

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

No Compensation can make up for inequality.

ARISTOTLE (Politics)

Vol. 17, No. 2

January 14th, 1956

Threepence

OUR CRAZY ECONOMY

Short Time in Car Industry

AS far as the motor industry in this country is concerned, Mr. Butler's credit squeeze seems to have been all too successful. His attempts to rectify the situation described as 'too much money chasing too few goods' have been most effective and now we have the beginning of the reverse situation—'too many goods chasing too little money'.

This may bring satisfaction to Mr. Butler, whose Autumn Budget shocked even his own supporters, but for some thousands of workers it brought short-time working this week. At the Austin works at Longbridge, Birmingham, 7,000 out of 18,000 workers have started an indefinite period on the four-day week, while at Coventry 2,000 at the Rootes Group factory at Ryton-on-Dunsmore were to start short-time working. The Standard company has announced a 10 per cent. reduction in production of its smaller cars, and Morris Commercial are also said to be affected.

The reaction on the Stock Exchange was marked and immediate. On Monday share values in the motor and allied industries dipped by a whacking £8 million, the biggest losses being Fords (£2 million down) and Dunlop (over £2½ million down).

The motor industry is one of this country's most important export businesses, and the effects of curtailment of production could be staggering. Rubber, glass, paints, acces-

sories, right back to steel and through that to coal mining, hundreds of trades employing perhaps millions of workers are bound up with the frantic production of more and more cars for export and for our own congested roads.

For what? To keep the wheels of industry turning. Why? So that Britain can maintain her pre-eminence in the world's markets. But to-day she is being challenged by other industrially expanding countries, all driven on by the same crazy urge—to get on top.

But there's only room for one on top, and whoever is there is continually being jostled by those coming up from below. There can be no relaxation, no pause for breath, no leisure to enjoy the fruits of labour.

So the workers in all competing countries (and as each country develops its resources it enters the race), have before them nothing but the prospect of unending competi-

tion with each other. In a world in which communication can bring us together as never before, competition must be forever driving us apart. And the only relaxation our fantastic ability to produce can bring is when we work ourselves out of a job and go on short time—with a consequent setback to our security or standards of living.

Ever since the war, the cry for production and more production has driven the workers on. But capitalism is a crazy economy. It drives on and on to reach abundance—but is then embarrassed when it is achieved. 3,000 cars are now parked in and around Austin's factory at Longbridge, gathering dust in sheds and disused quarries—while the workers who made them suffer partial unemployment. Until they are sold and the mad rush to produce more (120 cars an hour roll off the Austin production lines), once again brings its temporary prosperity.

This is not a sensible way to organise society. Like this human beings are merely production units, adjuncts of the machine, and humanity serves the machinery of production and distribution because a small minority of people wax rich and powerful through it. But the majority are made irresponsible, are dehumanised by this crazy economy over which they have no control.

Anarchists say that the machine and the processes of production and distribution should serve humanity. That our ingenuity and skill and strength should be used to produce the best out of life for all the peoples of the world.

This is impossible through competition. It is impossible through a money system, impossible through production for profit. But unless they will think about it and then act upon it, the workers must expect to suffer the ups and downs, the insecurities and fears, of which this week's lay-off in the Midlands is but a small example.

Spanish Morocco Strikers Win Demands

Four thousand striking Moroccan miners near Melilla have returned to work after the Spanish authorities had granted their demand for a 35 per cent. wage increase. The strike was the first reported in Spanish Morocco since General Franco came to power.

—Manchester Guardian 7/1/56.

PAINLESS CHILDBIRTH

THE POPE GIVES HIS APPROVAL

CATHOLIC mothers and mothers-to-be, forbidden by theological law to control conception, will be pleased to learn that the Pope, in his address to 700 gynaecologists in Rome, approves of what is known as the psycho-prophylactic method used in childbirth. The method, which consists in teaching the mothers details of the physical process of childbirth, thus helping her to control the nervous reactions set up by the muscular movement of birth, and which is claimed to be 85-90 per cent. successful in achieving painless childbirth, has positive value and "fully confirms the will of the creator". With the Pope's infallibility as the guide, God's intention as expressed through Genesis, that "in pain shall you bring forth children", has been established as not meaning to forbid men to lighten the burden of work, pain and sickness. Nor, in punishing Eve, did God "wish to forbid mothers to make use of means which rendered childbirth easier and less painful". However, in case the flock might get the wrong impression that suffering is not necessarily the burden we have to bear for the fall of our "first parents" the Pope adds this rider:

"One must not seek subterfuges for the words of sacred scripture; they remain true in the sense intended and expressed by the Creator; namely motherhood will give the mother much suffering to bear. In what precise manner did God conceive chastisement and how will He carry it out? Sacred scripture does not say."

In spite of this exercise in dialectics, there is significance in the new interpretation of Genesis. As we have discussed before in FREEDOM, the Catholic Church has much experience in the subtle procedure of adjusting doctrine to meet the onslaught of science or views which cut across doctrine. This latest attitude to psycho-prophylactics, developed by the Russians, may seem relatively unimportant, but it is yet another blow which will help to crumble the wall of absolutism.

What has the Church to gain from the acceptance of this method of painless

childbirth which not only leads to a modification of doctrine as has always been understood but involves the use of will and emotion unrelated to spiritual forces?

Firstly, most women, catholic or otherwise must welcome a method which has as its aim the elimination of painful child-bearing. However much pleasure a woman gets out of child-bearing her enjoyment can only be increased if less pain is involved. Thus, if the Pope had made judgment against this method there would have been a great deal of criticism against a celibate old man laying down rules upon a type of human pain he is never likely to experience. (To us the insistence of the Catholic authorities that catholics, whatever their economic conditions, should not limit their families implies a total disregard for human feelings. It does not seem to matter that children born into a poor family will be deprived of even the basic essentials so long as a stupid dogma is upheld).

Secondly, the Vatican advisers have seen in this method a way of increasing catholic births rather than diminishing them. The Pope has said that the method could lead to "positive moral achievement". By eliminating pain and fear from childbirth it "frequently diminishes an inducement to commit amoral acts in the use of marriage rights". What is this abuse of marriage rights? It means that a couple who feel that they are not in a position to support children, or simply do not want them, may well decide to deliberately avoid conception by one of the proscribed methods. This is exercising freedom of choice forbidden by the Church.

The Pope has made it clear that although the psycho-prophylactic method was developed in Russia, and "even a materialistic researcher can make a real and valid scientific discovery", this contribution does not in any way constitute an argument in favour of his materialistic ideas. And to vindicate any slur of materialism which may ensue we are informed by His Holiness that the Englishman Grantley Dick Read has perfected a similar theory and technique. M.

IN AN H-WAR

Annihilation Guaranteed

A NEW report has just been published in Washington which describes what an atomic war would be like in ten years' time. The committee which has produced the report, under the chairmanship of General Nelson, vice-president of the New York Life Insurance Company (can it be accident or design that a Life Insurance company gets all the first-hand information?), was appointed in order to review civil defence problems in the light of atomic developments since 1952, and included such experts as Professor Hill and Dr. Haworth, both of whom are directors of research establishments.

The report states that defence planning should be revised so as to take account of the difference in destructive power between the atomic bombs of the past, which were equivalent to 20,000 tons of T.N.T., and the megaton bombs of the present which are equivalent to 50 million tons of T.N.T. "or even more"—the size being limited principally by the ability to deliver the bomb. The report declares that:

"Instead of having almost complete destruction above ground within a half-mile of the point of burst, as in the case of the earlier atomic bombs, we would have in the case of a 20-megaton bomb virtually complete destruction above ground within a radius of five miles of the burst and a somewhat greater radius if we dealt with a 40- or 50-megaton weapon."

It continues with an analysis of the problem of atomic fall-out, and emphasises the serious nature of the problem because atomic weapons would be detonated near ground level, and it therefore followed that nuclear warfare would bring about:

"a many fold increase of radio-active dust in the atmosphere resulting in potentially lethal fall-out over thousands of square miles. This is a development which not only greatly complicates civil defence measures but also requires special counter-measures."

Accordingly therefore, the potential "disaster area" would be larger than the area of any city and would no doubt overlap "state boundaries".

The report found some consolation in the fact that due to defence co-operation with Canada it was reasonable to suppose that a period of up to two hours warning would be likely. Curiously enough however it laid emphasis on the possible warning time for an inter-continental ballistic missile as being not

more than ten to twenty minutes. Previously it had stated that the best principle to work upon in the event of atomic war was to "evacuate and survive", providing that the anticipated time in which to evacuate was improved to between one and two hours!

A grim note of realism is struck when it discusses the possibility of an enemy power striking the first blow:

"The principal production problem in the United States in the event of war may well be not the manufacture of military supplies and weapons but the production of those basic items needed for the rehabilitation of the civilian economy and for the re-establishment of our entire economic structure."

It draws the conclusion that the primary task might be "the salvaging of a 'balanced 30 per cent. of our gross national production', which would provide a basis on which to develop the economic power to strike back. The report adds:

"The time is close at hand when the United States and its potential enemy will have these weapons in quantity and also greatly increased carrier capabilities, in terms of speed and load, so as to pose the threat of annihilation."

One might think that the possibilities conjured up by such a report (and they are no doubt toned down in some degree), would lead the big Powers to some form of agreement as to the non-continuance of atomic-bomb production, or at least the non-continuance of tests which create radio-active fall-out. But of course this is far from being the case, and following the recent explosions in Russia in November, the U.S.A. has just announced a new series of tests in the Pacific early this year.

Russia claimed that with the aim of preventing radio-active influences she had conducted her experiment at a great height, which was interpreted as meaning that the bomb had been dropped from the air. But America has now developed an "almost unbelievably powerful weapon" small enough to be delivered by modern atom bombers, according to "Congressional sources".

So there is no question of slowing down research and experiment in offensive atomic weapons—on the contrary the competitive spirit (as opposed to the "Geneva spirit"), is abroad in the air, and East and West are determined to prove, one to the other, that they have the better means for annihilating civilization.

A Sensational Document from Inside Spain

Students Condemn Franco Regime

THE results of an officially sponsored poll recently held among students of Madrid University were so "disquieting" that they have not been published in Spain! However, a detailed report, written by José Maria Pinillos, Professor of Experimental Psychology at Madrid University, who analyzed the answers and wrote the conclusions, has been distributed privately in official and diplomatic circles . . . and details have found their way into the columns of the *New York Times* (January 4).

The Institute of Public Opinion's report (the Institute is a department of the Ministry of Information) said the questionnaire had given the following results:

"Political ruling class [the Government]: 74 per cent. of the students accuse its members of incompetence—lacking seriousness of purpose, amateurish, ignorant; 85 per cent. accuse them of immorality—comedians, ambitious without scruples, false.

"Members of the military hierarchy: 90 per cent. accuse them of incompetence—ignorant, bureaucratic, worthless; 48 per cent. accuse them of immorality—libertines, brutal, heavy drinkers.

"University professors: 67 per cent. consider themselves a generation without teachers, not because there are no teachers, but because of the lack of sincerity or devotion to duty among professors.

"Ecclesiastical hierarchy: 52 per cent. accuse its members of immorality—ostentatious, ambitious; 70 per cent. do not

believe that the social policy of the [Roman Catholic] Church is accepted by the people; 65 per cent. believe the Church does not show enough concern for the working class."

Of the students consulted, 60 per cent. were decidedly opposed to any form of totalitarian régime, 20 per cent. supported totalitarianism in principle but disagreed with the way the régime was managing public affairs, and 20 per cent. were politically indifferent.

But even those who favoured an authoritarian government opposed many aspects of the Spanish dictatorship, according to the report.

"This attitude does not stem from a clearly expressed progressive ideology, but only from disagreement with that which exists at present," it said.

Answers to many of the questions, the report said, brought out that:

"Eighty per cent. of the students are convinced there is class hatred in the country and 55 per cent. believe that hatred is caused by abuses of the Spanish capitalist system. In view of that situation, 65 per cent. are certain that Spain will "inevitably wind up with a socialist type of régime" and 20 per cent. believe the problem can be solved through "conservative means."

"Specifically, 82 per cent. declare unreservedly that they have no confidence in the present ruling minorities [civil authorities]. Sixty per cent. of the students who hold that view are divided

equally between monarchists and republicans."

The term republican is used in the report as a synonym for left-winger. Both groups are "waiting for a political change that will permit collective action," the report said. "Ideologically, the tendency of that action would be liberal, because more than 85 per cent. of the students regard personages who are the exponents of liberal doctrine as their present teachers."

"For the time being those social and cultural views do not seem to be translating themselves into decided action. They are rather the result of a general nonconformist feeling. The practical consequences that could stem from it are checked by collective fear, economic ambitions and, above all, by the lack of clear constructive ideals likely to be adopted.

"However, the growing malcontent and lack of political experience provide fertile ground for the very possible action of extreme left-wing minorities", whose ideologies are "highly alluring because of the mere fact that they are against present conditions," the report said.

The *N.Y. Times* correspondent in Madrid reports (*N.Y.T.* 6/1/56) that university professors have stated that on the basis of their personal experience they believed the poll accurately reflected the students' attitude.

Continued on p. 4

BOOK REVIEW

FANTASY AND UTOPIA

IN an age when so many of the social and technological innovations imagined by Utopian writers have become part of the world around us, it is to be expected that many writers should turn to the examination of Utopian literature. In the past, most of the studies have been from a more or less strictly socio-political viewpoint; writers like Lewis Mumford and Marie-Louise Berneri have been concerned mainly with the ideas and proposals contained in Utopian books. Richard Gerber, the author of *Utopian Fantasy* (Routledge, 16/-), breaks new ground in considering such books mainly from a literary viewpoint; significantly, his study is sub-titled, "A Study of English Utopian Fiction since the End of the Nineteenth Century." But a Utopian romance is by definition concerned with ideas; however well these ideas may be assimilated into the fabric of fiction, they remain the chief subject matter, almost the main characters, and thus even Mr. Gerber's attempt to limit his study does not depart often or impressively from the consideration of what the writers are trying to say rather than how they are saying it.

My first—and principal—criticism of *Utopian Fantasy* relates to the scope of Mr. Gerber's subject matter. For in his

survey he not only includes those visions of ideal commonwealths which are devoted to the consideration of changes their authors believe to be within the scope of man as he is, upon this sub-lunary earth, but also those more romantic dreams that proceed far into the future, when man has become Superman, or into worlds beyond our own, and which are dominated less by serious social theories than by fantastic speculation. But the novels of futuristic or otherworldly fancy, which in recent years have proliferated vastly in a great off-spring of "science" fiction, cannot strictly be regarded as Utopian at all, and my objection, while it starts from a point of definition, goes far beyond it, since I believe that the two kinds of fiction spring from and represent markedly different impulses.

THE idea of Utopia began in Sir Thomas More's idyll of a kingdom where men like ourselves had arranged their lives according to what seemed to

More a rational pattern. The impulse that led him to write this story sprang directly from the social circumstances of his time, as was made amply evident by the elaboration with which, in the early pages of *Utopia*, he discussed the state of Tudor England; the picture of the imaginary kingdom that followed this criticism of his own country was clearly meant to suggest how he, as a practical man of affairs, thought that it might be possible to avoid the injustices among which he lived and from which, incidentally, he was to die. Not only More, but also many of his contemporaries, took his proposals quite seriously; Vasco de Quiroga, the sixteenth century Bishop of Michoacan in Mexico, actually tried to build Utopia on the shores of Lake Patzcuaro by founding villages of Tarascan Indians which were operated, for several decades, according to the rules laid down in *Utopia*, and there is reason to believe that the semi-communistic settlements which the Jesuits formed among the Indians of Paraguay were also influenced by More's ideas, in part directly and in part by way of Quiroga's attempt to apply Utopian idea in practice.

Since More's time the authors of socio-political Utopias have consistently been concerned with possible means of organising human life, and the practicality of their suggestions, which often seemed so wild to their contemporaries, has been shown during our own century by the number of innovations, originally imagined by Utopian romancers, that have actually materialised among us. Often, with an irony which the authors did not anticipate, these innovations have done more harm than good, have enslaved men rather than liberating them, but this fact at least emphasises the contention that what the real Utopians suggest can be put into practice, while most of the writers of fantasies that are other-

worldly in time or space have been concerned with speculative daydreams rather than with realities that might be achieved within a reasonably close future.

PARADOXICALLY, however, most Utopias—despite their practicality—arise from a fear of life, a fear of letting human nature blossom freely and produce its own organic solutions to social problems. And this fear of life, of course, the Utopian shares with the other-worldly fantasist. Both seek to escape from the unpredictable impulses of the man within, the Utopians by caging him within a rigid social framework and the fantasists by flying to some strange and remote future where man will be angelic rather than human. Both are escapists, but the first leads us straight into a prison, while the second lulls us into an opium trance. Another attribute which they share is, as Mr. Gerber has suggested, their quasi-religiosity. The Utopian seeks to establish the Kingdom of God on earth as quickly as possible, and in the process makes Paradise look uncommonly like a new circle of Dante's Hell. The creator of the futurist fantasy foresees an indefinite extension of human potentialities in which man becomes steadily less human and progressively takes on the attributes of Divinity. The fact that Wells should have called one of his romances *Men Like Gods* is not accidental.

But these common characteristics—the fear of man as he is and the impulse towards a humanitarian quasi-religiosity—do not mean that Utopia and the futurist fantasy are the same thing. Mr. Gerber has suggested that with the nineteenth century an evolutionary and progressivist element entered into Utopian literature. It is true that it entered into and has dominated "scientific" fantasy,

but an evolutionary Utopia is a contradiction in terms. Utopia is the perfect society; it is essentially static and timeless; it is an attempt to reduce the theological concept of eternity to earthly terms. The final rules of living have been laid down, and any attempt to depart from them is treason against the ideal which has been reduced to material form. With a tiny minority of exceptions, like *News from Nowhere*, the socio-political Utopias are rigid and regimented permanent societies, and even in *News from Nowhere* the evolutionary urge has ebbed away; where is there to go when one has entered the Garden of Eden?

Both the socio-political Utopia and the superhuman fantasy have, of course, their opposites, and sometimes, as in the case of Wells, the same man saw both sides of the vision, the nightmare as well as the daydream. But what is significant—and this comes out very strongly in Mr. Gerber's literary assessments—is that the anti-Utopias and the pessimistic fantasies are so much the more convincing and the more artistically valid. Among the works of Wells, it is the grandly gloomy fantasies like *The Island of Dr. Moreau* and *The Time Machine* that one remembers, rather than *Men Like Gods* or *A Modern Utopia*. And it is critically just that Mr. Gerber should have picked *Brave New World* and *1984* as the best modern Utopian romances from a literary point of view. Both are in fact anti-Utopias; they show how the eminently practical suggestions of the Utopians can lead us—and are even now leading us—to the defeat of humanity. The real function of the novel as a literary form is the study of man in all his individuality. But the citizens of orthodox Utopias have ceased to be individuals, and the people of the futurist fantasies have become streamlined supermen. Only in the anti-Utopias does man survive, doomed perhaps to defeat, but at least human in his struggle against the overpowering forces of uniformity, of the deified State.

GEORGE WOODCOCK.

Folk Songs With a Difference

IN "Harriet and Her Harmonium" (Faber & Faber, 15/-), Mr. Alan Lomax who has travelled widely in search of genuine folksongs of the nations, gives us an engaging story of a prim little Victorian English girl who embarks on a visit to America to rejoin her father who has gone to the Californian goldfields in search of fame and fortune. All alone she crosses the Atlantic armed only with her parasol, a portable harmonium and a notebook in which to jot down songs. Her father had written to say America was full of songs.

In the course of her fabulous journey by every kind of transport, including pony, Mississippi steam-boat and wind-wagon, she meets with a shipwreck, a stage-coach hold-up, a red indian attack and shelters a little negro slave boy from the wrath of a cruel white master. She keeps cool and collected in the face of every crisis and on her way she picks up the songs of America from the people who created them. She meets them all, sailors, tinkers, trappers, cowboys, colonists, red indians, goldminers and even

Abraham Lincoln himself, who teaches her "The Blue-tailed Fly"!

The story might have gained from a neater outline and more crisp approach, it is apt to ramble somewhat, and some of the songs are set a little high, but this is surely an ideal and most original way of learning the folksongs of a nation and the book is sure to provide many hours of pleasure to the whole family. I hope there will be more from the same quarter about other countries.

The drawings by Pearl Binder are delightful and among the best she has done, though she cannot curb a tendency for over-crowding and sometimes spoils her own effects thereby. D.

Reflections on Some of the Problems of Voluntary Initiatives

IT is often rightly pointed out that figures can be made to mean anything you like. We have not such a complete contempt for statistics as that, and certainly balancing the family budget is something very real, and the figures of income from wages and outgoings for rent, food and clothing only start lying when one enters the super-tax levels of income and expenditure! The figures we offer below speak for themselves and give an all too clear picture of the financial affairs of the FREEDOM PRESS!

DURING 1955 FREEDOM PRESS income from all sources (that is from the sales of our literature, subscriptions, donations to the Deficit Fund and from the Bookshop and Book mailing service) totalled £3,289 (American readers should multiply all our figures by 3 in order to obtain an approximate equivalent in dollars). Our total expenditure in that same period was £3,501, thus there was an unbalance between income and expenditure of £212. To this figure must be added the sum of £513 representing our accumulated debts from past years as at January 1st, 1955, so that we start the year 1956 with debts totalling £725 against which we must put available cash in hand (£8) and £170 in amounts owing to the FREEDOM PRESS by booksellers, private individuals and groups. Thus assuming that we shall receive payment in full, we have £178 to some from 1955 which will help to reduce our debt from £725 to £547. (say \$1,500).

BEFORE we start breaking down our figures, let us look at the positive side of our activities, since, after all, our interest in the finances of F.P. are only of relative importance, the purpose of F.P. being the propagation of anarchist ideas, and the awakening of independent thinking among the people and not money-making. To this end in 1955 we issued 53 issues of our journal

FREEDOM, we published one volume of "Selections from FREEDOM", and have had to have more sheets of some F.P. titles bound up as stocks were exhausted. Orders for our literature have been received from all parts of the world, not for spectacular quantities, but in a steady demand. Freedom Bookshop besides being a daily reminder to the passing public of the existence of our ideas—and many are those who stop to read the front page of FREEDOM displayed in the shop window—is also responsible for selling an average of 100 copies each week besides our books and pamphlets. Furthermore many visitors to the shop have remarked on the excellence of the selection of Second-Hand books that fill our shelves, and which eventually find their way into interested people's bookshelves and to libraries as far away as India.

Over these past fifteen years we have built up a list of some fifty FREEDOM PRESS titles, representing a stock of not less than 40,000 books and pamphlets which ensures that as far as possible the anarchist literature of these years and some of the classics of past years will still be available to young people coming to our ideas for some time to come. At the same time we have been building up the FREEDOM PRESS library which though at present available to only a restricted number of comrades in London will, some day, we hope, be housed and managed in a way that will increase its availability and its usefulness. Of course the rate at which we can add books to this collection is largely determined by our finances, though even they do not induce us to part with any rare, out-of-print works of interest!

During 1955 we have maintained contacts with comrades and sympathisers throughout the world, dealt with the 3,000 letters that reach our office each year—some quite straight-forward, others complicated enquiries about books and not infrequently for advice about personal matters.

As to the tangible results of this

activity, this is something much more difficult for us to assess, for apart from being able to state quite categorically that we are always reaching new people, besides maintaining regular contacts over the years with the solid core of our readership, the answer to this question can only come from those who read our journal and our publications. Has their introduction to and study of the anarchist point of view helped them to live fuller lives by opening and broadening their minds and modifying their attitudes to people, to problems and to politics and politicians? Do they find themselves applying anarchist teachings in their dealing with family problems (particularly children), neighbours and fellow-workers as well as expressing anarchist ideas in discussion? In other words, consciously or unconsciously, are they assisting in the growth and development of anarchist ideas as a way of life and an alternative to the authoritarian society of to-day? Perhaps one of these days, in an optimistic moment, when we feel that we are on top of our work, we shall send

out a questionnaire to all our readers in an attempt to assess the effect of our work and to have their opinions as to how it can be carried out more effectively than at present. (In the meantime any sympathetic readers who care to express themselves on these questions will be welcome in the columns of FREEDOM!)

THE work—and the finances—of FREEDOM PRESS—can be divided into four sections: (1) publication of FREEDOM; (2) Freedom Press publications; (3) Freedom Bookshop and Book service; (4) Running overheads. In item (1) we have limited outgoings to (a) printing charges (b) paper supplies and (c) postage—which item alone amounts to £300 a year! In item (2) we include only printing and book-binding charges incurred in the year. In item (3) we include expenditure on book purchases, postage on parcels dispatched, and sundry charges involved in collecting and "searching" for second-hand books. In item (4) we include Rent for the shop, office, library and storage basement, as well as Rates, Lighting, Heating, Telephone, Stationery and Postages. How these different departments have fared is shown in the following Table:

	Loss	Surplus
(1) FREEDOM. Excess of Expenditure over income from sales and subscriptions	£1047	
Contributions received to Deficit Fund	667	
		380
(2) FREEDOM PRESS LITERATURE		117
(3) FREEDOM BOOKSHOP & BOOK SERVICE		387
(4) FREEDOM PRESS Running Overheads, Rent, Rates, Gas, Light, Stationery, Postages & Sundries		336
		716
Excess of Expenditure over Income 1955		212
		716

The above figures reveal, in the first place, that our estimate of a loss of £15 a week on FREEDOM was low, that the figure is more like £20*.

*It should however be pointed out that we have some 200 readers in the United States who do not pay a yearly subscription but who prefer to contribute now and then, and sometimes more than the equivalent of a subscription, to the Deficit Fund. To avoid complicated

book-keeping we do not deduct part of their contribution as subscription. By so doing it would reduce the loss on FREEDOM by some £200 and the Deficit Fund would be also correspondingly less. From the point of view of assessing the financial stability of FREEDOM so doing would give a more accurate picture of the situation, though so far as the ultimate position is concerned, it makes no difference.

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.

- New Books
 Sexual Behaviour in the Human Female Kinsey, Pomeroy & Martin 52/6
 Reprints
 Moulin Rouge Pierre La Mure 3/-
 Second-Hand
 Lourdes Emile Zola 3/6
 Sutter's Gold Blaise Cendrars 3/6
 The Fate of Homo Sapiens H. G. Wells 3/-
 Herbert Spencer, the Man and his Work Hector MacPherson 3/-
 Principles of Political Economy John Stuart Mill 2/6
 A System of Logic John Stuart Mill 2/6
 Commonsense and the Child Ethel Mannin 4/-
 A Fearful Joy Joyce Cary 3/-
 Money and Morals Eric Gill 5/6
 The Politics of the Unpolitical Herbert Read 3/6
 A Chance for Everybody Hyacinth Dubreuil 5/-
 The Kreutzer Sonata and Sevastopol Leo Tolstoy 2/6
 The Conquest of Violence Bart De Ligt 10/-
 The Idiot Fyodor Dostoevsky 3/-
 Anna Karenina Leo Tolstoy 3/-
 (2 vols.) the Set 4/-
 A New View of Society Robert Owen 3/-
 Meditations Marcus Aurelius 2/-
 The Revolt of the angels Anatole France 3/-
 The Power of Non-Violence Richard Gregg 7/-
 The Economic Consequences of Power Production Fred Henderson 3/6
 Towards Industrial Freedom Edward Carpenter 3/-
 The Women in Gandhi's Life Eleanor Morton 6/-
 Backgrounds of Conflict Kurt London 7/6

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

Voluntary Initiatives

Continued from p. 1

Our aim this year must therefore be to raise £1,000 in contributions as well as to seek to reduce costs of production by considerably increasing the circulation of FREEDOM. That is if the paper is to continue in its present format and appear weekly. (Incidentally, several readers have suggested that the price should be raised. We are opposed to doing this except if actual printing charges and paper prices rise steeply. Our problems at present are caused by our circulation being much too small compared with the size and frequency of publication of the paper, and can only be solved by increasing circulation and/or by being "subsidised" by contributions from those readers who can afford to, and those who specially value the paper to wish to see it continue in its present format.)

We do not think that the criterion for the continued publication of FREEDOM should be "its ability to pay its way". The fallacy of such an argument (which has, unfortunately been used by one or two of our erstwhile contributors), is revealed if one considers the extreme situation, under a dictatorship, where it would be a crime to publish or read such a paper as FREEDOM. Would the fact that under such conditions it is obviously impossible to make a paper "pay its way" be a valid argument for remaining silent? To-day we are only one stage removed from that situation. Instead of suppression of ideas we have apathy, a kind of voluntary suppression, encouraged and fostered by the political parties and workers' organisations. Does FREEDOM pack-up until people become interested, or is one of our functions to help to break down the apathy? And if so are we not entitled to expect, and hope, that our work, freely and willingly given over a period of years, and its chances of success, should be gauged by the validity of the arguments advanced and the human values on which our ideas are based, but never, surely, by their popular appeal or the sordid yardstick of capitalism by which success is the ability to make every enterprise "pay its way"!

★

TO return to our Balance Sheet.

We have always stressed how important it is for the financing of our enterprise that as many readers as possible should order their books (of all kinds) through Freedom Bookshop. Our figures show that last year it resulted in a surplus of £387 which more than covered the cost of maintaining a shop window and running FREEDOM PRESS office. We hope more readers will help us this year in this way, and in thanking all those who presented us with books for re-sale we trust others will be encouraged to follow their example. It is difficult to assess what proportion of our income came from donated books but it was not an inconsiderable amount. Only last week an American reader sent us some magnificent books, and we record this fact as a suggestion other American readers of FREEDOM might care to follow up.

One final comment on the Accounts. This year, as last, the surplus from the sale of Freedom Press literature, has been absorbed by the losses on the paper. This of course is a serious trend for it means that we shall be unable to bring out new books and pamphlets, the publication of which is financed by the money accruing from the sale of literature from our existing stocks. And this, we feel, is an added argument for seeing to it that we reach the £1,000 (\$3,000) mark in contributions this year! And what are we to do with the £725 (pound) baby that we have been left with and will be carrying on our backs (and on our minds)

The Anatomy of Aloneness - 2

(Continued from last week)

The Medusa figure of the landlady does not let off hovering over him and demanding propitiation. In desperation Umberto D has himself admitted to the ward of the local Catholic hospital where by feigning piety and pain he hopes to gain a week's free board and therewith set his accounts in order. With the timely assistance of a neighbouring "invalid" who has long since learned the ropes of wangling temporary quarters ("Ask for the rosary," he urges Umberto D, "and they'll let you stay a couple of days anyhow"), Umberto D does gain a little time.

But not enough. After rescuing Flick from imminent extermination in the city pound, Umberto D, at the end of his tether, posts himself on a corner; with shame and despair vying fitfully to conquer him, he deliberately, painfully forces himself to hold his hand out for alms, yet at the last moment he with-

draws his palm before it can be contaminated with solicited lire. Want and loneliness have shucked him of all things but a sense of dignity, of compassion—in a word, of humanness. How different from the proper denizens of the brothel, with their sneaked respectability: the tidily-dressed woman skulking away in the shadow of her own sense of shame, the dapper shell of a man sauntering off a few moments later after paying off the landlady and shooting off the chattelized woman before him lest he be seen departing the premises with her. This—this is the stuff of "respectability".

Umberto D fights to the very end to hold onto his lodgings—his place, his home, but he cannot beg and he cannot borrow (he does accost two former colleagues of his, but with a practised know-nothing air they subtly elude his unvoiced petitions; in a hard economy geared to cut-throat internecine competition, there is nothing so smug as the smugness of one who is working contra

one who is hanging on by the skin of his pension), and his landlady is on the verge of re-possessing his room because she is going to marry an epicene movie director and "needs the space". Alone, lonely, stripped of hope—not for being "old", to be sure, but only for being old and unwanted, "unnecessary" in the grand material scheme of things, Umberto D has no alternative now but to do away with himself, for Ariadne has perished without leaving a clue out of his nightmarish labyrinth. Even in this extremity, however, he does not lose his sense of obligation to Flick, but the people with whom he would board the dog betray themselves greedy beyond acceptance. As a final resort Umberto D offers Flick to a little girl he knows to be fond of the dog. She yips for joy, but joy for a little girl is short-lived. "Oh no," exclaims her guardian-for-the-day, "Who'll take care of him?" "But I don't want to sell Flick," Umberto D protests his final accusation against a world that prelates profiteering. "I want to give him away. He—he isn't any trouble, really." "Come along now, Daniela," commands the haughty guardian as she yanks the little girl after her, "and none of your tantrums now."

Crushed by this final turn of the screw which impedes his giving away his most prized possession, Umberto D can only watch the figures retreat into the park. There is only one escape-hatch left him now, Flick or no Flick: he would destroy himself—or at least that much of himself which has proved indestructible by the insensate forces about him. But he fails—as though there were within him a hard core of something which refuses absolutely to succumb to the hawks and vultures of money-mad libertinage.

I have described the scenes of *Umberto D* at some length not because they are so extraordinary or storyful in their own right, but rather to attempt to clue the motivations of an elderly pensioner entirely disabused of self-pity. So far from being a pejorative concept, agedness, even when it involves aloneness, is by no means synonymous with misery, most certainly when it is not accompanied by loss of humanness. Umberto D's crime is not that he has grown old, but that he has grown old without funds, which is to say dependent, which is to say useless—all according to the "lights" of a devious machine which can collect and collate every mite of data under the man-made satellites except those which con-

cern themselves with human beings. To date the demiurgi have sported with all sorts of political solutions to the problem of the aged (e.g., social security, Townsend plan), but these "solutions" have been found to hold little water when put to the test, especially under inexorable economic pressures which have tried the agility of even the most adept of political temporizers. Thus, for example, the hue and cry raised by fussy traditionalists—and avaricious bosses—over increasing unemployment insurance rates; to their way of thinking, of course, guys out of work are utterly useless except as they can be manipulated to keep in line those who are working.

But pastured pensioners comprise only part of the problem. Many older men to-day cannot "afford" to retire, and don't, with a commensurate retardation of job turnover "at the top." Meanwhile the assembly-line schools do not let up spewing forth thousands upon thousands of young ambitious technicians in mortal rivalry to make a "good deal" for themselves, and the devil take the hindmost. These are the real "useful ones", trained to the teeth to serve a senseless unfeeling machine. They'll have to wait their turn, however, and while they're waiting they'll have to see to it that they aren't trampled under by the next class ready to cut loose and run amok. What is supposed to keep them in line, is anybody's guess. And the politico's livelihood.

None of which, to be sure, is the immediate burden of *Umberto D*. Nor is it, as the eminent critic of the *New York Times* has so blandly suggested, that "we must do something (sic) for our senior citizens". The best thing we can do for them is to let them alone to live out their days as they choose, without overt or covert duress. For the man Umberto D, in the final analysis, is less obsessed with "age" than some of our younger articulate do-gooding sociologists appear to be. Aloneness for Umberto D, as for most others of his generation, could be a fruitful and rewarding period of life if they did not exist in imminent peril of being overtaken and devoured by the hounds of practicality. Yet only at the last moment, with their ears cocked for the bleat of political advantage, will the caretakers of slavocracy's hounds cry havoc, but by then the "senior citizens" will have seen the promise of a twilight aloneness corrupted to bleak forbidding loneliness; and they will have succumbed to it, spiritually if not physically.

SEYMOUR GREENBERG.

EXHIBITION

Modern Art in the United States

THE most impressive works in the exhibition of "Modern art in the United States" at the Tate Gallery, Millbank, are to be found amongst the prints. These are of an extremely sensitive and technically assured kind; they have what one looks for in vain amongst the painting—confidence and conviction, and a very high standard of skill. I will mention a few which struck me as being quite outstandingly good; Leonard Baskin's "Man of Peace"; James Forsberg's "The Family"; Misch Kohn's "Tiger", and almost all of Lionel Feininger's prints. The quality of these works and the range of method is very high and would be exceptional in any company—here American art seems to have truly found its way, perhaps because the making of a print is in a certain mechanical sense more to the liking of the technically minded.

The sculpture, of which there is not much, is dominated by the stabiles and mobiles of Alexander Calder, at least, so far as excellence of intention and achievement go. Calder's mobiles, and in particular, the large one which hangs from the ceiling of the gallery entitled "Jacaranda", are so interesting and fascinating. None of his imitators ever achieve the acute sense of balance and harmony, and the slow evocative movement which animates these extraordinary creations. Calder's handling of his materials is strictly workmanlike. The stuff is sheet steel, aluminium, steel and wire. It is heated, shaped, perforated and rivetted, and it hangs in the air in the most exciting way. Calder is an outstanding sculptor. Ferber's and Lassaw's

abstracts are interesting but I find the huge women of Gaston Lachaise, in spite of the "accent on the ventral mass", vide the catalogue, bulbous and pneumatic in a rubbery way.

Among the paintings, those of Lionel Feininger, Arshile Gorky, Ben Shahn, Andrew Wyeth and Morris Graves are of real quality, especially Graves, who has something of the magical creativeness of Paul Klee. In paintings such as "Joyous young pine" and "Bird singing in the moonlight", Graves makes a really native American painting; his work is original and owes little to the influence of European painting.

That much said, we now come to the difficulties of modern art in the U.S.A. The great achievements of modern European painters are all here, with nothing added, and with the intellectual apprehension mostly absent. American painting seems, for the most part, to happen so self-consciously that the majority of these works compel the immediate and appropriate derivative source. Mondrian, Rouault, Braque, and so on. This is not always such a bad thing, especially when the artist conquers the influence and turns it decisively to his own personal ends. When this happens, as I believe it does, in Mark Tobey and Hyman Bloom, then we get painting which is vital and very convincing.

Uneven as these works are—and in parts this exhibition droops dolefully—yet I enjoyed it, and shall go again. There must be much which I overlooked and failed at first to appreciate. The show closes on the 12th February. R.S.

during 1956? Are there no readers of FREEDOM burdened with too much money who could give us a big hand to relieve us of some of our load?

★

THERE should have been a fifth item to our balance sheet. It was not included because the figures cannot be translated into money terms. But in whatever terms it can be expressed, it would have to be placed in the column of Losses. We refer to the considerable editorial difficulties experienced in producing FREEDOM each week due to the unpredictable collaboration of our writers. The "pay your way" journals pay their editors and contributors as well, and because of the power of money in our society, such journals can plan their features weeks ahead, and their editors know well in advance who will fill what. And the drawers full of unsolicited articles can always be ransacked if the regular contributors are suddenly taken ill or join the *Daily Mirror* staff. Indeed so well organised are these journals that their editors seem to spend most of their time visiting the politically hot spots of the world or taking part in Television and Radio Quiz programmes! Not so with FREEDOM, however!

During the past six years the problem of editing the paper has become increasingly difficult. Not only is the editorial group smaller in numbers than ever before but also the number of regular contributors outside the group is now almost non-existent. And the result is that more and more of the burden of

writing the paper falls on the shoulders of a smaller editorial group, which they somehow manage to do each week but at a price: in the quality of their own writing and the editing of the paper; by neglecting important correspondence or issues and situations which should be followed up by personal contact, etc.

No less serious is the fact that the editors are only human and cannot be expected to go on indefinitely accepting the nervous strain that such a situation (plus the financial worries) imposes, quite apart from the fact that it is physically and mentally impossible for some of us to go on writing three, four or more columns a week indefinitely (let those of our collaborators who "cannot find time" to write one column a week ask themselves for one moment to what extra work they put us when they fail to write their column; perhaps they have even forgotten that we too have to do a day's work before we settle down to a night's work on FREEDOM!)

There are no less than twenty able and intelligent writers who have been regular contributors to the columns of FREEDOM who at present are silent. The foregoing is a collective appeal to them to get in touch with us now and to pledge themselves to regular collaboration, every week, or fortnight or even once a month, but a regular contribution on which we can rely. Our journal will truly express the ideas and aspirations of freedom only when its columns echo the thoughts and feelings of as many as possible of those men and women dedicated to the cause of freedom!

THEATRE

DOWN TO THE SEA IN SCHOOLS

THE trouble with "Listen To The Wind" by Angela Ainley Jeans (Arts Theatre Club) is I think, that though it tries hard to strike out on a line of its own it does not quite manage to get away from the old pantomime tradition. For one thing it is too ambitious, and in the second act where there is even an attempt at a diminutive ballet the old pattern comes to the fore and I am afraid is a bit of a flop.

The story is of two rather wild children, poor relatives of a prim little Victorian girl called Emma who come to visit her at Xmas time. They all three get captured by gypsies and rescued by a canny Gale Bird who takes them to the kingdom of the Winds. Here they meet various elements among them Miranda the Sea Witch who lures two of them into the company of her special friend Black Thunder Cloud. He imprisons them and sets them to work making thunder noises. It turns out that Grannie, at first thought to be a dear old lady, had quite a position herself once in the Wind Kingdom and was known by the name of Lady Serena. She manages to bring little Emma safely back home while the Gale Bird gallantly scours the sky until he has sighted the other two children and returns them to the nursery too. After this there is a tremendous fight between East Wind and Black Thunder Cloud in which the latter is defeated.

The Victorian part of the story is quite charming, the tunes by Vivian Ellis though undistinguished are catching, there is an excellent number called "Who would be governed by a governess", which reminds me of an A. P. Herbert lyric, but it loses most of its effect by being repeated. What I fail to understand is why so many utilitarian modernisms are brought into the story, W.R.N.S., W.A.F.S. and all manner of air force and up-to-date slang. Pantomime tradition again I suppose. And then the Sea Witch Miranda! Here the temptation to bring something naughty and smart is too much for the author and Miss Karlin goes one better than the author's intentions I've no doubt. Miss Karlin is at her most risqué and gives us a very tired wreck of a mermaid still doggedly enticing all and sundry on to her old sea-bed! The

number is eminently suitable for revue but sadly misplaced in a Xmas play that tries to be better than pantomime. It is in bad taste.

Apart from the Gale Bird, crisply and raffishly put over by Roderick Cook, none of the wind people have much character. The shade of dear old Sir James Barrie is very much with us as well as some precocious modern wit. It is an unhappy mixture, I can imagine that in the intimacy of Oxford and for the benefit of fellow undergraduates this show was a wow. Here in the somewhat literary precincts of the Arts Theatre Club it becomes slightly pretentious and very much falls between two stools.

It is nicely acted by the company though some of them lack the zest which this sort of thing requires. Clive Revill on the other hand manages to make the small part of Pearson the butler uproariously funny. The children are all three more than adequate, but Richard Palmer who acts most capably as Jeremy, sings consistently and excruciatingly flat. His voice is on the verge of breaking, he is required to sing much too high and just can't make it. I could have done with less breezes and tides and more pithy dialogue in the nursery and in period! The evening has charming patches but cannot escape some longeurs. The scenery by Disley Jones is delightful.

D.

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 1

Deficit on Freedom	£20
Contributions received	£7
DEFICIT	£13

Dec. 31, 1955 to Jan. 5, 1956

London: Hyde Park Sympathiser 1/9; London: Moq 10/-; London: L.J.B. 1/3/0; Newport Pagnell: W.S. 1/3/0; Prestwich: V.M. 13/-; London: G.G. 3/-; London: H.M. 2/3; Rhymney: D.H.E. 4/-; London: L.C. 3/-; Huddersfield: A.L. 10/-; Salisbury: N.H. 10/-; Belfast: H.C. 13/-; Newcastle-on-Tyne: H.C. 5/-; Worthing: R.G.A. 3/-; Hook End: R.P. 5/-; Glasgow: S.M. 6/6; Hoddesdon: A.R. 8/9.

1956 TOTAL TO DATE £7 4 3

The French Elections

THE General Election which took place in France on January 2nd has given rise to many problems for the French politicians, and brings in its wake several new dangers threatening the French people.

When the old Assembly was dissolved it was thought that the right centre parties which had shared the government over the past four years were hoping for an "electoral coup d'état", to get rid of the radical faction in the Chamber and replace it by their own supporters. If this was the case it has boomeranged against them, for the net result of the elections is a shifting to the left. The features of this in terms of seats won and lost are a gain of 53 by the Communist Party, 34 elected "Radical Socialists", i.e. definite followers of Mendès-France, who have been standing as a separate list for the first time at this election, and the loss of 75 by the clerical M.R.P.

Despite this difference in the composition of the Chamber of Deputies, an examination of the actual voting figures shows that opinion throughout France, to the extent that it is reflected in electoral statistics has remained remarkably constant. Despite their resounding success in increasing their parliamentary representation, the percentage of Communist votes did not change significantly, and the same is true of the other parties which have maintained the same name and composition. In the other cases the same type of opinion is presented at each election with a different banner, and the voters switch their allegiance accordingly. To a certain extent this explains the unexpected success of the near-fascist Poujadist movement, when it is taken in conjunction with the defeat

of most of the remnants of the Gaullist movement, dispersed among the fragments into which that party had split.

Nevertheless, it is one of the accepted hazards of the parliamentary system that a minute change of proportion among electors in an evenly divided country will cause a much magnified displacement in the parliament, and the probable future of the French people for at least four years will unfortunately depend on the results of January 2nd. Since, as usual, none of the parties has a majority, the various leaders are engaged in speculations and negotiations to find out who is prepared to co-operate with who, in forming a government. The problems which the government will be faced with are the important one of North Africa, where the clash between the imperialist activities of French capitalism and the nationalist feelings of the people is growing more intense and violent each day, and the more isolated problem of subsidies for religious schools over which, nevertheless intense feeling rages.

The success of the two extremist groups indicates, that at the same time that a slide to the left is taking place, a polarisation of the political forces is occurring. The internal problems in France are coming to a new crisis, which during the past years has resulted on one side in strike actions for higher wages among the workers, and on the other hand the extra parliamentary activities of the shopkeepers refusing to pay their taxes. At the same time the violence in Algeria, and the demonstrations among potential recalled conscripts have shown that a compromising policy will produce an eternal state of tension, and forcing general opinion into either the right wing attitude calling for even

stronger repression, or into Communist anti-imperialism.

Despite their so-called parliamentary successes, both the Communists and the Poujadists have shown that they are prepared to use anti-democratic methods, when these appear appropriate. This is a further illustration of the anarchist view that democratic parliamentarianism is only a mask to lull people into thinking that they control society, and shows that it is not such a very deep deception after all. The interests of the petit-bourgeoisie will certainly be the subject of the speeches of the right wing deputies, but the threats to the French workers do not come from that quarter, but from the policy of physical terrorism which the fascists are prepared to use when the opportunity presents itself. The working class is still solidly communist. Its representation in parliament means nothing anyway, but the tragedy lies in the fact that the majority of the organised workers are prepared to expose themselves to all the dangers and hardships of industrial action in order to further, not their own interests, but those of the Communist Party and its Popular Front. As yet, the left centre parties have still the possibilities of muddling through with a succession of minority governments which will leave untouched the fundamental problems, and hang on to the parliamentary farce. It represents the more highly paid section of the workers, who support the Socialist Party, and the business interests who prefer the *status quo*.

Whether or not it can hold on to power, the future of the French workers depends on the extent to which they can become conscious of their own interests and take practical steps to defend them. P.H.

DISCUSSIONS

Anarchism and Gradualism

THERE has developed, over recent years, an attitude among anarchists, at least in this country, of distrust of the idea of a revolution in the generally accepted sense, and an embracing of the idea of gradual evolution towards the free society.

This has been expressed for a long time by those comrades who looked to the liberative influence of progressive education, and pinned their hopes on the next generation—if not the generation after that. Conforming with this general approach is that of the Reichians, who also dismiss as 'the lost generation' all those who have already grown up in years and have, inescapably under an authoritarian upbringing, grown like a shell a character armour to protect them from the discomfort of contact with any influence which might disturb their rigid personality.

Also in the same vein is the position adopted by the 'one-man revolutionists', who look to individuals to emancipate themselves from the ideas and values of capitalist, authoritarian society, to make for themselves an oasis of sanity in the lunatic desert of that society.

These three approaches have a lot in common, stressing as they do (and rightly) the need for social change to begin with the individual. But from that concept has sprung a development of the attitude which is, to my mind, less healthy. It is one of rejection of—even hostility towards—the belief in social forms of struggle and of organisation.

The development is logical enough. If you believe that the present generation is hopeless, because of the baneful effect of the last generation and its authoritarian influence, then it follows that anything attempted in this generation (i.e., in the field of social organisation for the free society), is doomed to failure because of the very nature of the human material available. Similarly the 'one-man revolution' approach implies a contracting-out of social struggle for much the same reasons, and the most that can be done is the individual protest or demonstration.

These trends of thought, as I have said, have developed over recent years in this country and also in America. There are, of course, environmental reasons for this. It is difficult to think of popular uprisings in these countries. The material progress that has been made; the intense industrialisation and the development of mass communication and entertainment; the relatively high standards of living of the masses of the people with, paradoxically, the debt that goes with it; the growth of the welfare state and education for specific levels and functions in our hierarchy; above all, the entrenchment of social democracy; these have all contributed to an acceptance of a comfortable mediocrity in all

things, including integrity, dignity and liberty.

Looking at and living in this environment, it is easy to forget that in many other parts of the world things are very different. That in many parts of Central and South America, Africa and Asia, and still in some European countries, even the crumbs of material progress have not yet been thrown. And can we honestly advocate that the peoples of these lands should follow in our footsteps, so that the arguments and attitudes we can apply here can apply to them also?

Most anarchists will agree that an anarchist society can be established firmly and permanently only on a worldwide basis. To be applicable all over the world then, our interpretation of anarchism must have relevance to the conditions, levels of development and appropriate means of struggle all over the world.

It seems to me to be quite useless to evolve an attitude to social progress, still more so to social revolution, which conforms to the conditions of western democracy but is completely inapplicable in the totalitarian régimes which straddle half the world and in colonial or other under-developed countries—under-developed, that is, both in terms of technological and political organisation and experience.

For anarchists to do this means, as I see it, a retreat from internationalism. It leads them into the trap which has already swallowed the socialist parties, all of which to some extent or another, have become so involved in national régimes as to have relevance only within those régimes. Socialist parties within democratic countries, tied as they all are to the parliamentary machinery, have a message and a use value strictly limited to the confines of that parliamentary democracy.

There is only one section of the world's socialists that in any way protrudes beyond that limitation and that is the Communist international. And they do so to the detriment of the world's peoples, for they transcend national frontiers only to serve the interests of one State or bloc of States. They offer an alternative tyranny, or myth, and in fact tend to divert such revolutionary ideas as may exist into reactionary channels. Inasmuch as the Communist Parties have relevance outside of national régimes they are harmful to the cause of social revolution—by whatever path it may be sought.

But all the other parties—say in this country—which call themselves socialist are quite meaningless as far as the people of, for example, Spain, are concerned. They have no message which can be applied there. Nor can they be in many of the countries I have already mentioned. It is true that the more watered-

down the socialism the better the chance of expression may be. But that simply means that the further away from anarchism the socialism gets the more relevance it may have—until you reach the perversions of socialism which are Bolshevism and Fascism, the dominant creeds in half the world.

Socialism, therefore, defeats its own ends by its own methods. And it is my contention that anarchism will do the same if we try to make our interpretation of it conform to the prevailing conditions in any one country. To pin our faith to free education, character analysis or the one-man revolution may appear reasonable in a liberal democracy like Britain (or even in an illiberal democracy like America), but if we take the world view—and as anarchists we can take no other—then we have to find out how to establish progressive schools in South Africa under the Bantu Education Act; how to set up Reichian clinics in Catholic Spain and what would be the fate of the one man in revolt in the Soviet Union? P.S.

(To be continued)

Spanish Students Condemn

Continued from p. 1

"Some intellectuals feel Government censorship is stifling Spain's cultural and artistic development. University students are said to be resentful of official policies that bar access to the work of masters, both national and foreign, representing intellectual currents that either are anti-clerical or conflict with totalitarian ideology.

Criticism seems to have become more outspoken since the death last October of José Ortega y Gasset, regarded by many as Spain's major twentieth century philosopher.

On Nov. 18, Gregorio Marañon, one of Spain's foremost intellectuals, delivered a speech at Madrid University commemorating Señor Ortega y Gasset.

Señor Marañon, a powerful influence in shaping liberal thought in the years preceding the civil war, has retired from politics. However, when he mentioned in his lecture that he was a liberal, hundreds of students gave him an ovation that lasted several minutes.

Señor Ortega y Gasset was a leading representative of a group of liberal intellectuals at the turn of the century. He was strongly anti-clerical and against any form of dictatorship.

For that reason, the Government was reported to have issued strict instructions to the press after his death limiting publication of comments on his works and personality.

Apparently, similar instructions have been issued on other occasions, such as that of the death last year of Eugenio d'Ors, Spain's leading art critic.

This discontent and critical attitude is not limited to University students. Ac-

CORDING to the *N.Y. Times* correspondent "younger Spaniards are increasingly voicing disappointment with present cultural, social and economic conditions" and it is not without significance that Franco, in his New Year's Eve message to the nation should have expressed his concert over unrest among Spanish youth.

DEAR COMRADES,
Surely Holley Cantine (FREEDOM 31/12/55) misses the main points in my disagreements with Ammon Hennacy. My objections in the main were first of all directed against any idea of creating martyrs in the Anarchist movement as such. That has nothing to do with whether people in the course of their lives die, for some reason, for those beliefs.

I do hope that if death is inevitable Anarchists will give up their lives unwillingly and will even temporarily forsake an idea in order to live it later on. This may appear as cowardice to some, but as I am interested in living for anarchy, and not dying for it, I have no conscience about my 'cowardice', and agree with Bernard Shaw when he said—"better a live coward than a dead hero". As life itself is far more basic to my existence than this or that ideology, I give life first preference.

Which leads me to my second objection, and that is that people act the way they do because acting in such a way is being themselves, and living any other way would be intolerable to them. Hence Hennacy, I think, might find great difficulty in living the life of a wealthy business executive, or settling down to an ordinary married existence. Whether these are the most desirable forms of living is not the point at the moment. It only suggests that people act and

THE WARSAW UPRISING

I HAVE to apologise to the readers of FREEDOM in general, and to Bernard Gelstein in particular, for airing my ignorance in my letter of 31st December.

This was in my reference to the Warsaw Ghetto uprising in which I said that I had not heard of a Warsaw uprising of 1942. Actually here I could hide behind Mr. Gelstein's own inaccuracy, for the Ghetto uprising was in fact in April-June 1943. There was no such event in 1942 so it was not surprising I had not heard of it.

However, the fact is that I had forgotten about the 1943 revolt (had never really known much about it to forget) and hastened on to the later rising of the whole city, which served my arguments much better anyway.

The reference to the uprising by Mr. Gelstein however, is important in that it does tell us that he sees the situation in Israel to-day as similar to that of the inhabitants of Warsaw's Ghetto in 1942. I think it is stretching the analogy too far, but even if it isn't then we are forced to ask: Isn't it about time that the Jews learned something about living in ghettos? If the analogy is just, Israel is in effect just another Ghetto and so it is not surprising if just the same problems arise, but on a larger scale. Living in ghettos has led to Jewish sacrifice through the centuries. Living in a State must apparently bring the same. P.S.
London.

espouse a cause on the basis of their own unconscious; in other words being, rightly or wrongly, themselves. This being so why parade actions as a virtue? Hennacy thinks that enjoying the good things of life is wrong. I do not. He sees nothing wrong in being an anarchist and rejecting man-made authority while at the same time accepting the authority of a deity and his earthly representatives.

Holding the point of view I do I can understand Hennacy's attitude but can only say, if you are being yourself comrade do not parade your actions as virtuous in the name of anarchism or any other ism. If one is lucky enough to be born an 'anarchist', and here I am equating anarchy with all that affirms life in its many and varied aspects (that excludes bomb throwers, masochists, fanatical evangelists black and red, or compulsive religionists to name but a few) one is indeed lucky. Otherwise the acceptance of an ideology as a way of life in adulthood is nothing but a 'wolf in sheep's clothing'. At best we can hope that some of the clothing embodies ideas that further and protect the needs of life, at worst, a greater negation of life itself. Society it appears demands of us reasons for our actions, hence a whole host of rationalisations for being ourselves; the heart rules but the head must justify, only because in this technological age the head commands more respect.

In conclusion I cannot help but remark upon Holley Cantine's observations when he says—"while they (the anarchists) do not go out of their way to seek martyrdom neither did they go out of their way to avoid it". Avoid what martyrdom? Cantine goes on—"and it seems to me that if the movement is to continue on a level of genuine seriousness this must still be the case". Since when does a man portray genuine seriousness if he is prepared to die? Is dying synonymous with seriousness? It may be serious only because a life may be wasted.

London.

S.F.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

LECTURE-DISCUSSIONS
Every Sunday at 7.30 at

THE MALATESTA CLUB
155 High Holborn, W.C.1.
(Near opposite Holborn Town Hall)

INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS
Every Thursday at 8.15.

OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting
HYDE PARK
Sundays at 3.30 p.m.
MANETTE STREET
(Charing X Road)
Saturdays at 5.30 p.m.

GLASGOW

INDOOR MEETINGS
Friday evenings at 7 p.m. commencing
Friday, October 14th at 200 Buchanan
Street.

LIBERTARIAN FORUM

813 BROADWAY,

(Bet. 11 & 12 Sts.)

NEW YORK CITY

Round-Table Youth Discussions

Friday Evenings at 8.30

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