"Politics: The Conduct of public affairs for private advantage."

> -AMBROSE BIERCE (Devil's Dictionary.

Vol. 16, No. 33

August 13th, 1955

Threepence

THE SCIENTISTS BUSINESS MEN CONFER

MORE PIE IN THE SKY

THREE conferences of scientists have been taking place during the past week or so. The first a twoday meeting sponsored by the World Association of Parliamentarians for World Government was attended by 130 delegates from 24 countries on both sides of the erstwhile Iron Curtain. From the sketchy press reports one has the impression that this conference was particularly concerned with the social issues resulting from the development of atomic power, though commissions were also set up to examine such practical questions as the possible harmful effects of peaceful uses of atomic energy as well as its supervision and control. Yet another commission, led by Professor J. Bronowski, will deal with the social responsibility of scientists in relation to nuclear energy. In the discussion that took place on this topic Professor J. Furth of Birkbeck College proposed a pledge which scientists of all countries might be expected to take. He called it a "Hippocratic oath" for scientists. The deliberations of these commissions will not be published until the second conference to be held in a year's time at the Hague.

A FART from the affability of the delegates which is "news" the deliberations contained none of the sensationalism which determines whether an event is reported or ignored by the popular press. Perhaps the sensationalism of the Press is a reflection on the dullness of the everyday lives of the people of this country. Be that as it may the fact remains that hardly a week passes without some new fantastic discovery being blazoned across the front pages of the daily press to help down the stodgy breakfast porridge or relieve the monotony of an interminable, straphanging underground journey to work. Since Geneva has apparently filed the claws of the

Russian bear and removed the nightmare of an H-bomb war, new topics have been needed to keep up the public interest in, and the 16 million circulation of, the British Press. There being nothing new on the face of the earth the obvious next step was to join the enthusiasts of science fiction in the realms of outer-space. And since the opening of the International Astronautical Congress in the land of Hans Anderson, at the beginning of this month, the Press, aided and abetted by President Eisenhower and the other Big Powers, have been whisking us 250 and 500 miles from home (vertically) with as little respect for our feelings as they showed a few years back when millions of people were being driven underground to protect themselves from the very latest in bombing planes.

It is clear from this congress that apart from the healthy curiosity shown by scientists to learn more

and more about the workings of the Universe, to seek answers to scientific questions which have eluded them so far: apart from this curiosity which is the health of mankind, the governments of the world have shown an enthusiasm for man's conquest of space which is almost suspect! Already Khrushchev has responded to Eisenhower's statement that America will launch its first man-made satellite, with an offer to co-operate "if it is in the interests of mankind". It is true that mankind cannot stand still, but sometimes one wonders whether it might not pay to pause a while to ask the question: "what are the interests of mankind?" Science is now so far ahead that in more senses than one it appears no longer to have its feet on the ground. Every scientific discovery is heralded by the promise of great prosperity round the corner. Now at Copen-

Continued on p. 3

ITALIAN MINERS CONTROVERSY AGAIN

THE opposition of the miners in the Yorkshire and South Wales coalfields to the proposal by the National Coal Board to recruit over 12,000 Italians for work in the British mines is not entirely based on the economic arguments put forward by the men. This is evidenced by the recent history of the Yorkshire miners who, in many pits, operate a colour bar, and who were so strong in their opposition to the 1952 Italian contingent of miners that most of the two thousand men had to return to Italy.

The miners argue that the answer to the acute manpower shortage in the mines is to increase pay and pensions for British miners, because the average earnings of a face worker are not adequate in the Midlands to "counter the appeal of a surface job in the engineering industry, where a man may smoke occasionally".

While we acknowledge that some men may genuinely feel that foreign labour will keep wages down, the disturbing factor is that the opposi-

tion to the Italian miners is largely prejudicial and the economic arguments merely a justification.

In any case, there is little evidence that foreign workers in the large specialist industries work for lower wages or are content to put up with bad working conditions. If we examine the position we find, and this is particularly so of the coloured worker, that workers coming to Britain from other countries are acutely aware of trade union "principles" and are careful not to transgress them. This has been acknowledged time and time again both by the rank and file and the leadership of some of the unions when disputes have arisen over the employment of coloured labour.

We have to face the fact that ordinary decent men who would not think of beating their wives or starving their dogs to death are apparently indifferent to the fate of their fellow workers from Europe.

At the moment there are 10,000 foreign miners working in Britain, and although their employment had been accepted by the British miners, objections have been raised from the Yorkshire area to their continued presence. It is easy to see that while a deep-rooted prejudice rankles. when grievances arise it will be the non-British worker who will provide the scapegoat. And although the liminaries to further debate (in the employers are anxious at the moment to recruit 17,000 men into the mines, in times of slump and crisis they will be just as indifferent to the fate of the foreign miners as they were to the British miners in 1926. Viewed from these two angles the future of workers from abroad is not very bright. What a tragedy that the workers of the world cannot see the strength of co-operation and solidarity.

Freedom Vanishes into Thin Air

JUST as Parliament prepares to go into a long recess, the Government has issued a directive which officially deprives us all of a part of our freedom of speech. The word directive has about it a strangely ominous and undemocratic ring, and in this instance would seem to be highly appropriate to its reference. It requires of the B.B.C. and the I.T.A. that they: "1. "Shall not, on any issue, arrange discussions or ex-parte statements which are to be broadcast during a period of a fortnight before the issue is to be debated in either House or while it is being so debated." 2. "That when legislation is introduced in Parliament on any subject, the Corporation shall not arrange broadcasts on such subject by any Member of Parliament during the period between the introduction of the legis-

lation and the time when it either receives the Royal Assent or is withdrawn or dropped."

So runs the text as issued by the Postmaster General, Dr. Hill. (Can it be an irony of fate that the ex-Radio Doctor, who made his name through this medium, (now dictates its partial strangulation?) There can be little or no justification for such a step, and indeed the arguments so far put forward as justification are so transparent as to be laughable. Firstly we are informed that radio and television debates might improperly prejudge an issue, and subject Members to undue outside pressure when they cast their votes; secondly that since many unorthodox M.P.'s are first-class performers on political programmes, full freedom of debate would give them undue advantages over their loyal colleagues.

Possibly we have misunderstood the meaning of democracy, but these arguments seem to be nothing short of fantastic even in terms of democratic government. It is extremely hard to find reasons why Parliament should deem it necessary to forbid prejudgment of issues either by the public or its own members, when in fact it is upon prejudged issues that all members are elected. It is also questionable whether anyone prejudges the issue of a parliamentary debate because they take part (speaking, listening or watching), in a discussion on radio or television.

The attitude taken up by the

directive implies that discussion and debate are the worse possible pre-House), and might involve M.P.'s in compromising situations.

One might reasonably enquire as to the source of outside pressureand what is the pressure? It cannot come from the audience sitting at home, unable to contribute anything (unfortunately); it cannot be undue pressure if exerted by fellow panel members, for they will be met in the House next day. But even supposing there were some evilminded person lying in wait for the unwary politician, the only pressure he could bring to bear would be in conversational form, and who knows but that he might be right.

Even more rediculous—if that is possible—is the argument as to "undue advantage over loyal colleagues". Here is an example of the absurdity of the present system; the cult from which springs the 'democratic' notion of voting with the Party-right or wrong. The term loyal colleagues refers to devotees of this curious cult. Undue advantage presumably means that it is not quite fair for some M.P.'s to know a little more about the subject of the debate than others; perhaps if they knew too much they would vote the wrong way. So much for the justification of this latest measure to protect the workings of the present governmental system.

In actual fact the directive would seem to be unnecessary even from the Government's point of view, for the position with regard to this type of broadcasting has for some time been almost exactly what is now laid down. During the war the B.B.C. agreed to these measures despite the fact that there was no legislation forcing it to do so, though there is every reason to believe that if it had not done so, legislation would immediately have been put forward to remedy the situation. In practice this agreement has remained ever since that time, and operates even more effectively now than it did then.

However the substitution of an Order instead of an agreement in time of stress, alters the situation quite considerably. The correspondent of The New Statesman

makes the point quite clearly: "It is one thing for weak and cowardly men to agree to limit their freedom. It is quite another for a Government to forbid freedom by Order in Council."

One might have supposed that the public would have created an uproar against this type of autocracy, if not on grounds of principle, at least for the reason that they are being deprived of a part of a very popular form of entertainment-no such uproar is in evidence, and it is highly probable that the great majority of the electorate would take the view that if the Government has seen fit to take action of this sort then it must be right and proper. Yet if a similar slice of Press freedom were withdrawn there would undoubtedly be a public reaction of

Continued on p. 3

"UP FIDO-DOWN FIDO"

ADDRESSING the leaders of Russia at a meeting of the Supreme Soviet, the Russian Federal Premier, M. Alexander Puzanov said of the people of the world: - "We stand for sincere and firm relations with the American people, as indeed with all peoples", and "The have. 'Up Fido-Down Fido'. people do not hate each other".

If the people do not hate each other, and governments have everything in common, who or what causes wars? Or could it be the people are made to hate each other by a cleverly disguised and diabolically consistent propaganda machine, intent on whipping up nationalistic feelings. 'The country is in danger' is a sure way of getting public support and unanimity of spirit.

The irony is that during wartime the enemies who slaughter one another are not governments (who can always go to Switzerland and have a nice cozy chat), but members of the common herd. It is not the governments who drop bombs on people, but poor little misguided Fritz or Tommy or Ivan or any other working man anywhere in the world. War Cabinets do not bombard towns. Joint Consultative Councils, General Staffs do not stick bayonets in bellies and Hitler didn't operate Belsen. That might have been too sickening even for him. In fact all the orders are issued by the governments and the operations are carried out by "The People" who "do not hate each other".

It would seem that the "People" are being conditioned now to accepting A sort of sickly, nostalgic, syrupy peace, not a natural one because people want it, but an unnatural peace that governments want the people to

The Anarchist appeal to people is to first withdraw your support from government. Then and only then can you say that government does not speak with your voice. For once having voted or supported government you have no right to argue with government policy. Government can only speak of "the people" when people allow them to. And to make the sentence "The people do not hate each other" ring true, it must be said by the people, not by government confidence-tricksters. It must be said by the removal of travelling restrictions, abolition of passports, a social consciousness on the part of the people and above all it must mean that people must first get to know one another. For how can you hate or not hate somebody you haven't even met?

So I still remain uneasy by the false words of M. Alexander Puzanov. All the time people swagger about the Red Square with banners or line up ten deep at Constitution Hill all night or have two entrances in American hotels, I must remain uneasy of his words. "The people do not hate each other"-Phooey! Let them prove it first.

MONTY.

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 31 Deficit on Freedom £465

Contributions received

1955 TOTAL TO DATE

DEFICIT July 29 to August 4 Fresno: P.P. £11/5/4: London: D.S.M. 1/6: Huddersfield: A.L. 10/-; London: C.F. 3/2; Dereham: J.B. 10/-; London: J.S.* 5/-;

£410

... £410 10 6

London: Anon* 2/-; London: Anon. 2/-; London: Joxer 5/-; Crewe: C.Q. 2/-; San Francisco: In memory of Falstaff, £35; Spokane: R.F.W. & T.H. £3/10/5; Kingston: J.C. 11/6. Total ... 52 7 11 Previously acknowledged ...

is Everybody Happy?

A CCORDING to a recent news report, doctors are concerned about an increase in the suicide rate, which they attribute to the stresses of modern life. The 1953 total in England and Wales was 4,754, that for the previous year, 4,338. The 1954 figure is likely to show a further rise when it is published in the Ministry of Health report.

In Middlesex the total for last year rose by nearly 40 per cent. (from 181 to 250), according to the annual report of Dr. A. C. T. Perkins, county Medical Officer of Health. He said that in the age group of 25-44 suicide was the second most frequent single cause of death, and added "Deaths by suicide now materially exceed those involving motor vehicles (210) and are approaching the total for pulmonary tuberculosis (292)."

IF PEACE BREAKS OUT

MY introduction into the world of finance began with appreciating the columns of City Editors. Headlines like Rubbers Bounce, Gold Glitters, Tea Boils Over, caught a naturally curious eye; the merits of war and peace, the atom's contribution to our future, full employment and foreign policy, were all part of a City's Editor's working day. The remarks recently made in the Editorial Column of the Daily Telegraph stating that we should rather risk nuclear warfare than surrender our democratic freedoms, were mild and inoffensive compared to those of the tough financial omniscients. And what was even more fascinating about the City men was the assumption that an authority on the world of banking, stocks and shares, trade and commerce, had a kind of practical genius which could be applied to any subject and, with ruthless objectivity. would cut through the distortion and rhetoric to the heart of the matter. Countries could survive without the advice of politicians, churchmen and trade union leaders; national disaster was the penalty for ignoring the wisdom of those who spoke for capitalism and the City.

It was therefore with special respect that I advanced from City Columns which address laymen to the higher spheres of financial weeklies. After all, peace and the capitalist system are closely related—as closely, in fact, as the shopkeeper to the wares he sells. Where, for example, could one learn more about the chances of peace than where capitalist addresses capitalist? For ten years it's been the gentle inflation of the Cold War-Total War was really a little too destructive-so if there was to be any change at all, particularly with the optimism of Geneva, surely one would discover it in the financial press.

With the kind of respect, then, that the layman has for the special knowledge of the Lancet, Gemmologist, Gas World and Occupational Psychology, I was captured by a title on the front of the Investors' Chronicle. "If Peace Broke Out . . . " Surely, I thought, one can learn more from the Peace and War Specialists than from the N.S. & N., The Observer and FREEDOM. A shilling was a lot to pay- But to be reassured about Peace!

Disillusionment did not come gently. It came absolutely and immediately. The article began: 'This peace business looks carious. It's time we gave it our best attention . . . ' But where was the hope, the desire . . . for peace! The joyful song! Then I realised that I was to blame. Which columnists had a finer sense of wit and satire than the City Candidus, the columnist, was surely enjoying a game of 'wicked capitalists'.

The next paragraph was neutral and informative-the country was spending ten per cent. of its income on defence. 'To cut off arms-spending of this magnitude . . . would knock large segments of

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

OPEN 10 a.m. to 6.30; 5.0 SATURDAYS

All books sent post free, so please get your books from us. We can supply any book required, including text-books. Please supply publisher's name if possible, but if not, we can find it. Scarce and out-of-print books searched for. Second-Hand Books . . .

Inquest on Peace Vigilantes (1935) 2/-Between the Lines Denys Thompson 2/-Voice of Civilization Denys Thompson 3/-The Great Offensive Maurice Hindus 2/-Humanity Uprooted Maurice Hindus 2/6 Faith for Living Lewis Mumford 2/6 A Scientist Among the Soviets Julian Huxley 2/6 Promised Land Cedric Belfrage 3/-Politics of the Unpolitical Herbert Read 5/-The Hawkspur Experiment W. David Wills 3/-The New America: the New World H. G. Wells 2/-The Unvanguished Howard Fast 3/-Mazzini, Garibaldi and Cavour Mariorie Strachey 1/6 The Kingdom of Man Sir Ray Lankester 2/-Philosophical Dictionary Voltaire 3/6 The Road to Wigan Pier George Orwell 6/-Women Winifred Holtby 3/-Pamphlets . . . Not by Bread Alone Wilfred Wellock 6d. Introduction to Rudolf Rocker Autobiography Joseph Leftwich 1/-

the British economy for six . . . ' But there seemed a certain lack of sympathy in the next paragraph—'However, it is clearly unnecessary to envisage anything anywhere near as dramatic or as drastic as that. For one thing, it has now sunk deeply into the Nato powers' consciousness that Russian amiability has increased in direct proportion with the growth in the strength of the West. To throw away the clear advantages which rearmament has brought the instant Russia has come to appreciate the implications to her of that rearmament would be folly of the highest order which, we may be sure, the Nato powers will not

Yes, we may be sure of that. But there are two sides to every argument, we are told, and Candidus goes on to talk of the benefits which armaments and militarism brings. Ten per cent. of the national income is evidently not too much to pay for-'Quite a lot of good atom bomb has brought us the nuclear power station . . . Why, we are even, it seems, to have ideological competition in flying saucers encircling the globe."

Where, I kept asking myself, were the words of hope, the love of peace? Those first words of his . . . If they were humorous, could they have been to sweeten the pill? How, for example, could the following be taken ambiguously? 'A reduction of the demands the armed services are making on our manpower should ease the present overfull employment situation . . . Surely Candidus could not write with such equanimity about losing his own job! It must . . It can't be . . . But what else could it be than a longing for a good pool of unemployed to keep down wages?

Disillusioned completely, no hope of Peace left, I now read: 'The aircraft industry and its allied and sub-contracting trades would be vulnerable to precipitate disarmament. It has been estimated that the total airline fleet of the world numbers only 3,000 aircraft of which half is due for replacement during the next five or ten years. This problem is complicated by the fact that a relatively small number of aircraft firms are responsible for a high proportion of civil aircraft output, which obviously increases the vulnerability of the others to any slackening in military orders.' I wondered what Candidus would have said to the thought that it would be better to give the workers an indefinite holiday with pay than to have them turning out bombers . . . and it would cost the country no more! He would certainly have shaken his head at such naïve ignorance.

As I said earlier, however, it is not and scientific advancement . . . The only on matters of finance that these City Editors claim to be experts. Everything from the kind of fashions women may be wearing next year to the modernisation of the Peruvian railways are subjects on which they can speak significantly. It is therefore touching to read the humble modesty implied by Candidus's last paragraph. This is the language of the suddenly enlightened adolescent after a first reading of Marx and Lenin . . . 'Armament expenditure, in the nature of things, is to an important extent wasteful and unproductive. It is true that, as I have said, we are justified in regarding some of it in the nature of development and research for peaceful ends. But a great deal of it literally goes up in smoke. A great

deal of it involves the use of precious manpower in occupations which add little or nothing to the world's wealth. We should be well justified in diverting that expenditure—either in public or private hands-to projects which are infinitely more worthwhile in terms of human happiness and progress the world

It's all very puzzling . . . First he's for Peace, then against. Finally he's not only for peace but for humanity as well. And City Editors were supposed to know so much and ALWAYS to make it seem that their readers were uneducated children. But that last paragraph makes one think . . .

If Freedom ever reaches the point of needing a City Editor, would the Editors kindly consider my qualifications. I don't know anything about finance, and about banking: I only know that you never draw more than you put in; but at least I've known for many years, without it being a revelation in the year 1955, that 'armament expenditure, in the nature of things, is to an important extent wasteful and unproductive'. C.H.

Working for the Free Society

Those who are in and around the Anarchist movement have good reason to value the discussions in the Malatesta Club. It is one of those all-too-rare places where people seem happy to indulge in the practice of conference. And to accept the method of conferring doesn't mean coming along with your own decided set of ideas and resolving to keep them intact—it means throwing them into the debate so that from all the intermingling a new approach might

At the Malatesta and elsewhere a number of people have been discussing an approach to social problems which has much in common with the anarchist approach and yet which is by no means an exclusively anarchist product. We do not accept the theory which holds that the free society is to be established at one fell swoop. We agree with last week's FREEDOM editorial in criticising the "all or nothing" philosophy which holds that the worse the conditions in which people live the greater the chances are of the "revolution" succeeding. This

does not mean that we have become "creeping reformists" who have lost whatever vision we once had of a free, harmonious and co-operative society. It is precisely because we are trying to give this goal some relevance to present-day conditions that we can see it expanding with every step made towards it.

Everything in nature and social life is a gradual development. Even the things that look like sudden appearances -a newborn baby or a national revolution—are moments in a process that had been going on for some time. Obviously some factors helped in the process: others could, and perhaps did, hold it

Applying this to the free society, we can see that the practical thing to do to further it is to distinguish what helps from what hinders its emergence, and to support and oppose accordingly. Very often it might be difficult to see just what to support or oppose-say, on a vexed issue like trade unionism. Here it is better not to insist on a single answer intended to impose uniformity of opinion on everyone with whom you are working. Let some decisions be individual-though always enriched and informed by group discussion.

There are two ways of working for the free society—or rather two aspects of the same way. In all fields of human endeavour there must be those who are actually thinking and acting in ways which are more typical of the free society than of property and authoritarian society. And then to give meaning to the particular there must be the general. Those working in free schools, or propagating social equality, or learning more about the satisfaction of human needs, can gain from seeing the relationship their work bears to the achievement of the free society.

This way of uniting the demands of the present and of the future is perhaps best described as social integration. It is the pursuit of this purpose for which the movement for Social Integration has been formed. Its meetings are open to all those who are concernd to contribute to the better formulation and development of these ideas.

MOVEMENT FOR SOCIAL INTEGRATION. John McGregor,

Secretary

London.

THEATRE

on the Human Scale

EVERY couple of years or so I write an article under the title The Man Who Knows His Village . . . I have forgotten how the quotation ends but the inference is clear. The phrase is a sort of shorthand for a series of ideas which to me are fundamental. For the idea that the man who knows his village understands the world, that everything important starts in small ways in small places, that the only real politics are those of the parish pump. For the idea of small communities, dispersal, fragmentation, the human scale, anarchy.

Not that, as a Londoner escaping at

weekends, I can claim to be a man who knows his village, because I remember too well the scathing words of Mr. Robertson Scott (who has done more than anyone to arrest the decay of the English village), about the members of the 'week-ending classes' who express themselves with 'satisfied certainty' about country life and village people. 'How,' he asked, 'are these energetic confident well-wishers of the rural population to be persuaded that it is possible to be close to facts and pass them by, to be within sight of facts and fail to grasp them?' All I can speak of with satisfied certainty is the Annual Show held in our village last week. Organised by those voluntary bodies which add savour to the life of most villages, the Horticultural Society, the Women's Rural Institute and the Young Farmer's Club, this was the event of the year. For weeks it had been discussed and prepared. Volunteers had trimmed the hedges of the sports field and erected the big tents. Last year's balance sheet was examined and this year's prize money collected and programmes printed. There was a record number of entries-over eight hundredflowers, fruit, vegetables, eggs, preserves, needlework, cakes and handicrafts. entered cauliflowers, shallots and blackcurrants-a queer assortment but my gooseberries were too early, my raspberries too late, my peas too thin, my beans too short, my celery too green and my surviving carrot too solitary.

As we staged our exhibits in the morning we eyed each other's efforts, marvelling at other people's perfection, mentally measuring and calculating size and quality (though the days are gone when the most bloated marrow wins the prize; the judging is done according to the Royal Horticultural Society's carefully framed rules). In the domestic tent the women were more openly reckoning their chances, and declaring that this cake was too large and rich to have been made to the prescribed recipe, or that that bottle of fruit couldn't really have been home-grown. Then everyone went home and left it to the judges, waiting for the opening of festivities in the afternoon. The show was a great success, everyone was there, the sun shone, the sports were hilarious, an old lady won a pig in the draw and wondered what to do with it, gardening

techniques were discussed, prize-winners

were proud and the rest of us resolved to do better next year.

THIS sort of thing happens every year in thousands of villages and towns up and down the country, from humble 'Fêtes' in hamlets to the big agricultural shows in market towns with their magnificent cattle and pigs, beautifully groomed horses and shiny machinery. Within five miles of this cottage there are five horticultural societies affiliated to the R.H.S. In our village organisational procedure is kept to a minimum, no membership cards and no dues. A public meeting in the village hall elects the officers by acclamation and appoints two collectors who call on everyone with a garden for a donation once a year.

The show is one of the only occasions in the year when the village acts like a community and not like the scattered collection of week-end farmers, retired majors, rural proletarians, petty gentry, small shopkeepers, struggling smallholders and commuting stockbrokers that it largely is. The truth may be that, as Edward Hyams writes of his own village twenty miles away, 'in everything but a few accidents our parish is what every part of the Western world has become, a suburb Megapolis, and if it were cut off from that centre of a civilized and sophisticated and often brilliant corruption, from the decadence of scepticism and cleverness, its survival would be physical merely, and perhaps not even that . . . ' You wouldn't have taken so gloomy a view of it last week, for there was ample evidence that this village can still cultivate its garden and preserve its

But really Hyams is right; the village community may be a memory of the past and a hope for the future: it is not, hereabouts at least, a present reality. The village lives by the same standards as the city, although its preoccupation with food production makes it seem more 'real' and more healthy than the city whose preoccupation is with making money and spending it at the behest of advertising agents. But the thing that makes life more fragrant in a village or small town is simply a matter of scale. 'In the World City we are nothing living and less dying'. In big cities we are little men, in small places it is at least possible for us to be big men. The Greek city-states were mere villages. Even in William Blake's day Hell was a

city much like London. The tendency of modern society, with its worship of power, is towards more and more centralisation, and the irony is that at the very time when advances in technique, especially electrification, have made the big city an anachronism, its obsolete magnet draws more powerfully than ever. It expands through force of habit simply because, as Herbert Read said of the silly campaign for world government, 'whilst people are accustomed to think along lines of the concentration and centralisation of power, towards an ideal of authoritarian

control, they are not used to thinking along lines of the dissipation and decentralisation of power, towards an ideal of mutual aid'. If we really want to nurture the growth of freedom and the breaking down of authority, we have to reverse the unconsciously authoritarian lines of thought that make the elephantine city, the industrial monster and the big battalions seem desirable, and to foster the automony of the small unit, the provincial, the local, the parish

TAN MACKAY used to say that his job on the News Chronicle was to turn the rich red wine of socialism into brown cocoa. Is that what I am trying to do with anarchism when I suggest that it's all a matter of dispersal and fragmentation? Not really, I think, for what is anarchy but the ultimate decentralisation —the autonomy of the individual?

C.W.

WAITING FOR GODOT

IN "WAITING FOR GODOT" (Arts Theatre Club), Mr. Samuel Becket has written a nihilistic intellectual exercise with an economy of means and a lack of theatrical device quite admirable in its audacity. Mr. Becket is an Irishman, one-time secretary of James Joyce, living in Paris and writing in the first instance in French with the discipline of a purist. The audacity is that he has dared to present his exercise as a stage play, he flaunts all the conventions and sets before us a bare table without even laying the cloth. No repast is offered and none is served. The exercise is devoid of poetry, profundity or even originality of thought. The miracle is that as an entertainment it comes off, at least for the first hour. It's as if we were taking part in a cynical debate, we are stimulated, though not inspired or elated, by the end we feel utterly sapped, but the evening has not been spent in vain.

TWO tramps, on a bare piece of wasteland, shadowed by a dead tree, are tunities to the 'nth degree.

There intrudes upon their little world a certain Pozzo, a bullying tyrant.

leading a slobbering cretinous slave by a rope round his neck. Here, Mr. Becket's comment on the world of thought and progress is given full rein when the slave is made to put on his thinking hat and delivers a long speech of sufficiently potent gibberish.

In the second act the situation remains unchanged except that Mr. Pozzo reappears from the opposite direction and has become totally blind, while his minion still led around the neck by a rope is dumb. They go on their way (presumably backwards), a little boy appears as in Act 1, with a message from the illusive Mr. Godot. He regrets that he is unable to come but will most certainly come to-morrow! The tramps just go on waiting as before, bickering and cursing each other to pass away the time.

Mr. Becket loses his grip on us somewhere about the second act which, by its blatant repetition becomes slightly tedious. And yet, for an hour or so, we have been sitting in the dark, spellbound, while the lid has been taken off an unused bin and the articles inside it found to be vaguely familiar.

This is, without doubt, Mr. Peter Hall's most effective production to date. It is lively, flamboyant and inventive. His touch is absolutely sure and he is exceedingly well served by his actors. The two tramps are flawless and never allow our interest to flag. It is delightful to see Mr. Paul Daneman so surefooted, Mr. Timothy Bateman as the slave enters magnificently into the spirit of the play and Peter Woodthorpe as the tramp with the death-wish is a rugged and valuable new acquisition to the stage. Only Mr. Peter Bull, as Pozzo. was slightly out of key. He appeared to be more at home in Wonderland than in the Wasteland.

waiting for a certain Mr. Godot who never comes. They just go on waiting, passing the time quarreling, mothering and boring each other, keeping themselves warm by proximity and the resultant irritation, to give themselves the 'impression that they exist'. The two of them are like a vaudeville act. One, Mr. Paul Daneman is a Chaplinesque, shoulder-shrugging character, with a blind faith and bladder trouble. The other, whom we are told was once a poet, has a longing for death and annihilation, and sore feet. All the symbols of slapstick are used to full advantage and the actors exploit their oppor-

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

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

MAN THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY O

Vol. 16, No. 33

August 13, 1955

PIE IN THE SKY

Continued from p. 1

hagen we are being promised "pie in the sky".

AT Geneva the Atom scientists are discussing among themselves the problems of atomic energy in its application to industry. With them have come the business men who have spared no expense in laying out their wares—the Americans have already issued an atomic price-

the Manchester Guardian points out, in somewhat forthright terms, the motives behind the conference are far from idealistic. In the first place the free discussion is not the result of the New Look in world politics, but partly to an awareness by the Big Three powers that scientific information was so widely known by each of them that there was no point in maintaining secrecy, and also to a need to instruct commercial firms in this country and America in the techniques of atomic energy. Furthermore another motive for the conference was the need that different countries have recognised to advertise their expertise to others for the reason of prestige. There is every likelihood that in the next ten years the struggle for the international market in atomic power will have an important bearing on the countries taking part in it.

And here is where the cynicism of governments who glibly talk of "the interests of mankind" comes in. For reasons given above the Manchester Guardian considers that

it is only fair to expect that some parts of atomic energy will remain secret even after the conference. Technical details that affect one country's ability to make an atomic pile cheaply or efficiently may well be as closely guarded as industrial secrets often are. As long as the basic information is made available there will be no cause to complain of this.

Thus, the "interest of mankind" must, as always, come second to the interests of big-business and competition for world markets. Mr. Henry Ford, who has provided 1 million dollars for financing awards to scientists who achieve outstanding things in the field of atomic energy, has written that he hopes that "business men will provide an incentive for finding new ways in which atomic energy can be used for the benefit of mankind". He clearly indicates in this one sentence that "the benefit of mankind" is not in itself an "incentive" for business-men. Which of course is no discovery!

AS we have written on other occa-sions the new "Industrial Revolution", symbolised by Automation and by Atomic energy, has not been accompanied by a corresponding revolution in social and political thought. If we wait for the politicians and business men to have a change of heart, we shall indeed wait a very long time. They will go on promising us pie-in-the-sky . . when we die. If we want something more substantial, if we want Automation and Atomic energy to be developed for "the benefit of mankind", we must act now. As a first step we must start thinking for ourselves; we must question every concept on which existing society is based; we must clear away the cobwebs which have allowed prejudices to be accepted as basic truths. Doubt is perhaps less comforting than certainty. But just as doubt is the key to the progress of science so is it the key to development in social thought.

Or are our minds so warped that we dare to penetrate the unknown with rockets but fear the impact of new ideas?

(Continued from our last issue)

THE industrial revolution in Britain caused untold misery to the newly created industrial proletariat. What could have been a gradual development of technical knowledge and processes, bringing with it a steadily increasing well-being and abundance for the ordinary people, became instead degradation and want.

In order to sell Britain's new industrial products to the undeveloped countries of the world, our commercial masters had to offer Britain as a market for the agricultural products of those countries. The underdeveloped countries could not buy British goods unless Britain bought theirs. This made it necessary to curtail agricultural production in this country and in this process the Land Enclosure Acts of the early 19th century played a double purpose.

These Acts enclosed the common lands, taking away from the common people lands on which they had held grazing rights for centuries, land to which all in a community had free access. Enclosing this land, driving the common people off it, giving it to the rich and powerful who already had plenty, performed the two very useful functions of reducing agricultural production and producing a class of dispossessed, landless people with 'nothing to sell but their labour power'.

And who could they sell it to? Who but to the industrialists looking for labour for their new factories, their mills, their railways—and their mines. So the exodus from the land began, and into the towns streamed thousands of desperCOAL-2

ate folk, robbed of their means of livelihood on the land, forced to sell themselves into the insecure slavery of the industrial dungeons,

Plundering Natural Wealth

But it was, of course, not only the people who were thus exploited. The most important natural resource of this country-industrially speaking-was coal, and the coal deposits underneath Britain were assaulted with blind and thoughtless vigour in the landowners' determination to cash in on the wealth beneath their fields. Here, incidentally, is a third very useful function of the Land Enclosures—by giving surface rights to the right people, they also gave ownership of what lay beneath the surface.

The rape of the land which took place over the plains of the Middle West in America, leaving behind the huge manmade deserts of the dust-bowls, had its equivalent in Britain during the previous 100 years under the ground, where the 'black diamonds' were ruthlessly torn out to be sold and wastefully used without thought for the future, as well as on the surface where the need to build dwellings for miners and their families led to the growth of the drab and ugly mining villages, dominated by the towering black slagheaps, making deserts of wide tracts of countryside.

But soil erosion, through hard and patient toil, can be overcome. Years and years of tending can put heart back

into exhausted soil-but how can you put coal back into the earth? Creating humus, making soil fertile again, this can take long enough in terms of one man's lifetime-but coal takes millions of years to make by natural processes, and anyway demands thousands of years of the growth and decay of mighty forests. Once you've had your coalyou've had it.

More Difficult to Get

And that is exactly the position that Britain is working herself into now. Thousands and thousands of millions of tons of coal have been torn from the pits of this country and one by one they are beginning to dry up. In many cases, of course, the 'drying up' means that it is no longer economical in the money sense to get the coal out; it does not necessarily mean there's none left. Nor does it mean that there are not pits with enough coal for another 100 years at present rates of production-or that there is no possibility of discovering new seams.

By and large, however, the coal deposits of Britain have been, and are being, sucked dry. The coal that remains in known deposits; the small amount that may yet be discovered, cannot be got out in sufficient quantities to satisfy the demands of this country's still expanding economy.

For it is not only that the abundance of coal is simply not there any more, but what is still there is getting harder and harder to get. All the coal that was

easy to get was used up years ago. Today all our most productive mines are very very deep and very very long, burrowing for miles, thousands of feet down.

In the coastal areas of the North of England, seams have been followed for miles under the North Sea from Northumberland and Durham, under the Irish Sea from Cumberland, In these and in all the inland fields, the continually driving through the seams have led to added expense and difficulty in getting the coal to the surface—as well of course to added danger in the work.

A Worn-out Industry

Through all the years of bustling prosperity for mine owners before the first World War, the only thought was to get the coal out regardless of equipment, safety or the future. During the depression years between the wars mines were closed down and neglected, while Britain's industrialists found it cheaper to huy foreign coal and Britain's miners sang in the streets.

When the war came in 1939 and brought with it the need for coal, the bustle began again, but old and neglected mines could not be re-equipped because the steel had to be used for guns and the man-power was making them, or using them. When, therefore, the National Coal Board took over in 1947, it inherited an exhausted, worn-out industry, manned by exhausted, worn-out miners, and the heavy losses the Coal Board sustained during its first years of operation were in part due to its desperate efforts to re-equip, modernise and mechanise the mines in order to produce the tremendous quantities of coal that the country's economy now demands.

Not a small factor in the losses, of course, was the hefty compensation the State agreed to pay the ex-owners. It seems that the huge fortunes their families made in the past through their savage exploitation of the country's natural resources and workers, was not enough—they had to be kept for another few generations on the proceeds from those resources and those workers.

The Coal Board's efforts at mechanisation, however, have had very mixed results. Their direction has been twofold: to develop machinery and new technical methods here at home, and to import machines from abroad. Unfortunately, however, machines which suit the conditions of American and German pits are not necessarily suitable for British pits and so the experience of technicians and mining engineers from other countries has not been all that valuable here. There was one German machine worth £12,000 left rusting at the bottom of a Yorkshire pit for months because the Coal Board had ordered it without realising that it was quite unsuitable for the conditions in that particular pit.

Mistakes like that can only be made when both the direction and the technical research are divorced from the place of work and the men on the job.

(To be continued)

ANARCHIST SUMMER

THE ninth annual Summer School of the British Anarchist Movement, and the second to be held at the Malatesta Club in London, took place over the August holiday week-end.

On Saturday afternoon S. E. Parker gave the opening lecture on "The Problem of Violence". After several years during which he had considered that violence could, under certain circumstances, be used by Anarchists in defence of a revolution, Comrade Parker had returned to the point of view that the use of violence must inevitably have a corrupting effect on those who seek to establish a free society. This, he submitted, presented an agonising problem, as in a particular situation to abstain from violence might appear to be betrayal of the revolution, while if they did resort to arms the theoretically freedom-loving anarchists would be using their enemies' own methods of coercion, and involving themselves in the hierarchical structure of military organisation: a process which could only end in the rise of another authoritarian régime. The solution, he suggested, lay in the adoption of positive non-violent methods of resistance to authority.

A vigorous discussion followed. The main problems raised concerned what action should be taken in a given situation such as that in Spain on July 19th, 1936, the link between mass revolutionary violence and individual violence, such as the restraint of men about to commit injurious acts, the bourgeois nature of the pacifist movement, and whether it was harmful to commit ourselves in advance to a principle of this kind.

CATURDAY evening was given over to social activities, with dancing as

the main activity. During the course of the evening a 'cabaret' was put on-more or less spontaneously-consisting of 'turns' by the amateur and professional entertainers among the habitues of the Malatesta Club. The final item in this entertainment was a short parody of the afternoon's lecture presented in the form of a Greek tragedy. The writing of this was completed just before it was presented and some of the audience felt that in view of the hot weather that was not a minute too soon.

On Sunday morning, Tony Turner spoke on the subject of "Sex & Sin", tracing the development of social attitudes towards 'morality' through the

He pointed out that whereas the western way of life took its laws from the Romans and its political organisation from the Greeks, its religion and the sexual morality based upon it were taken from the Jews. In the circumstances in which the Jews of antiquity found themselves, their restrictive morality had some practical foundation, but by and large the development of repressive morality had as its basis the assuaging of the Gods by the rejection of pleasure.

Throughout the development of Christian morality, sin has been equated with what is pleasurable, and doing that which gives pleasure to oneself has been regarded as a lessening of the devotion one should be giving to God.

In the times of the Puritans this attitude achieved its highest and most absurd forms. To-day, however, the development of more rational attitudes is lessening the acceptance of a connection between sin and sex and ideas on morality are changing from religious morality towards a more social morality.

SCHOOL The discussion that followed Tony

Turner's lecture was, inevitably, wide and diverse, ranging from the early Christian fathers to the mating habits of beavers, but, as the speaker had anticipated, there was a general measure of agreement with his own attitude.

ON Saturday afternoon the usual openair meeting was held in Hyde Park, giving the provincial visitors a chance to hear the London speakers and giving the London crowd a chance to hear at least one speaker new to them.

ON Sunday evening, dealing with "Anarchism and Education", Philip Lewis spoke of his experiences as a student teacher at St. George's-in-the-East, the most progressive State school in the country, and, on the demand of the audience, continued to describe A. S. Neill's famous school at Summerhill.

Continued on p. 4

SCIENCE NOTES -

THREE WORLD PROBLEMS

GLANCE at the newspaper headlines, or any attention paid to a B.B.C. news broadcast would lead one to a completely false impression about the important basic problems in the world to-day. Politicians meet, argue and quarrel about the exact position of national boundaries, the political future of Formosa, or spheres of political influence in the Middle East. Yet such conferences do not help to feed one child anywhere in the world. Scientists appear to be almost entirely concerned with designing faster fighter planes, or more destructive explosive forces; efforts which will not eradicate a single disease. Many people are employed preventing crime, catching criminals, and keeping them in prisons, but few are studying the problem of anti-social behaviour and its causes whether due to the nature of the individual, or the structure of society.

(1) Food Supply

U.N.E.S.C.O., although the largest world organisation ever created for tackling basic problems, is but a "poor relation" of U.N.O., that glamorous extravaganza of political intrigue, the "green table" of world politics.

U.N.E.S.C.O. has given help to a few small areas where there is an acute food shortage, but a majority of people still do not get enough to eat and death from starvation is common. Educational help in better farming methods, and soil erosion control; fertilisers, irrigation schemes, and improved animal stocks, are urgently needed in many parts of the world. Skilled help and advice and the means to be able to make use of it must be sent from areas where it is available to where it is most needed.

(2) Physical Health

The second basic problem is the problem of physical health, and the preven-

tion of disease, and is intimately related to the first. For the improvement of nutritional standards would in themselves bring about a big improvement in general health. Malaria which can be prevented and cured is still the largest single cause of death in the world but pessimists have argued that if people are saved from malaria they will die of starvation. But the weakening effect of chronic malaria and hookworm is partly responsible for the low agricultural standards in affected areas. In many areas such as India and Central America both basic problems can only be tackled simultaneously. The development of chemotherapy has simplified the largescale treatment of epidemic and endemic diseases. Their application is held up partly by political considerations, partly by superstitious, and religious objections to the prophylactic and therapeutic measures involved.

(3) Mental Health

Many millions who are not short of food and who do not suffer from any organic disease suffer intensely from an inability to make satisfactory social relationships, in our complex urban society with its variable and incoherent standards of value. This problem although perhaps less important than the first two, is rapidly increasing in size. In America it has been calculated that more hospital beds are needed for mental health cases than the others. And with the breakdown of so many small static cultural systems and the spread of a world urban civilisation this problem will in the ultimate be the greatest of the three. Palliative measures in social adjustment may help but the final solution may involve such considerable social changes as to be considered revolution-

Freedom Vanishes into Thin Air

Continued from p. 1

some magnitude—the results would probably be negligible but at least an injustice would be noticed by those whom it affects.

It is hard to understand how the comparative freedoms of Broadcasting and the Press are now to be rationalized. A Member of Parliament is now forbidden to express his views on radio or television with reference to any legislation which is at that time before the House; he may write articles for newspapers or effect an advertising campaign on precisely those issues about which he cannot broadcast. If he wishes he may even stage a giant demonstration in Hyde Park. For some reason therefore, it is the Government's policy—supported by part of the Labour Party even when out of office—to suppress certain freedom of Broadcasting.

The main reason is not too difficult to find. Unscripted broadcasts are impossible to control, and con-

stitute a threat to the smooth-running efficiency of the party machine. Who can tell what a flustered and perhaps bewildered M.P. will say on the spur of the moment—only too easily may he make an off-theparty-line remark without sufficient time to consider carefully what the line is. Or worse still, comment on a current issue before the party has made up its mind as to its official view. One may re-read a written article, or submit it to the censorship of Lord Woolton or Mr. Morrison, but a few rash words before an audience of three million can never be blue-pencilled.

No reasonable case can be made for this latest directive, no valid justification put forward. Another freedom is forfeited-freedom to discuss or debate in the most public place of all, those questions which are of the most importance to allfor they may be law to-morrow.

IT seems to be the custom, when defending a revised approach to anarchism, to accuse others of believing in all or nothing and the fact that they must then necessarily believe that things must get worse and "the worse the conditions, the greater the chances of the revolution". I agree that neither Kropotkin nor Malatesta supported that. I find it difficult to find anyone at all who ever suggested it. Marxists used to be accused of doing so by Anarchists, but it rests on a doubtful story attributed to Lenin. Of course such an approach would betray "a contempt for the feelings of the ordinary human being". It would indeed betray a contempt for oneself in the bargain.

Those who read my letter, and the editorial in last week's Freedom, must wonder why the latter had to resort to such an argument. In the letter I did not attack the National Health Service. I merely stated that health services were not paid for out of taxation but out of the labour power of the workers. I did not attack the idea of free health services but said they were not provided by the money system, nor by the organising ability of the State. Talk of hospitals instead of "National Health Service" and you will find this explained at

Money and the Free Society

In your editorial "Approach to the Libertarian Approach" (6/8/55), you write:—

"Money will in all probability cease to play an important part in a free society..."

But, surely, in a "free" society money will play no part at all.

As I see it a free society is one where there is complete equality of access to the things that society has produced; a society where all will take from the common pool what they need, what they desire. In such a society where the means of life are the common possession of all; where government, coercion and authority are a thing of the past, money—a means of exchange—will be no longer necessary. Like the State it will have been relegated to the museum of antiquities!

Battersea, Aug. 6. PETER E. NEWELL.

Thoreau. (I did not even suggest "the workers should be worse off"—and was berated for being a materialist as a result!)

I agree taxation is not the major evil of the day. But how can you collect taxes without some form of force or compulsion? How can you levy rates for local government without at least the threat of distress warrants and forced sales? And if rates, why not rent? To equate these things with anarchism means that the latter loses its purpose. A governmental anarchism is a white blackbird. You talk of the income tax system "recognising certain principles of equal rights and of mutual aid". I am not concerned to refute that for the sake of those who pay it, but that Mutual State Aid is just not my idea of anar-

If the State is performing a useful function in collecting taxes, then presumably the next step must be to see that those taxes are properly spent. (On page one you yourself begrudge the £10 to the hangman—quite properly—which "we" pay willingly). Like the "neo-anarchists" in Sweden, the next step must surely be to enter government, or at least local government, for you cannot surely say you trust the State so much in this new-found objectivity that you will let it do as it chooses with the taxes you call for, knowing that these will be spent reasonably.

My questions were forceful to the point, at least, of bringing the statement that "money will in all probability cease to play an important part in a free society". Does this mean that the money system may continue, and that there is some probability of a money system? True, if mutual aid and equal rights are secured by taxation, that follows hard upon. You say none of these are such great evils. Not, for instance, compared with forced labour camps of colonialism or the A-bomb. Agreed. But what do these less objectionable evils leave of anarchism?

At least these American pacifists like Joffre Stewart and Ammon Hennacy do recognise some fundamental anarchist principles in their opposition to taxation. It is unreasonable to say that they are concerned mostly with "money as an end in itself" (though this might be said of the Poujadists). Most of them are pro-

The objections you make to it could all have been made by Kropotkin, Thoreau, and other anarchists. The Marxists did indeed claim that anarchism was petit bourgeois because they felt that these considerations did not affect the workers. There is no difference between R.M.'s criticisms of these American pacifists and these old Marxist criticisms. Then,

as now, there was a class of the well-to-do who opposed State interference—the Liberal "Individualists" who opposed Factory Acts, etc. If you have not comprehended the difference between that type of opposition to the State and the anarchist type, then you have not comprehended anarchism. Why not do so before revising it?

London, Aug. 8.

A.M.

Our Reply

A. M.'s arguments would be valid if either of our Editorials (As Ye Sow . . . 23/4/55 and last week's Approach to the Libertarian Approach) were, even remotely, an attempt at revising anarchist principles or advocating such a "white blackbird" as "governmental anarchism". That he should assume they were, against all the evidence to the contrary,* is, to our minds, an indication of his bad faith in the present discussion. What is more we were not discussing the anarchist (or free) society but existing society. And whilst we, as neo-, O.H.M.S.- or pure-as-A.M.-anarchists, agree unreservedly with him when he writes that the health services are "not paid for out of taxation but out of the labour power of the workers" the fact remains that in our society money is the currency with which health services (yes, and hangmen) are paid for. And but for the fact that money is power in capitalist society it would matter little whether we talked of certain services being paid for with "money" or "labour

It is in this sense that we referred to money "in all probability" ceasing "to play an important part in

*For instance our series of twenty-three articles on the Lessons of the Spanish Revolution were based on such principles as that anarchists cannot accept to participate in government nor approve of conscription even in a so-called "people's army". A.M. compares us to the "neo-anarchists" in Sweden who entered local government, conveniently forgetting that in these columns we strongly attacked an article by Phil Lewis in which he attempted to justify the reformism of the Swedish syndicalists of the S.A.C. (not the anarchistsas A.M. wrongly suggests-who, in fact contributed a letter in support of FREE-DOM's position)! In the previous issue of Freedom A.M. echoes Joffre Stewart's viewpoint that we could "quite easily go on to justify conscription so long as there was capitalism". We resisted conscription in the last war in fact as well as in theory, which is more than some of our critics can say!

a free society". We agree that the picture of the free society presented by our correspondent Peter Newell leaves nothing to be desired, and if we could believe either that the advent of the free society will be universal or, if located in only a part of the world that it will be selfsufficient as well as 100 per cent. for the free society, then we would not have introduced the offending words "in all probability". But though we live in an age which talks of conquering outer-space as a mere bagatelle, we prefer to keep our feet on the ground so far as the free society is concerned. Because we believe that such social experiments will have relatively small beginnings we cannot be sure that it will be possible to abolish money as a first step. But the power of money, as the symbol of injustice and inequality, will have been removed, without which that particular community could not be free.

OF course taxes are collected by "some form of force or compulsion". These are the fundamental tenets of governmental society, and apply whether we are dealing with such common-sense questions as observing traffic signals and driving on the left side of the road or such unreasonable, inhuman and psychologically unsound laws as that he who commits murder shall be hanged. If A.M. objects to taxation because of the "force or compulsion" involved then he must object to drivers observing the Highway Code and so on. Perhaps he does, but we would like to think that for him anarchism is a human philosophy, not an intellectual exercise, an idée fixe, opposition for the sake of opposition. In which case he will recognise that "force and compulsion" are the only language in which existing society can express itself both in the things that are good as well as those that

are evil. It is a sheer waste of effort, therefore, for anarchist propagandists to concentrate their attack on such details as taxation (in the course of which they will gain such doubtful allies as the Poujadistes and the Surtax class grumblers) at the expense of the fundamental argument which divides us from the present organisation of society: namely, that they believe in the principle of compulsion and inequality whilst anarchists advocate co-operation and equality. And if we really aim at the free society we can only do this by encouraging and stimulating people to carry out a revolution in their thinking, and not by shouting the kind of slogans which, for people who have not undergone this "revolution", sounds like an invitation to commit hara-kiri . . . and we cannot blame them if they don't accept!

Freedom needs more Readers

Are You Helping?

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

Every Sunday at 7.30 at
THE MALATESTA CLUB
155 High Holborn, W.C.1.
(Nearly opposite Holborn Town Hall)

AUGUST 14—Peter Hoch on THE NAZI STATE SCHOOL

Every Thursday at 8.15.

Weather Permitting
HYDE PARK
Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

MANETTE STREET (Charing X Road) Saturdays at 5.30 p.m.

GLASGOW

OUTDOORS
At Maxwell Street
Every Sunday at 7.30 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 Sundayat 7.45 p.m.

ALL WELCOME

DISCUSSIONS

By Bonar Thompson
DICKENS, WILDE & SHAW
Alternate Thursdays at 8.30
August 18th: Dickens
September 1st: Wilde
September 15th: Shaw

Saturday, August 13th at 9 p.m.

EXCERPTS FROM SHAKESPEARE

By Bonar Thompson

FRANCES SOKOLOV

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

7 Red Lion Street
London, W.C.I. England

Tel.: Chancery 8364

The Anarchist Summer School

Continued from p. 3

The chief problem at St. George's lay in the children's desire to be told what to do, instead of deciding for themselves. When this resulted in the classes being stalemated over a period, the headmaster grew rather disturbed, so his stay at the school was a rather stormy one. The fundamental reason for the problem was that St. George's is based on the idea of true democracy, involving duty, majority rule, etc., and is essentially unhealthy.

Summerhill School is far superior, and

Summerhill School is far superior, and the "Summerhill Spirit" provides an atmosphere in which young children can develop in complete emotional health. Its disadvantages lay in its backward teaching methods, which made it difficult for children to learn as they grew up, and possibly led to a feeling of reticence and apathy among those of "adolescent" age.

Compared with any other school in the country, Summerhill is outstanding, but Comrade Lewis said that by the very high standards by which anarchists should criticise educational institutions, it had shortcomings.

On the general theory of education, he thought that every child was born an anarchist, that is, rational and healthy minded, and if no painful experiences occurred during childhood, would remain one. That was not true of Summerhill, as ex-students often joined the army when conscripted, and sometimes joined the Communist Party. The only satisfactory solution, in his opinion, would be for anarchists to organise educational facilities for ther own children. Most important of all, for intelligent parents, was not to let their children fall into the hands of the State.

Several members of the audience offered the opinion that the speaker had overestimated the effect of authoritarian education, and thought that it could be offset by a free home atmosphere.

THE culminating lecture of the weekend was given by Rita Milton under the title "The Rôle of the Revolutionary

To-day". She defined a revolutionary as one who sought a fundamental change in social institutions which he found incompatible with freedom and justice. Some people, who adhered to the gradualist school, held the opinion that such a revolutionary had no place in society to-day, and that one should merely encourage those trends in society by which certain institutions seemed to be changing automatically in the general interest. In epposition to this attitude she pointed out that other institutions were changing in the opposite direction, and that it implied a lack of personal activity. The revolutionary, on the other hand felt personally impelled to protest against the injustices which he found. Since there was no social revolutionary movement in England to-day, the only avenue of revolutionary activity lay on the individual plane, and since all values are subjective, could only be justified in subjective terms.

Comrade Milton went on to consider the connexion between the decline of the Labour Party and its lack of a revolutionary spirit, and concluded by saying that she personally felt compelled to the position of taking an intransigent and uncompromising attitude to all social institutions.

During the discussion the question of intransigence was debated, and it was agreed that subtle means should be used in personal propaganda. Contributors differed as to the value of specific activities, such as open air meetings, and the suggestion was put forward that the most useful practical activity for anarchists was instruction of adolescent people in sexual matters.

WE could not end our report without a word of thanks to the comrades responsible for the catering. Although many more comrades turned up for meals than had booked in advance, everyone was fed eventually, thanks to the splendid work done by Joan Sculthorpe, Mary Canipa and Jack Robinson.

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

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

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

MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI:
Neither East nor West
cloth 10s. 6d., paper 7s. 6d.
Workers in Stalin's Russia 1s.

ALEX COMFORT: Delinquency Barbarism & Sexual Freedom boards 3s. 6d. **HERBERT READ:** Art and the Evolution of Man 4s. Existentialism, Marxism and 3s. 6d. Anarchism Poetry and Anarchism cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d. The Philosophy of Anarchism boards 2s. 6d., paper 1s. The Education of Free Men ALEXANDER BERKMAN: ABC of Anarchism

Marxism, Freedom and the State.

cloth 5s.

ERRICO MALATESTA:

Anarchy 6d.

Vote—What For? 1d.

TONY GIBSON:

Youth for Freedom paper 2s.

Food Production and Population 6d.

Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.

M. BAKUNIN:

Homes or Hovels? Railways and Society What is Anarchism? The Basis of Communal Living JOHN HEWETSON: Sexual Freedom for the Young 6d. Ill-Health, Poverty and the State cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s. PHILIP SANSOM: Syndicalism-The Workers' Next Step 18. PETER KROPOTKIN: The State: Its Historic Rôle The Wage System Revolutionary Government Organised Vengeance Called Justice F. A. RIDLEY: The Roman Catholic Church 2d. and the Modern Age 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)

RUDOLF ROCKER:

Anarchy or Chaos

Nationalism and Culture

GEORGE WOODCOCK:

New Life to the Land

cloth 21s.

2s. 6d.

K. J. KENAFICK:

Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx

paper 6s.

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