years old according to the Soviet authorities, and scarcely of school-leaving age in any case, was put up to address the press and was taken to Frankfurt on what seems to have been a proselytisation mission. Reputable American newspapers lapped up his wisecracks about the Soviet régime and the Communist Clapham Common boys who, he maintained, continue to live their own lives under it."

The decision taken by young Lysikov to return home in no way affects the need, which we expressed in our editorial, to seek ways and means to penetrate the Eastern side of the curtain with our ideas. To this suggestion our internationally widely read contemporary *l'Adunata* has added its support. We feel that such an initiative should commend itself to FREEDOM's readers and to anarchists in general, and that in the near future some first steps may be taken to fulfil this intention. Are any of our readers interested?

Mr. Burke replied first that when he had disagreed with the union he was supporting majority decisions of the Labour party, and secondly "that as long as you send me on to the national executive you will send me not as a delegate but as a representative, to act according to my conscience and judgment."

Mr. Alan Birch, general secretary of the union, endorsed Mr. Burke's constitutional interpretation "without any question". The party could not be conducted successfully if every representative was a delegate.

In other words, when you send a representative on to an executive council, you no longer have any control over what he might do or say. That's democracy.

Journalists Oppose Colour Bar

DELEGATES to the annual conference of the National Union of Journalists at Margate passed resolutions on racial discrimination and nuclear weapons at their final session last Saturday. The conference passed unanimously a

South Africa Tightens Up on Passports

A NEW step to give the South African Government more control over its citizens has been announced.

Up till now, South Africans have been able to claim dual citizenship, and hold British passports, travelling freely on them to and from South Africa, but an amendment to a bill recently passed in the S.A. Parliament aims at closing this loophole.

If the amendment is passed (and what is to stop it?), South African passports or travel permits will be regarded as the only valid documents for South Africans leaving the country. The bill is designed to prevent Communists or sympathisers from visiting Communist countries by way of Britain and returning to spread indoctrination, especially among Africans.

The Opposition maintains that the bill, while aimed at a small minority, threatens the liberties of all, but since their protests will be limited to verbal opposition inside Parliament, where the Nationalists have a majority, the liberties of all don't stand much chance of being effectively defended.

resolution requesting its national executive council to put forward at the next Trades Union Congress a motion that "it is hereby declared against the spirit

of the trade union movement in this country that any person should by reason of race or colour be denied work which he is qualified to do." The resolution on nuclear weapons read:

"This conference, conscious of the incalculable dangers of nuclear weapons, of the influence exerted on public opinion and the international atmosphere by the press, and of the high responsibility incumbent on journalists, calls upon all members of the N.U.J. to contribute conscientiously in their work towards the lessening of international tension and at all times to avoid adding to an atmosphere in which nuclear weapons might be used."

Children of Hiroshima

Continued from p. 2

lessly about on dry land; a stricken raven fluttering madly on the ground near a piece of burning cloth; a woman's torso drenched in a sudden spate of blood from the unseen mouth; writhing bodies, seared flesh tormented by the tattered wisps of clothing that still hang about it; the frightened stare of eyes gone sightless; and above it all an awful pillar of smoke.

In the long anticlimax we follow the young schoolmistress on her search for the three children from her old school who are still alive. The town has been mostly rebuilt. Life goes on. But the scars remain. On some stone steps you can still see the shadow of a man who was sitting there on that August morning. Some faces still carry the marks of burns. Every so often someone falls unaccountably sick and dies. The midwife, sterilized by radiation, finds solace in helping other women to have babies. And the scars are not only physical. When a plane drones overhead and the people of Hiroshima look up at the sky we know what they are thinking.

There is not a single false note in this film. It is completely sincere and honest, and the director has avoided the sentimentality, self-pity, and overdramatization that such a subject could so easily have led him into. He has achieved his effect by the contrast between the brief scenes of rapidly mounting tension followed by swift, numbing catastrophe and the placid, almost pastoral tempo of the rest of the film. It is a work of art as well as a social document. And no-one can dispute that this is a social document. For if ever a film had a message it is this one: it tells us just how mad we all are. E.P.

Non-Governmental Society

Continued from p. 2

We have supposed a whole people started on its journey by the lifting off of a burden of Fear and anxiety; but in the long, slow ascent of evolution sudden miraculous changes are not to be expected; and for this reason alone it is obvious that we can look for no very swift transformation to the communal form. Peoples that have learnt the lesson of "trade" and competition so thoroughly as the modern nations have—each man fighting for his own hand—must take some time to unlearn it. The sentiment of the common life, so long nipped and blighted, must have leisure to grow and expand again; and we acknowledge that—in order to foster new ideas and new habits—an intermediate stage of definite industrial organization may be quite necessary.

When one looks sometimes at the awful residue and dregs which were being left as a legacy to the future by our present commercial system—the hopeless, helpless, drunken, incapable men and women who drift through London and the country districts from workhouse to workhouse, or the equally incapable and more futile idlers in high places, one feels that possibly only a rather stringent industrial organisation (such as the War has brought upon us) could have enabled society to cope with these burdens. The hand of the nation has already been forced to the development of Farm-colonies, Land-reclamations, Afforestation, Canal-restoration, and other big industrial schemes, and these are leading to a considerable socialisation of land and machinery. At the same time the rolling up of companies into huge trusts is, as we plainly see, making the transference of industries to public control and to public uses, daily more easy to effect.

On the other hand, the Trade Unions and Co-operative Societies by the development of productive as well as distributive industries, and by the interchange of goods with each other on an ever-growing scale, are bringing about a similar result. They are creating a society in which enormous wealth is produced and handled not for the profit of the few, but for the use of the many; a voluntary collectivism working within and parallel with the official collectivism of the State.

As this double collectivism grows and spreads, profit-grinding will more and more cease to be a lucrative profession. Though no doubt great efforts will be made in the commercial world to discountenance the public organisation of the unemployed (because this will cut away the ground of cheap labour on which commercial-

ism is built), yet as we have seen, the necessity of this organisation has reached such a point that it can no longer be denied. And as it comes in more and more, it will more and more react on the conditions of the employed, causing them also to be improved. Besides, we are fain to hope that something else of which we see growing signs on every hand, will also come in—namely a new sense of social responsibility, a new reading of religion, a healthier public opinion—which will help on and give genuine life to the changes of which we speak. If so, it might not be so very long before the spread of employment, and the growing security of decent wages, combined with the continual improvement of productive processes and conditions, would bring about a kind of general affluence—or at least absence of poverty. The unworthy fear which haunts the hearts of nine-tenths of the population, the anxiety for the beggarly elements of subsistence, would pass away or fade in the background, and with it the mad nightmarish competition and bitter struggle of men with each other. Even the sense of Property itself would be alleviated. To-day the institution of Property is like a cast-iron railing against which a human being may be crushed, but which still is retained because it saves us from falling into the gulf. But to-morrow, when the gulf of poverty is practically gone, the indicating line between one person and another need run no harsher than an elastic band. People will wake up with surprise, and rub their eyes to find that they are under no necessity of being other than human.

Simultaneously (i.e. with the lessening of the power of money as an engine of interest and profit-grinding) the huge nightmare which weighs on us to-day, the monstrous incubus of "business"—with its endless Sisyphus labours, its searchings for markets, its displacement and destruction of rivals, its travellers, its advertisements, its armies of clerks, its banking and broking, its accounts and checking of accounts—will fade and lessen in importance; till some day perchance it will collapse, and roll off like a great burden to the ground! Freed from the great strain and waste which all this system creates, the body politic will recover like a man from a disease, and spring to unexpected powers of health.

Meanwhile in the great industrial associations, voluntary and other, folk will have been learning the sentiment of the Common Life—the habit of acting together for common ends, the habit of feeling together for com-

mon interests—and once this has been learnt, the rest will follow of its own accord.

In the course of these changes, moving always towards a non-governmental and perfectly voluntary society in the end, it is probable that some Property-founded institutions, like the payment of labour by wages, though not exactly ideal in their character, will continue for a long period. It may perhaps be said that in some ways a generous wage-payment convention (as for instance sketched in the last chapter of Carruthers' *Commercial and Communal Economy*) on a thoroughly democratic basis, gives more freedom than a formless Anarchism in which each one takes "according to his needs", simply because under the first system A could work two hours a day and live on the wage of two, and B could work eight and live on the wage of eight, each with perfect moral freedom—whereas if there was no wage system, A (however much he might wish to loaf) would feel that he was cheating the community—and the community would think so too—unless he gave his eight hours like everybody else.

Some system too of National Guilds will quite probably be worked out, which, while rendering the worker-groups self-determining will award to them their fair share and their fair share only of the National income. Then, though the Cash-nexus may and no doubt will linger on for a long time in various forms of Wages, Purchase, Sale, and so forth, it must inevitably with the changing sentiment and conditions of life lose its cast-iron stringent character, and gradually be converted into the elastic cord, which while it may indicate a line of social custom will yield to pressure when the need arises. Private Property will thus lose its present virulent character, and subside into a matter of mere use or convenience; monetary reckonings and transfers, as time goes on, will seem little more than formalities—as to-day between friends.

Finally, Custom alone will remain. The subsidence of the Property feeling will mean the subsidence of brute-force Law, for whose existence Property is mainly responsible. The peoples accustomed to the varied activities, of a complex industrial organism, will still—though not suffering from the compulsion either of hunger or of brute authority—continue through custom to carry on these activities, their Reason in the main approving.

Custom will remain—slowly changing. And the form of the Societies of the future will be more vital and organic, and far more truly human, than they have been or could be under the rigid domination of Law.

VIEWPOINTS

Exercise and Education

THERE was recently published in FREEDOM an article taken from the American paper *Manas* on the rôle of physical exercise in the education of children. The author considered that "physical disciplines" (or words to that effect) were necessary for the young, but did not state very clearly what sort he favoured. From what was said about the system of education in Gandhian schools, it appears clear that handwork was not meant, and one was left with the uneasy feeling that the writer was thinking of some form of "physical jerks", or "games".

In view of the controversy that may follow, let me state my own experiences. I was at three schools during my childhood, and in all of them games were a fetish. The days were over when a boy could get away with badness at work by excellence on the football field, but otherwise it was a situation much like that portrayed in school-stories, with the important difference that the enthusiasm for games was only on the part of the masters and the older boys. The younger boys looked upon sports and exercises as an unmitigated curse, a thing without rhyme or reason, that the adult world thought fit to inflict on boys who could not protect themselves against it.

On long lovely summer afternoons we younger boys used to be herded out to the cricket field to watch matches, in which we were not at all interested, or

worse still, to play. If one was watching one had to sit still, and "pay attention to the game", if one was playing it usually meant standing for hours fielding, occasionally running after, or trying to catch, a small incredibly hard ball.

On the other hand winter meant the horrors of freezing cold. Ancient philosophers maintained that the world passed through ages during which it was alternately drowned or burnt. It was rather like that. In the winter one played football several afternoons each week, usually in a cold drizzle, sometimes in a damp bitter wind that penetrated our scanty football kit. The game was generally played enthusiastically by a few boys, who constituted themselves "forwards", and the remainder of the team wandered about dispiritedly, bored and frozen.

Exercises also were on the curriculum, as if "games" were not enough. They consisted of endless seemingly pointless movements, which the less athletic of the boys could never do properly. Failure to be able to keep up with the others in these really stupid activities bred a feeling of inferiority. Boys who could not touch their toes, run fast, or do "press-ups", developed a feeling of being weaklings, and of no account. The psychological harm done was worse than all the Oedipus complexes put together.

Dislike of "games" or exercises was of course regarded as a mark of laziness. Personally I hardly believe that there is such a thing as a lazy person in the world, though certainly some people are inclined to a feverish activity, while others take things more slowly. At one school I was at, we used at weekends to go into the woods behind the school, and construct camps and fortifications for the war games in which we indulged. The amount of trouble that we took in building these structures surprises me now when I look back on it. Huts were built two stories high, and some must be still standing, unless pulled down for building materials. Deep trenches were dug, everything so elaborate that I think they would have been defensible in a real fight.

But all this counted for nothing. It was "play", and therefore a waste of time. The real thing of importance was "games", and other things organised by the adults. To my mind such an attitude is one of criminal stupidity. I cannot put it too strongly. Children are quite capable of organising their own pastimes. There was no need for the organisation of these idiotic and unconstructive ball-games and races, which only develop a sense of inferiority in those who are not good at them, while all can work equally in building huts and so forth (or those who cannot do this can go off on their own and do

whatever they are good at, everybody is good at something).

NO doubt it is good for young people to have physical exercise, but if left to themselves they will find the form that suits them. Some may even like "physical jerks" and football. The reason why these exercises are forced on children must be sought in the realms of psychology and sociology. We live in a war society, and children must be hardened for war, and for the brutal competitiveness of peacetime life too. These exercises have a hardening effect as much on the mind as the body. They make a person rigid and tough. They produce men and women who will be good officers, cannon-fodder, bosses, or wage-slaves, according to social class.

Children brought up in freedom should have no need for such things. Even if a child does stay in and read when the adult thinks he should be out in the fresh air, it is best to leave him alone. He will get tired of staying indoors presently, and then he will go out on his own accord.

These exercises and "games" are connected with a cult of Spartan (rather than Christian) asceticism. As early in the year as was safely possible we were expected to be in the swimming pool, which at one school I was at was a pool in a mountain stream. Running mountain water is the coldest in the world, and even in the height of summer it required courage to go into it. We used to start bathing in the early days of spring, and were not allowed to remain in for more than a minute or so to begin with, in case someone caught a chill. This is almost on the borders of insanity.

I could cite endless numbers of such ascetical practices from my own experience alone. All this, we were told, was to prevent us getting "soft", as if man had not a natural toughness, that he will keep if left alone. Actually, by breaking the spirits of some, and rousing revolt in others, this system did in fact produce "sissies". I knew several boys who wore necklaces or cuddled teddy bears, when they thought no one was looking, and several who actually suffered nervous breakdowns, and had to be taken away from the school by their parents.

Such conditions are at their worst in the schools to which middle and upper class parents send their children to live. I do not know if the average State day-school has such a cult of "games", and fetishism of "toughness".

As far as any libertarian form of education is concerned, I can only say this: "Children, if left to themselves, are healthy young animals, who will take all the exercise they need, provided they have the opportunity. Any sort of physical discipline is to be avoided at all costs. Organised games are only of real interest to adults, or those nearly adult. ABOVE ALL, FOR HEAVEN'S SAKE LEAVE THE KIDS ALONE!" A.W.U.

FREEDOM PRESS

VOLINE :
Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed) cloth 12s. 6d.

E. A. GUTKIND :
The Expanding Environment 8s. 6d.

V. RICHARDS :
Lessons of the Spanish Revolution 6s.

GEORGE WOODCOCK :
Anarchy or Chaos 2s. 6d.
New Life to the Land 6d.
Homes orhovels? 6d.
Railways and Society 3d.
What is Anarchism? 1d.
The Basis of Communal Living 1s.

PHILIP SANSOM :
Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step 1s.

JOHN HEWETSON :
Sexual Freedom for the Young 6d.
Ill-Health, Poverty and the State cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.

F. A. RIDLEY :
The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age 2d.

★
Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications :
Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute cloth 5s.
Journey Through Utopia cloth 16s. (U.S.A. \$2.50)

★
K. J. KENAFICK :
Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx paper 6s.

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

A Plea for Unity

THE plea for less airing of our differences in public is one that is often made, and the contributor in last week's FREEDOM on this issue, suggests that the heat often generated by anarchists in public on their differences might confuse the possible adherents hovering on the fringe of the movement.

It is obvious that where there is agreement on theory or application there will be less discussion, but where there are disagreements the purpose of discussion is a reasonable way to resolve the differences. It will be argued that this is all very nice, but that disputation should be decently confined to the caucus, but the anarchist movement, unlike political parties, having no selected policy makers, does not need the kind of artificial front to present to the public and political opponents for the reason that they are concerned with the truth of their ideas, and not merely using them as a means of achieving power. All political parties discourage a frank discussion of ideas or policy which are generally handed down through the hierarchy and have to be accepted by the rank and file.

We hold the view that an exchange of ideas helps to clarify thought and prevents a blind acceptance of a theory without necessarily understanding its significance. If this takes place in public it may also help to clear up the confusion created sometimes by those well-meaning sympathisers who are neither for us nor against us.

Further, we are opposed to a united front which merely has as its intention the presentation of a façade to hide any real differences from possible 'converts'.

The view that there is a considerable group of people ready to swing our way but who are discouraged by the "interminable squabbles" is not, in our view, a correct analysis of why people are attracted to anarchism in the first place.

Generally, people who respond to our ideas do so because of the intellectual or emotional appeal. It is our experience that where the attraction is purely emotional the interest will not be sustained. Where anarchism however, appeals to both reason and feeling those people are not going to be put off because some differences are aired in public. If the views are held lightly then there is a tendency to drift away.

On the point that we cannot afford to lose a "single prospective member", we can only say that the strength of our movement does not necessarily lie in the "Plea for Unity" in FREEDOM 9/4/55 appears superficially to be quite attractive as a means of increasing the influence of anarchists in everyday affairs, and I would be interested if H.W. would elaborate on what practical steps he considers necessary.

However, I think he is mistaken in placing too much emphasis on anarchism as a movement, rather than on anarchist thoughts and ideas.

Firstly, the type of person who would allow the fact that a movement was united to be a determining factor in causing him to adhere to it is not the type who would contribute to the development of a healthy movement.

Secondly, it is not really of primary importance whether or not a person consciously regards himself as an anarchist or not. For instance while A. S. Neill seems to give an almost conventional mis-interpretation to the terms 'anarchism' and 'free love', he has done quantitatively more to further libertarian ideals than most anarchists are able to do.

While it would be encouraging if such people did declare themselves to be integral anarchists and identify themselves with propaganda activity, etc., their own specific contributions are of far greater importance.

With anarchism as a movement of diverse individuals, each emphasising those aspects of it that seem most appropriate, contact can be maintained with the various forms of partially anarchist activity, and the logical connexion between them shown, but if anarchists were to 'unite' on a policy of driving home fundamental principles again and again, it would tend to increase the isolation of the movement, with a loss of effectiveness.

It is true that the political parties, who desire an obedient card-holding membership to help the leaders into power, require a simple, united policy, but this is surely an argument against anarchists adopting the same tactics.

Unity is a purely incidental occurrence, and any attempt to cultivate it as an object in itself can only do harm to a movement based on ideals of freedom. Exeter. PHILIP HOLGATE.

number of heads we can count; the quality of our ideas will have more lasting value. This is not to say that we are not concerned with extending our movement, but that if truth has to be sacrificed to expediency, that is for the sake of "getting people", then we are not so interested.

It has to be admitted that our ideas appear to have little mass appeal, and for some of the reasons made by H.W. It is more comforting perhaps to enter a movement which gives a false feeling of stability because there appears to be unanimity, and in this way organisations like the Communist Party and the Catholic Church offer a kind of haven, but to what end?

Some anarchists hold the view, of which this writer is one, that our job at the moment, in the words of Marx, is "an uncompromising evaluation of all that exists, uncompromising in the sense that our criticism fears neither its own results nor conflict with the powers that be", a method which equally applies to our own movement.

This is not to say that the only function of anarchists is criticism, but that it is an important prerequisite to the practical application of our ideas.

M.

Don't Forget the DEFICIT!

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)

APRIL 17—Sam Levitsky on SETTLEMENTS IN ISRAEL

APRIL 24—Bonar Thompson on MYSELF & THE WORKING CLASS

MAY 1—F. A. Ridley on THE ETHICS OF ASSASSINATION

MAY 8—Edwin Peeke Subject to be announced.

MAY 15—Sybil Morrison on THE FEMINIST MOVEMENT

INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS

Every Thursday at 8.15.

OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting HYDE PARK Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

GLASGOW

INDOORS

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

The Malatesta Club

155 HIGH HOLBORN, LONDON, W.C.1.

★

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

Human Bomb Damage Repaired

A group calling themselves the Hiroshima Peace Center Associates, of Orange, New Jersey, have arranged for 20 young women injured by the Atom Bomb ten years ago to be treated in Mt. Sinai Hospital, New York. *Associated Press* reports (April 4):

"Two physicians, Dr. Arthur J. Barsky, Mt. Sinai plastic surgeon, and Dr. William M. Mitzig, an assistant professor of medicine at Columbia University, are flying to Tokyo for the patients.

The girls, who were trapped in a school building by the blast, have been living together and are known as the "Hiroshima maidens". They range in age from 19 to 24. All have suffered from the tissue-contracting effects of radiation. Most will require advanced plastic surgery.

They are expected to get here about the end of this month, and treatment at Mt. Sinai will take from four to six months."

It is good to hear that some of the misery caused by the Bomb is being relieved, however little and however late. D.R.

Communists and the Bomb Continued from p. 1

and dependant, those bomber bases in East Anglia could bring their inevitable reward. But while British governments are always quite willing to sacrifice the British people in their own interests, they are not so pained to do so in someone else's interests—Not even an ally's.

Britain, therefore, as well as becoming economically independent of America by increasing her trade with the Communist countries, has a very real interest in becoming militarily independent by developing her own hydrogen bomb.

The True C.P. Line

The true line for the Communist Party here in Britain, therefore, should be, not only 'More East-West Trade' but also 'More H-Bombs for Britain'. For the more H-Bombs Britain has—and the more superfortress type bombers to deliver them—the sooner can she become militarily independent of America and the sooner will the Government be in a position to say 'Go Home Yankees', which is, presumably, what the Communists want it to say.

The same military arguments can be used with regard to the re-arming of Western Germany. The sooner there is a Wehrmacht in being, the sooner will the Germans be able to say 'Go Home Yankees' and the sooner will the Russian Government be able to negotiate direct with an independent German Government—as Stalin did with Hitler in 1939.

Trying to teach Communists to

be 'realistic'—in the sense of expediency—is like teaching your grandmother to suck eggs. But with all due humility, we offer these arguments for their consideration. After all, they are the only sort of arguments that carry weight on the political field, and the fact that the Russian government itself is making the hydrogen bomb shows that there is nothing wrong in simply the making of it—it is only *who* is making it that establishes the rights and wrongs of it. And if it can be shown that British manufacture can assist the Russian government in any way—surely that is justification enough.

The fact that Russia can manufacture the H-Bomb is itself interesting (apart from its coincidence with Communist agitation elsewhere for its banning). For the H-Bomb is certainly not a revolutionary weapon. It can only be made by States for use against peoples. And it could not be made except by authorities supremely careless and contemptuous of human life.

Russian (Socialist) H-Bombs, no less than American or British (Capitalist) H-Bombs, will destroy workers by the million, 'socialist'-minded as well as capitalist-minded. The fact that Russia's government can make them and threaten their use is proof enough (if more were wanted) that it is a government like any other, with no less death and destruction to offer the workers of the world than the American or British governments.