

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"I tell you it is not wealth which our civilization has created, but riches, with its necessary companion poverty; for riches cannot exist without poverty, or in other words, slavery."

—WILLIAM MORRIS.

NASSER LASHES OUT

OIL & TROUBLED WATERS

LAST week we wrote, but did not publish the beginning of an article on recent developments in the Aswan Dam negotiations, as between the U.S.A., Egypt and the U.S.S.R. The article remained unfinished for various reasons: partly because of our inability to detect any coherent form to events, and also due to lack of confidence by the writer in his prophetic powers.

One had the feeling that something was going to happen, but could hardly put a finger on it. The fact that FREEDOM goes to press four or five days before actual publication tends to inhibit short-term prophecy, for fear of appearing stupidly wrong, and behind the times as well. However, on a point of interest this is what we wrote on Monday, 23rd July, just before Nasser proclaimed the nationalisation of the Suez Canal Company.

"President Nasser of Egypt, smiling and triumphant statesman, acknowledged leader of the Arab world, is perhaps only now beginning to discover just how narrow is the path of successful international diplomacy. His hour of triumph, sounded by the final and complete ejection of the British from Egyptian soil, has barely had time to be fully appreciated by his followers, when he is confronted by a dilemma of sufficient magnitude to cause even the most experienced statesman to writhe in agonised apprehension.

"The American withdrawal of its offer of financial assistance for the high dam at Aswan, followed by the

same action on the part of Britain, inevitably means that the World Bank's offer, which was conditional upon Anglo-American aid, will also be withdrawn. The total amount involved in this first four-year stage of the project was \$260 million.

"This has brought about the dilemma in which Nasser now finds himself. He is faced with two possible courses of action: to accept the Russian offer, reported to be \$400 million with 'no strings political or economic' attached; or to forget the whole scheme and try to extract Egypt from a very difficult situation without becoming too compromised with either East or West."

Nasser Nervous?

We must freely admit that Nasser has not revealed any noticeable signs of "agonised apprehension", but at the same time there is no question that his precipitate action must necessarily give him good reasons for considerable nervousness.

He has surely overstepped "the path of successful international diplomacy" in that his already strained relationships with the Western powers can now only be regarded as mere recognition of existence.

In short, he has made enemies of the U.S.A., Britain and France; even India, under the leadership of erstwhile Egyptian sympathiser Nehru, considers his action questionable, particularly since there may be unpleasant effects upon European shipments to India of the vast quantities of machinery and materials required for her second 5-Year Plan. Other

Asian nations are also dependent on the Suez Canal for supplies of Western capital goods, and are, no doubt, looking askance in Egypt's direction. The U.S.S.R., despite protestations of friendship and economic aid continues to be something of an enigma, and one cannot yet tell what her actions may be, though they could, as is often the case, be decisive.

What has Nasser gained on the other side of this particular balance sheet? He retains the enthusiastic support of all the other Arab states, except Iraq; but even this may prove comparatively short-lived.

A consensus of real Arab opinion would probably reveal varying degrees of sympathy with Nasser and defiance of the West, but tempered by a mixture of misgiving and doubt as to what will happen next; what retaliatory measures will be taken by the Western powers, and what will be their effect.

Possibly some of the less rabid anti-Western Arab nations will be

disappointed that the gradual easing of opinion in the Middle East, which might have improved their general situations, has now gone by the board. This of course can mainly be attributed to the Anglo-American refusal of aid for the Aswan Dam, rather than to Nasser's subsequent move, which will be regarded as justifiable. But memories are sometimes short in politics, and yesterday's hero can only too easily be turned into to-day's irresponsible adventurer.

Quibbling Diplomacy

Opinion in America is that Foster Dulles did the right thing at the right time in refusing financial aid to Egypt; it is felt that the Nasser's double-dealing methods were no longer tolerable, and that he should be taught a lesson. The official reason given for the eventual withdrawal of support was that Egypt did not represent a sufficiently sound investment, and this was echoed by Britain and the World Bank.

Needless to say the Arabs see the Western action as the culmination of several months of quibbling diplomacy, and the action itself as a high-handed, hypocritical piece of back-play from a position of strength, directed not only at Egypt but towards the Arab nations in general.

Plainly, Nasser took his decision to

take over the Suez Canal Company immediately the U.S.A. made her announcement. But it seems probable that he began to formulate his plan some time before that, when reports from his Ambassadors indicated that the chances of aid were diminishing. His speeches on the 24th and 26th July were eloquently anti-West, and made with a complete disregard of the possible political consequences of his words.

This is not surprising in view of the later events which have touched off the series of economic and political reprisals which he must know to be inevitable. Considering that it was not necessary for him to decide what should be done about financing the High Dam until early next year, and he might therefore have utilised the time for diplomatic discussion (with East or West), his reasons for deliberately aggravating the West ought to be very good. It could either be that he feels himself so strong that he can afford to ignore the consequences, or that the real Egyptian economic position is so weak that his only hope is to carry out a spectacular *tour de force*.

Western Reaction

Reaction from the three Western powers most concerned has so far been mostly vocal. But as yet it is very early days. The French Foreign Minister, M. Pineau, subjected the Egyptian Ambassador in Paris to a "strong protest", and has said that the French Government

Continued on p. 4

Victory for U.S. Steel Workers

THE Tory press in this country misses no opportunity to blame strikers for the poor state of the export trade. If British car manufacturers lost a market to a foreign competitor, it is invariably because the wicked dockers have been on strike and have shaken foreign buyers' confidence in Britain's ability to deliver the goods. Now, of course, it is the car workers who are sabotaging the national effort.

It is probably this attempt to blame strikers for Britain's problems which leads the newspapers to be much more reticent about strikes in other countries. In America, for instance.

The American economy is usually held up as an example of everything the capitalist way of life should be. The American workers' productivity; his identification with the prosperity of his firm; his mobility—these are virtues which our mentors in Fleet Street wish us to emulate.

But they say very little about the

massive strikes which not infrequently rock American industry—and usually result in a win for the workers.

For example, 650,000 U.S. steel workers have just completed a four-week strike which completely paralyzed nine-tenths of the industry and, of course, had repercussions through the whole economy. As far as we know, however, there have been no prophesies of disaster for the American economy because of it. Other countries, it seems, can have strikes without too much harm, but in Britain a few thousand workers have only to fold their arms for a few days for the whole country to be pushed to the brink of catastrophe. Or could it be a lot of ballyhoo?

The strike arose out of disagreement between the steel companies and the National Steel Workers' Union over the conditions of the new contract. The companies (they were all represented by the "big three"—U.S. Steel, Bethlehem, and Republic Steel), wanted a five-year con-

tract, offering many new benefits in exchange for a pledge not to strike. The union would not accept the long term contract; the employers would reduce the term only together with a reduction in benefits.

In the fourth week of the strike, during which over a million workers were idle, suggestions began to be made in certain Senatorial quarters that maybe the steel industry should be investigated to see just what its financial position really is and how its fabulous profits are made. The companies didn't seem to relish this idea very much and hastened to re-open talks with the union. And so concerned were they that the nation should not suffer the inconvenience of the strike any longer that they backed right down on the period of the contract to three years—which is what the unions had stuck out for all along.

The new agreement provides a three-year, no-strike contract calling for a total increase of 45.6 cents (about 3s. 3d.) an hour in wages and other benefits.

The contract provides for a "package" increase for the first year of the contract of 20.3 cents (about 1s. 5d.) an hour, 12.2 cents (about 10d.) in the second year, and 13.1 cents (about 11d.) in the final year. It will add \$1,332,000,000 (£475,700,000) to the industry's total labour costs.

The 650,000 steelworkers involved will receive a direct wage increase of 10.5 cents (about 8½d.) an hour the first year, 9.1 cents (about 7½d.) the second year, and a further 9.1 cents in the third year, a total of 28.7 cents (about 2s.) in wages. Their average hourly wage under the old contract was \$2.47 (17s. 8d.).

The contract also calls for a form of guaranteed annual wage, extra pay for Sunday work, improved holidays and holiday pay, and improved union shop, improved pensions and insurance, and other benefits. When the new contracts go into effect some time next week, the steel industry is expected to raise steel prices by £2 17s. to £3 10s. a ton.

So the U.S. steelworkers have won a resounding victory, with many of the benefits usually attributed to the welfare state. They have, however, sold themselves into bondage by their contractual pledge not to strike. One more similarity between America and Russia is hereby underlined. In Russia the workers are not allowed to strike (they don't want to, say the Commies), now the steelworkers of free America are equally bound by law not to strike (they won't want to, says the union).

It seems a little cock-eyed to use the power of the strike to win a contract not to strike! However—that's unionism.

Enforced Migration of 50,000 Africans

A REPORT from Northern Rhodesia, tucked away in the inside pages of last week's *Observer* (July 22nd), tells the unhappy tale of another enforced migration of the 'backward' peoples. Fifty thousand Africans from the valley between Kariba Gorge and Victoria Falls are being moved back to make way for a vast lake to be built behind the Kariba Dam for the purpose of supplying electric power to the whole of the Central African Federation.

Cyril Dunn, author of the article, writes that the Valley Tonga are among the most primitive in Southern Africa and have lived undisturbed in this part of Africa since the days of the Norman Conquest. They are almost wholly pagan, there having been no missionary penetration of the valley.

To these people have come the bewildering bulldozing tactics of 20th century progress which, gradually applied, would undoubtedly bring benefits, if this is what the people want. A gradual change however, while it may be humanistic, would be too costly in terms of money.

Dunn visited the villages of Chief Simamba, the first of the Chiefs to be moved on the Northern side of the Zambezi, and although he got the impression that in the British protectorate "white officials actually at work in the valley are doing what they can to take the edge off the hardship for the uprooted Tonga," it would seem, that apart from the disintegrating effects on tribal life, material conditions are being made difficult. It is believed that the coffer dam now being built at Kariba will have damaging effects on the riverside villages at the next rains. Further, the land to which they are being moved may be "potentially better" but there is no water, and the women are already having to walk six miles to find it.

Valley officials have made recommendation for compensation which are so "generous by local standards that their purpose seems placatory". The people

however are already on the move, but so far compensation decisions have not reached them. The building of new huts therefore cannot be carried out.

This sudden uprooting by force of a people who are not particularly interested in the civilising benefits of electric power has little justification, and shows up the hypocrisy of the British Government—so horrified when similar measures were being carried out in the Soviet Union in the name of progress and industrialisation.

Although the Africans are not being starved or tortured as a deliberate policy, the principle of enforced migration is just as immoral whether carried out in the name of progress à la British style or Soviet.

The following report from Cyril Dunn sums up white official contempt for folk whom they regard as inferior:

"Although a vast amount of work has been done on an agricultural survey, this, too, is far from complete and could produce findings likely to change the whole character of the migration. Large tracts of the country into which the people are moving are covered by mopani bush, and the soil here is worthless. Other areas are infested by tsetse fly and attempts to eradicate them are still in the early stages.

There is some heartache here among friends and relations on opposite sides of the river now to be pushed apart by the lake. The comfortable official assumption that there is no social connection between the two riversides is not supported by what the Valley Tonga themselves say. Some want to change sides, but as the two Governments seem to be planning quite separately transfers are not provided for.

Officials here say they are satisfied that in a few years' time the Valley Tonga will be much better off than they were before the migration, provided that agitators do not get among them and induce them to withhold their co-operation. Since few of them can have any clear idea of the reasons for this upheaval it is obvious to anyone who goes into the Valley that the utmost consideration for their welfare is essential from the start."

Car Workers Call for Support

THE alliance of unions running the British Motor Corporation has called for support from the workers in other industries. Dockers are now refusing to handle BMC products, the railwaymen likewise, and attempts are being made to get the miners to cut off supplies of coal which are going into the factory by lorry during the night.

This shows the tremendous support which can be whipped up in an official dispute, where the resources of the trade unions can be called upon. Money is also coming in, with £500 from the Scottish miners and £100 from the printing workers.

During the first week of the strike, scenes outside the BMC factories at times resembled a battlefield. Strikers fought with non-strikers, they lay down in the road to prevent lorries entering or leaving, mounted police reinforced foot police to prevent pickets from interfering with blacklegs going in to work.

The second week of the strike was much quieter, since the BMC was due to close down its factories for the annual holiday anyway! It would not appear to be very brilliant timing to have called a strike one week before the beginning of the workers' annual fortnight's holiday!

The blacklegs are now well out of the way, enjoying themselves on some sunny beaches, those of the strikers who can afford it have gone on holiday also, and those who cannot are either moping at home or providing the pickets outside empty factories!

It is a tragedy that the courage and determination of the motor car workers should be so misused by the union leaders. The strikers are putting up a magnificent struggle in the attempt to whittle down the management's powers of arbitrary hire-and-fire, and are deserving of every support.

The trouble is that when the strike is won—the leaders will claim the credit. Whereas, as we said last week, victory will come in this strike only through the power of the direct action of the workers—in spite of the mishandling of the whole thing by their leaders.

If those workers learned this lesson they would then begin to mobilise their strength to defend themselves all the time and not only when officials so decided. And then begin to think in terms of going over to the offensive, to challenge the bosses' ownership of industry altogether.

PEOPLE AND IDEAS HISTORY & IMPROVISATION

"But is there such a clue? Is there a meaning in history?"

"I do not wish to enter here into the problem of the meaning of 'meaning': I take it for granted that most people know with sufficient clarity what they mean when they speak of the 'meaning of history' or of the 'meaning of life'. And in this sense, in the sense in which the question of the meaning of history is asked, I answer: History has no meaning . . ."

"There is no history of mankind, there is only an indefinite number of histories of all kinds of aspects of human life. And one of these is the history of political power. This is elevated into the history of the world. But this, I hold, is an offence against every decent conception of mankind. It is hardly better than to treat the history of embezzlement or of robbery or of poisoning as the history of mankind."

—KARL POPPER: "The Open Society & Its Enemies", Vol. 2.

★

THE theme of all the lectures at the anarchist Summer School which opens to-day is the question 'Is history on our side?'. I don't know whether it will be interpreted as meaning 'Is human history inevitably moving in the direction which we advocate?' or 'Does the evidence of past history support our contentions?' But I hope that the answer in either case will be that the question is meaningless.

It is surely rather late in the life of mankind to invoke the doctrine of historical inevitability, whether it be the idea of inevitable progress or of inevitable disaster. The doctrine of inevitable progress is silly on the face of it in view of the experiences of our own lifetime. But it is also dangerous doctrine. Dangerous because it absolves us from responsibility—if progress be inevitable, relax and enjoy it—only we wake up in a mess. Dangerous because it leads to the sacrifice of human beings to theories and abstractions, for whoever is too

stupid or pig-headed to recognise what is inevitable becomes not merely foolish but wicked and 'reactionary', and must be forced (by those who are the self-appointed instruments of progress) to bow to its inexorable demands. If progress is the goal, asked Herzen,

"for whom then are we working? . . . Do you really wish to condemn human beings alive to-day to the mere sad rôle of caryatids supporting a floor for others one day to dance upon? Or wretched galley slaves who, up to their knees in mud, drag a barge with the humble words 'Future Progress' on its flag? A goal which is infinitely remote is not a goal at all, it is a deception."

Has anything that has happened in the hundred years since Herzen wrote impaired the validity of his protest? Commenting last month on the sufferings imposed on the Russian people by the standard-bearers of inevitable progress, Ignazio Silone said,

"Nothing irritates me so much as the invocation of historical necessity in order to forgive everything afterwards. I do not believe in Fate, and still less in the fatalism of terror. I do not believe that there are situations with only one way out. I do not believe in the sanctity of *faits accomplis*. If I admit that in certain circumstances terror is indispensable to the politics of tyranny, I deny that it is indispensable to its victims."

The doctrine of inevitable disaster, comforting though it may be in its apocalyptic way to those who think they have nothing to live for, is also dangerous. It consists, as Orwell wrote, in predicting a continuation of the thing that is happening:

"Now the tendency to do this is not simply a bad habit. It is a major mental disease, and its roots lie partly in cowardice and partly in the worship of power, which is not fully separable from cowardice."

Anarchists, more than most people, because of the supreme importance which they attach to the idea of freedom, should steer clear of the blind alleys of determinism, which reduces men to puppets in the hands of some vague omnipotent deity known as history. Some look to history, Isaiah Berlin remarks "for salvation; others for justice; for vengeance; for annihilation . . . It is one of the great *alibis*, pleaded by those who cannot and do not wish to face the facts

of human responsibility, the existence of a limited but nevertheless real area of human freedom . . ." And at the end of his essay on *Historical Inevitability*, Mr. Berlin quotes a remark of Judge Brandeis which provides the answer to those who think that all we can do is to squat like petrified rabbits before the irresistible march of history. *The irresistible*, he said, *is often only that which is not resisted.*

★

THE other day I was looking at a child's drawing of the Tower of Babel under which he had written 'The People built a Tower, but they all spoke different Languages'. This is the trouble about trying to draw conclusions from the edifice of history. It is vain to look to 'history' for confirmation of our beliefs, for history confirms everything. History is merely a catalogue of everything that ever happened, with most of the pages torn out or unwritten. If the history of human society teaches us anything it is simply that men have found ways of staying alive and have been able to get some sort of happiness out of life under every conceivable social dispensation. This vegetable tenacity and adaptability may give cold comfort to those who look to history for all the right answers, but it is the one thing that is responsible for our being here at all.

But if history speaks to us "in divers tongues whereof they knew not the meaning", it does not mean that we cannot seek conclusions from individual aspects, in time and space, of human experience and aspiration. We can look for the lessons of the Spanish Revolution, or of the Peckham Experiment, or of the Co-operative Movement. We can also seek to comprehend different aspects of human life, in the way that Lewis Mumford does in his *Culture of Cities* or his *Technics and Civilisation*, or Edward Hyams does in his *Soil and Civilisation*. But all that these interpreters are after is a yardstick, a means of evaluation, a way of looking, not a system or a law of history. Kropotkin described his concept of Mutual Aid as 'A Factor of Evolution'. He was too wise to regard it as evolution itself. In

the same way the various interpretations of aspects of human history, are factors. The whole cannot be interpreted, or rather, it can be, but the interpretation is worthless since it consists in selecting, re-arranging and altering the factors to fit a preconceived thesis.

What would be called 'Natural Law', wrote Kropotkin,

"is nothing but a certain relation among phenomena which we dimly see, and each 'law' takes a temporary character of causality; that is to say: If such a phenomenon is produced under such conditions, such another phenomenon will follow. No law placed outside the phenomena: each phenomenon governs that which follows it—not law."

The key to the anarchist's way of looking at the evolution of social phenomena is in another famous sentence of Kropotkin's: "All faced one another: the Roman tradition and the popular tradition; the imperialist tradition and the

federalist tradition; the authoritarian and the libertarian". Dominion and free association, the state and society, the political principle and the social principle, which flourish in inverse relation to each other—here is a valid and valuable generalisation which if we grasp its implications, helps us to assess the social institutions of our own time and to clarify our attitude to them.

One of these two tendencies is the basis of every form of authoritarian state and social and industrial organisation. The other finds its ultimate expression, for us, in anarchism. History gives no guarantees to either of them. Their relative strength in our own society depends on our own continual choice on the direction in which we add our own weight. Every generation makes its own history. But those who are indifferent or resigned do not make history: they suffer it. C.W.

SOVIET BUMBLEDOM

STATISM inevitably means bureaucracy. The greater the power of the State over the men and women it calls its citizens the more crushing will be the stranglehold of that State's bureaucracy upon the common man. It follows, therefore, that bureaucracy is nowhere so powerful as in the Soviet Empire.

FREEDOM's eyes being everywhere we are able to provide information that might be of interest even to Pollitt's followers—if they took any real interest in the fate of the Russian working class.

And now to facts. In Gzhatsk (White Russia) recently it was decided to sink a well: cost 620 roubles. The town executive had the hard cash in hand. Some skilled navvies on the job, you'd think, was all that we needed. But, No! Permission had to be obtained from the Smolensk authorities. They haven't started sinking that well yet.

Calling themselves the Regional Department of Communal Economy, the said authorities must accumulate literally tons of documents of this kind; and they love it. The more paper-work there is the more they feel their existence is justified as they stifle all initiative, every independent effort.

In Velizh two heavy sledges and two four-wheeled carts were badly needed for the transport of night-soil. (There are

only dry closets there). Needless to say, Velizh is rather smelly to-day. Once again requests had to be sought from Smolensk for the building of this simple transport.

In Krasinsk township the roof of a two-flat house sprang a leak. Two layers of roofing material were required; but, first, permits had to be got from the Smolensk officials.

In Dukhovschina some 20 square yards of glass and 16 lbs. of putty were urgently needed to make the public baths weather-tight. Smolensk had to be begged to grant permission to put the work in hand. And so it goes on endlessly, aimlessly, frustratingly.

In the small towns of the Smolensk area there are 166 plants run as municipal concerns; also 71 shops providing various services such as barbering facilities and so on. Some of them are so small as to employ from three to five persons only. Yet in respect of all these local undertakings the people on the spot can do nothing without the knowledge and permission of the Smolensk RDCE. Can you wonder, then, that last year 40,000 sheets of paper (foolscap, we take it) were piled up or filed away, all dealing with a multitude of plans, projects, requests, permissions asked for, granted, or refused, plus quantities of correspondence relating thereto? The RDCE itself used up 324 kilograms of paper in just making copies of all this needless rubbish.

★

MR. HORIKOV, Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs and Communal Economy of the RSFSR has admitted that without the cognisance of his Ministry not a single barber's shop may be opened anywhere from the Baltic to the Urals. What power! Nor may a single additional slipper bath be acquired for any existing public baths without proper permission. His Ministry likewise grants the only genuine, correctly authorized permission for effecting the transfer of any workman or official from one municipal undertaking to another—although *The Daily Worker* tells the English "proletariat" that B. and K. has abolished the direction of labour in Russia.

That this is what is happening all the time under the new Dictator as under Stalin is shown by the case of the small town of Dmitrovsk-Orlovsk. Its public baths added ten new slipper baths. Just like that: off its own bat. The Ministry was furious when it got to know. So the equivalent of the borough surveyor's office had to re-issue its previous year's report to the all-powerful Ministry with its previous year's report to the all-powerful Ministry with this addendum: "The alteration effected in the output norms of this baths was augmented by ten places consequent on the extension of the dressing cubicles." This meaningless piece of illiteracy must, we suppose, have covered the situation to the satisfaction of the Ministry and the file was closed.

This same Ministry demands that it have sent in to its offices regular returns setting forth the cost to the country of each bath taken in a public baths, the exact details relative to the "rate of exploitation per room" in all municipally run hotels. In the case of the cost per hot bath the form to be filled in has ten items involving the writing of not less than one hundred figures!

Under the palsied hand of the bureaucrat, housing suffers in the same way. Titanic efforts are needed locally to cope with the avalanche of paper-work demanded by the Ministry just on housing provided by town soviets. There are 48 forms running to a total of 80 printed pages which deal exclusively with the expansion of the housing drive. Smolensk as the centre is expected to look after fourteen towns big and small in this respect and to fill in these forms properly must work through some 100,000 items with figures to match.

S. A. JOSEPHS.

Continued on p. 3

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 . . .

I am a Mathematician
Norbert Wiener 21/-
Arthur Koestler J. Atkins 16/-
Reprints . . .
Mornings in Mexico and Etruscan Places D. H. Lawrence 10/6
Sea and Sardinia D. H. Lawrence 10/6
Twilight in Italy D. H. Lawrence 10/6
Memoirs of a Sword-Swallower D. Mannix 2/6

Second-Hand . . .

The Trail of the Dinosaur Arthur Koestler 6/-
The Shaping of Psychiatry by War J. R. Rees 5/-
The Secret Road Jon Kimche 4/-
Dilemma in Japan (1945) Andrew Roth 2/6
Above the Battle Romain Rolland 2/6
Rose and Sylvie Ethel Mannin 5/6
General from the Jungle B. Traven 3/6
City Development Lewis Mumford 2/6
Instead of a Sonnet Paul Potts 3/-
Hollywood Cemetery Liam O'Flaherty 5/6
A Coat of Many Colours Herbert Read 3/6
Retreat from Glory R. H. Bruce Lockhart 3/-
The New Town Mervyn Jones 6/6
Franco's Rule: A Survey 3/-
Armies and the Art of Revolution K. C. Charley 5/-
Co-operation Among Animals W. C. Allee 7/6
In the Year of Jubilee George Gissing 3/-
End as a Man Calder Willingham 4/-
By What Authority? Hugh J. Schonfield 3/-
Interview with India John Frederick Muehl 4/-
Military and Political Consequences of Atomic Energy 3/-

Periodicals . . .

Views and Comments
No. 15, July 3d.
Postage free on all items.

Obtainable from

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

BOOK REVIEW

The Philosophy of the West

"SENSISM: THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE WEST" by Charles Smith. (The Truth Seeker Company, New York. Two Volumes, pp. lvi + xviii + 1612. Price \$10).

CHARLES SMITH the New York lawyer, amateur philosopher, and veteran editor of the American atheist magazine *Truth Seeker*, was commissioned in 1928 to write a book on morals. His preliminary enquiries into the various branches of ethics soon convinced him that he would not be qualified to carry-out this task until he understood the nature of knowing and being, and of man's place in the universe—so reversing the usual order of the objects of study he devoted the next twenty-seven years to investigating the nature of knowledge, existence, and morals. The results of his investigations have just been published in two volumes under the general title of *Sensism: The Philosophy of the West*, a mammoth work that professes to present a new world view appropriate to the atomic age. The originally proposed book on morals has grown into a complete philosophical system comparable in scope to the all-embracing systems of Kant and Spinoza, and ranges from philosophy, psychology, politics, morals, and ethics to science, logic, mathematics, religion, economics, syntactics, and analogic. *Sensism*, etc. is not an easy book to read or understand; each paragraph needs careful study and examination. The reader is continually held back by the strange word-patterns, the awkward style, and the obscure nomenclature employed by the author. Every other sentence contains some word the exact meaning of which can only be elucidated by reference to the copious glossary. It is a book that demands much hard work and prolonged concentration from the reader—but a book that offers ample compensation to those prepared to make the effort.

The basis of Smith's system is mechanical materialism which necessitates rigid determinism (the exposition of the determinist position is the best I have ever encountered) and the complete rejection of all philosophies that teach that the agent is—or ever can be—directly aware of his own soul, self, mind,

thoughts or ideas. No such knowledge exists, says Smith; people are aware and have feeling and that is all—the agent can never be aware of his awareness and can never feel his feeling. From this basic proposition Smith deduces his prime axiom, the first principle by which his philosophy succeeds or fails namely, that the object of awareness is always without and that everything in the mind therefore, came in some form through the senses.

Contrary to the teaching of Descartes the truth is not to be discovered by turning inwards, but by looking outwards—the correct starting-point for philosophy is *Objectivism*. The most real and most surely known world is the world known through the senses—the physical world—of which the mind is a physical projection. Failure to grasp this fundamental truth, thinks Smith, is the cause of much of the confusion in contemporary philosophy. From *Objectivism* the next step is *Particularism*, the doctrine that, contrary to the teaching of Plato, only physical particulars exist independently of being perceived, i.e. there are no universals or absolutes. Values, etc. depend for their existence on the valuer, and have no existence apart from him.

The author next proceeds to outline his theories of *Samism* and *Trialism*. *Samism* is the doctrine that the same thing may be named or classified by different relations without its nature being changed, and *Trialism* that the physical, mental, and spiritual are the same things classified by different relations. An example of *Samism-Trialism* is 'noise'. The vibrations are physical; the sound is mental; and the name is spiritual. All three are the same thing classified by different relations none of which alter its nature.

This three-fold classification Smith also applies to truth which, he says, may be lower, middle, or higher. Lower truth is physical and is correspondence of a statement of an independent relation with the relation, e.g. "Heat expands iron". Middle truth is mental and is honesty of report of a mental dependent relation. The speaker is the only possible authority for only he knows of what he is aware, e.g. "I saw a tiger". Higher truth is spiritual and is consistency of statement or coherence of associations, e.g. "The whole is greater than

the parts." Middle and higher truths are truths only figuratively, and should not really be called truths at all. Real truth is lower truth which is correspondence. Lower truth is not concerned with logic which is dependent on verbal consistency and is therefore a higher truth like mathematics and other closed systems. Middle and higher truths which are always certain are subordinate to lower truth which is never certain. Certainty of lower truth is not possible nor necessary. Overwhelming probability is a sufficient reason and guide for action, e.g. that the sun will rise to-morrow morning.

If this three-fold classification is accepted its importance is enormous. Applying it to ethics it is easily seen that the majority of moral judgments ("I think murder is wicked", and "pre-marital intercourse is wrong", etc.) are actually middle or higher truths (or falsehoods), and as such either subjective or tautologous. There can be no test of any kind for good and evil, and no test of right or wrong other than accepted authority. The test of consistency being agreement moral rules are prescriptions of behaviour promoting public welfare. When this is understood, and agreement is reached on what constitutes public welfare, there is a test, and morality becomes moralology, a branch of physics.

In a short article on a long book there is much that must be omitted. Lack of space has forced me to confine my review of *Sensism*, etc. to a brief examination of the main points of the philosophy expounded therein, but mention must be made of the excellent chapters on psychology, language, religion, and metaphysics which all contribute towards making Charles Smith's new book the most interesting, original, and thought-provoking, that I have read in recent years. The only blemish lies in the author's style which is awkward and for the most part dull and this, applied to his obscure vocabulary and love of repetition, makes prolonged reading difficult and tiring. The book has a copious and detailed glossary and index, and is printed on fine gloss paper and beautifully bound which makes it a pleasure to handle. I recommend it to every reader with a genuine interest in, and love of, the problems of philosophy.

Three Comments on Man's Inhumanity to Man

I

IT has taken seven years to lay a 125 mile-long gas main into Suffolk which will bring gas to some 93,000 new consumers. The laying of the gas pipe might well be the occasion for a little celebration in which those who have participated in the work are made to feel that it is a job well-done, and one that will earn the thanks of householders, isolated farmers and others who will now enjoy the benefits of piped gas for the first time.

According to a *News Chronicle* reporter this is how the occasion was in fact marked:

Sitting under a hedge and smoking hand-rolled cigarettes, 22 workmen yesterday celebrated the laying of 125 miles of gas piping. It had been a seven-year job.

Less than 20 yards away some 60 lounge-suited Eastern Gas Board officials, and guests, were in a flower-decked marquee, also celebrating the end of the job: with Martini, gin and French, sherry, stuffed olives, chicken, and cocktail savouries.

Mr. David Renton, Q.C., M.P., Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Fuel and Power, was there to tighten the last 12 nuts, which joined the pipes and completed the scheme.

But first the workmen lowered the pipes by crane, turned the 12 nuts, finger tight, and moved discreetly back to the obscurity of the hedge.

Then Mr. Renton donned a pair of yellow gauntlet gloves with black stripes, took a shining new spanner and tightened the nuts, to the applause of the officials and the clicking of cameras.

As the officials and guests returned to their marquee celebration, someone remembered the men under the hedge, and sent over a case of 24 bottles of light ale.

Finally, the workmen checked the tightness of the nuts, and 24 of the officials and guests went to an Ipswich hotel for lunch: prawn cocktail, cream of asparagus soup, roast saddle of lamb, mint sauce, red currant jelly, green peas, new potatoes, cream gateaux, cheese, coffee and more drinks.

Asked how much it cost to tighten those last 12 nuts an official of the Gas Board said: "We just don't know until the bill comes in—but what's a little celebration after a £500,000 job?"

In the last words of that reply we have the key to the attitude of officials (irrespective of whether they belong to private enterprise or nationalised industries—and gas is nationalised). They were celebrating a half-million pound job, not the climax of a human undertaking in which a small group of workers had dug a trench 125 miles long through fields and under roads; who had overcome all kinds of obstacles, had possibly to contend with water and certainly with the elements. And in the trench they had laid and jointed successfully thousands of lengths of iron pipes which are now buried from sight and will remain in service for years to come, for perhaps generations to come.

But this was not an achievement to be celebrated. Seven years hard work is less important than the act of some high official in putting his signature to a document authorising the spending of £500,000 on such a scheme. And though in these seven years governments and government officials have come and gone, there are always officials in office to take the credit when the job is completed and the time comes for celebrations. And the tightening of the last nuts needs to be done by a gloved, lily-

Concentration Camps for Americans

ACCORDING to the McCarran Emergency Detention Act of 1950, in the event of invasion, declaration of war or insurrection,

"the President is authorized to make public proclamation of the existence of an 'Internal Security Emergency' . . . Whenever there shall be in existence such an emergency, the President, acting through the Attorney General, is hereby authorized to apprehend and by order detain . . . each person as to whom there is reasonable ground to believe that such person probably will engage in, or probably will conspire with others to engage in, acts of espionage or of sabotage."

Neither this Act nor any other that I have been able to find actually appropriates money for and authorises the construction of concentration camps for the detention of the above described unfortunate. However,

"During the year this Bureau established five new minimum-custody prison camps—at Florence and Wickenburg, Arizona; Tule Lake, California; Avon Park, Florida; and Allenwood, Pennsylvania. The immediate reason for opening these camps was to provide additional space which might be required under the provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1950 in the event of the invasion of the United States or its possessions, declarations of war, or insurrection within the United States in aid of a foreign enemy. "To meet our responsibilities under the act, abandoned Government installations were taken over and small camp units established to place them in repair and prevent deterioration. Prisoners considered trustworthy and whose places of residence were in the general areas of the camps were transferred to them from the other institutions. The population of the camps will be maintained by transfers and also by direct commitments of prisoners under short sentences. The prisoners will work on the repair and maintenance of buildings

white Ministerial hand, to symbolise that this is yet another of the achievements of government.

However, we cannot help feeling that we are not so far from the day when real values will emerge from the fog of make-believe generated by governments and officialdom. Certainly the *News Chronicle's* report makes its point quite clear to anyone who can read and who retains a little human feeling. And perhaps the policy-makers of the Labour Party who believe that equality and the classless society will come about through taxation, might consider the implications of this little story of the nationalised Gas Board's Suffolk celebrations!

II

A REUTER report from Algiers (July 16) states that:

French troops killed 25 people, including a doctor, when they discovered a rebel hospital and rest-house in the mountains less than sixty miles south of here, French authorities announced to-day. Three women medical students were among over a thousand suspects detained.

We have so often been told that a "rule" of war is that one respects hospitals and succours the wounded even if they are on the "enemy's" side. Are these rules only extended to the enemy when the "state of war" is official, and not when one is fighting "rebels" (even if to do so one disposes of an army of 300,000 men and all the latest weapons of destruction)? The French authorities are doing no more than the British did in Kenya at the height of the fighting. But just as there was no protest then one doubts whether anyone will now raise his voice against violation of the "rules of war". What has happened to all the gallant and honourable gentlemen who denounced German atrocities against unprotected hospitals?

III

A Reuter report from Freetown (Sierra Leone) states that:

Three Africans were sentenced to death by the Supreme Court here yesterday for murdering an eighteen-month-old child in October to provide ingredients for a "medicine". One of the accused was described as the leader of a cannibal society.

One applauds those who seek to end such customs but is there not something equally barbarous in a civilisation which has only the hangman's rope to offer as a cure for cannibalism?

and also to a limited extent on agricultural projects."

(FEDERAL PRISONS 1952, a Report of the Work of the Federal Bureau of Prisons; U.S. Department of Justice, James P. McGranary, Attorney General; Bureau of Prisons, James V. Bennett, Director).

"The provisions of the McCarran Bill are not merely ineffective and unworkable. They represent a clear and present danger," President Truman's Veto Message. Despite Truman's public opposition to the Act, somebody authorized his Department of Justice to proceed with construction of camps which might be required under the provisions of the Act. Somebody informed James V. Bennett of his responsibilities under the Act that were not defined in the Act itself.

The *New York Times* of December 27, 1955, lists six camps in an article under the title "U.S. Keeps Detention Camps Ready". The Federal Bureau of Prisons Report for 1954 lists nine prison camps. The *Times* list includes one not mentioned in the Bureau list, giving a total of ten concentration camps publicly admitted to exist. The total list includes: Allenwood, Pa.; Avon Park, Fla.; Florence, Ariz.; McNeil Island, Wash.; Mill Point, W. Va.; Montgomery, Ala.; Tucson, Ariz.; Tule Lake, Cal.; Wickenburg, Ariz.; El Reno, Okla.

"It is unfortunate that the term 'concentration camps' has been used in connection with these facilities." Letter from James V. Bennett (Director of Bureau of Prisons).

The *New York Times* is generally assumed to be the least irresponsible of the big capitalist papers. I was shocked by the *Times's* unfrilled complacency in reporting, on September 23, 1950, the repassage, over the Presidential Veto, of the McCarran Act. It was quite unaware that the Act destroyed at one blow the centuries-old Anglo-Saxon concepts of justice. Without conceding that "punishment" is a socially desirable concept, I should like to point out that under all previous Anglo-Saxon law you could be

punished, not for being a specified classification of person (subversive, thief, etc.), but only for doing a specific act at a specific time and place (stealing a particular mink coat from a particular shop at a specified hour on a specified day).

The semantic absurdity of the new anti-legal concepts is clarified by assuming that burglary, say, operated like an administrative ukase against subversion. The cop would no longer have to catch you on the premises or with the stolen goods. He could merely get a statement from an unseen and unidentified person (maybe your mother-in-law, maybe a lunatic, an imbecile or a junkie), to the effect that you had been seen in the company of a person or persons suspected of being burglars (not of having committed any burglaries). You are then a burglar under the provisions of law.

It is illogical enough to shift the burden of proof so that the accuser no longer is required to prove that the accused did something, but the accused must prove he did not do something. It is actually logically impossible to prove that you did not do something. I can prove that I do play pinochle, for example, simply by playing a game. But it is altogether impossible to prove that I never played pinochle at any time in the past. Even if I don't know how to play the game, I could be lying; even if a flock of my friends and relatives swear under oath that I have never been a pinochle player, they could be lying. After all, pinochle players are notorious liars. I am caught in a logical trap.

The semantic nightmare goes off the deep end into sheer mania when you can be incarcerated for what some unknown person thinks you might do at some unspecified time in the future. If you can't even prove that you never played pinochle in the past, it is altogether impossible to prove that you might never do anything at all, even say, commit murder in the future. Not you nor Congressman Walter nor Bernard Baruch nor anyone else can prove that under unforeseeable circumstances and pressures

Is War Less Likely Now?

AS improvements are made in new war weapons the arguments which were used to justify the development of atomic weapons and the H-Bomb, become more powerful in the hands of politicians. Prevention of war through armed strength because of fear of reprisal which would result in both sides being annihilated is a familiar argument used again last week by Anthony Eden opening a two-day debate in the House of Commons.

"Eden says that everyone has been longing to hear (is this why he said it?)" headlined the *News Chronicle* commenting on Eden's statement, that he had "a growing conviction that a European war is not likely" because both sides accepted that nuclear weapons would destroy the human race, yet they would certainly be used if war occurred. The Soviet leaders accepted this fact and coupled with the new situation behind the Iron Curtain the possibility of war had receded.

It may be that fear of reprisal on both sides may act as an effective deterrent to large-scale war until such a time as science has means of combating H-bomb affects, but the fear that permeates the whole of society as a result of H-bomb diplomacy (apart from the positive ill-effects of radiation due to H-bomb tests) is breeding a fear-ridden population who will accept complacently any arguments and grasp any straw put forward by the leaders of the respective countries as a means of "preventing" war.

If Anthony Eden and his equivalents in the Kremlin and Pentagon "outlawed" war by campaigning against the production of war weapons entirely we would feel a little more convinced that war as a means of solving conflicts was no longer considered tenable, but the mad rush for 'improvements' in the development of modern weapons leaves us unconvinced that millions of pounds and man hours are being wasted merely for preventive purposes. The threat from Eden that "they would certainly be used if war occurred" may mean that whatever the consequences nuclear weapons

would be used or it may only be a statement designed to fill the Kremlin with fear, but whichever argument is applicable neither is acceptable in terms of human happiness and development of the "friendly" relations we hear so much about from the lips of cliché-ridden politicians.

An Atomic Pearl Harbour?

An article in *Time* (July 30th) discussed the basis of to-day's military and political considerations—the chance of an "atomic Pearl Harbour". Surprisingly little thought, says *Time*, has been given to an "epochal event in weaponry that will most certainly confront the world in four to six years: A standoff between the U.S. and the Soviet Union in intercontinental ballistic missiles."

It is argued that the Soviet leaders might still bet their lives on the possibility that a surprise hydrogen attack could wipe out effective U.S. retaliatory powers before U.S. planes could leave the ground. Congress was recently warned by the Strategic Air Command's General Curtis LeMay that it would be a desperate gamble but "that it might conceivably pay off". With its own ICBM though, however hard hit, the U.S. could still strike back with "equal ferocity". "Under such circumstances full scale aggression could not be considered by the rational mind" (*Time*).

The arguments used here are the same only we are now dealing in even more refined weapons of destruction and as we progress beyond the intercontinental ballistic missiles 1984 will be here completely. The rational mind already boggles at the lunacy permeating the seats of power throughout the world.

A breath of "sanity" however, comes from some of the U.S. military leaders who put forward a view that we ourselves suggested would be adopted to safeguard the continuation of war as a means of solving the economic problems of capitalism without the fear of total annihilation. They argue, that military and international relationship must change, and wars would then "be conducted with conventional weap-

he might not murder some unpredictably provocative someone at some unknown future time. Shall we, then, subject the entire population to the penalty for murder?

To return to *The Times*, it had become even more complacent by the end of 1955. Where the Act says ". . . such person probably will engage in . . . espionage or . . . sabotage," *The Times* simply says "spies and saboteurs". By 1954 a majority of the population was ready to put "Communists" in jail (*Communism, Conformity and Civil Liberties* by Samuel A. Stouffer, Doubleday, N.Y., 1955). What do you support the man in the street will think is too good for spies and saboteurs during a period of Internal Security Emergency as officially proclaimed by Our Beloved Leader, the Generalissimo?

Anyone who has ever talked with an interned Nisei will appreciate *The Times's* amiable summary. "After Pearl Harbor, for instance, a great many Japanese (sic) were rounded up and interned, some in one of the camps still maintained. It later was acknowledged that not all of them were disloyal or a menace to national security." To refresh *The Times's* memory, there were 20,000 men, women, children and babies at Tule Lake alone, and these people were not Japanese citizens, but Americans. Possibly those under one year of age were later acknowledged not disloyal.

How many potential subversives does the Department of Injustice count on housing? "The Civil Service Commission revealed to-day that it maintained a card index file with names of 2,000,000 persons 'allegedly affiliated with some sort of subversive organization or activity'" (*N.Y. Times*, November 29, 1955). Now, if we generously assume that one out of every ten men, women, children and babies in the country has applied for a Civil Service job and thus got his name on Civil Service files, then we can extrapolate and find twenty million subversives in the population as a whole. Either the Department has some unrevealed camps up its sleeve, or conditions will be rather more crowded than they were in Buchenwald.

(From *Views & Comments*,

ons on the style and on the scale of World War II. Others contend that there would be open season on brush wars of Korea's size and shape, with limited use of the tactical atomic bomb. Pundit Walter Lippman suggests that guerrilla warfare might become the only thinkable type of conflict.

Get Rid of Them!

It seems that peace after all will be prevented from rearing its threatening head. But *Time* ends on a note of despondency. The possibility facing mankind is that war might shift entirely to economic, social, political and ideological conflict.

If there are no material benefits to be gained from war or "ideological conflict", neither will be a necessity. The simple solution of removing the causes never occurs to those in power and if it did they would be unlikely to adopt any policy which threatened that power and privilege. How to get rid of them then? By a conscious revolutionary people removing them from power and using all the peaceful resources of society for the benefit of all. M.

SOVIET BUMBLEDOM

Continued from p. 3

"Reply in triplicate" is a kind of wry joke in England. In Russia the grim truth is that in the Smolensk area every working plant must furnish six copies of everything it writes out: there is, to be precise, one copy each for the town's municipal office, town finance department, statistical department, municipal bank, and, of course, the Regional Department of Communal Economy, leaving the sixth copy to be kept for its own files.

To go on for another column or two would be too wearisome. We can, however, promise a special interview on behalf of *FREEDOM* with Mr. Borisovsky. He is a big shot. He is chief of the Chief planning and Financial Board and a recognised specialist within the Ministry on matters of planning and accountancy. This is the kind of inside scoop that is missed by *The Daily Worker* whose special correspondents in the Soviet Empire are gently cushioned—and conditioned—against first-hand contact with Soviet reality. IVAN POPOVICH.

OIL AND TROUBLED WATERS

Continued from p. 1

reserve the right to take "appropriate measures". A Cabinet meeting was also held under Prime Minister, M. Mollet.

President Eisenhower has conferred at some length by telephone with Dulles who arrived back from Peru on Sunday. A Cabinet meeting was also held, and it was agreed that the "big three" should act together. Mr. Robert Murphy, U.S. Under-Secretary of State is now in London at the joint request of France and Britain. M. Pineau is also in London.

Anthony Eden called the three Chiefs of Staff to his Cabinet meeting on 27th July. It is reported that "Ministers want to get tough" with Egypt, but are up against two difficulties. 1. The need to work out joint action with the U.S.A. and France; 2. the problem of finding "tough" things to do. Eden has so far committed himself only very slightly—he said in Parliament last week: "The situation must be handled with some firmness and care."

As one might have guessed, he has the full support of both sides of the House. Mr. Gaitskell said: "... we deeply deplore this high-handed and totally unjustifiable step taken by the Egyptian Government." (The unjustifiable step is of course the nationalisation of a company by its Government, with the offer of compensation to the existing owners and shareholders. A practice which the Labour Party has carried out in the recent past as a part of its justifiable policy!) Mr. Clement Davies wished to associate himself with the remarks made by Mr. Gaitskell, and the statement by Mr. Eden as to "... this deplorable action."

The Troops are Ready

The central issue which now rests with the West is what sanctions, economic, political and military should be put into force. Whilst the Suez Canal is open the real difficulty for Britain and France is comparatively small, for as long as the essential supply of oil continues to flow through the canal no serious harm is done. France is actually far less dependent upon this supply line than is Britain, for whom it is effectively the main artery of industrial life itself.

Military action seems far-fetched at this moment, despite the sabre-rattling of some Tory M.P.'s, the Conservative *Sunday Express* and sundry other blood-thirsty individuals. This however does not mean that British troops will not be ready to move if it is deemed necessary (the most likely "necessity" being the actual closing of the Canal), hence the

presence of Service Chiefs at Cabinet meetings. Not for nothing has Cyprus been retained at whatever cost as a British base, and no doubt more troops will shortly find themselves stationed as close as possible to the Canal and its environs.

Economic sanctions are however a different matter, and there is no doubt that further measures will be added to the action which has already been taken. So far all assets belonging to the Suez Canal Company in Britain have been frozen, these probably amount to £15½ million; similarly in France where the figure is about £14 million. The next step is expected to be the freezing of Egypt's sterling balances totalling £110 million; which are supposed to be repaid at the rate of £20 million per year. Repayment date is in January so this would have no immediate impact, but might be withheld in order to compensate shareholders in Britain.

The United States Government has issued a protest to Egypt which said it had been shocked by many "intemperate, inaccurate and misleading statements" made by Nasser about the U.S. To prove the point she has decided not to pay Saudi Arabia (Egypt's closest partner), £16 million a year rent for the continued use of the U.S. air base at Dhahran.

U.S. Interest

The U.S. would hardly be affected by a closure of the Suez Canal, except insofar as it affected her allies, and of course because a major part of American strategy is bound up with the Middle East and general all-round containment of the U.S.S.R. by a ring of allies with whom either Britain and/or America have pacts and agreements, political, economic or military.

There are two other methods of achieving the equivalent of sanctions, both of which are perhaps more important than all the rest. The first would be the stoppage of all arms deals with Egypt, and the complementary, but more

effective action of increasing considerably the influx of arms to Israel. This is an extremely likely innovation, even if the arms have to be given away, for the presence of a very strong Israel could inhibit Nasser's behaviour to a considerable degree.

The second sanction will happen anyway. It is that other nations, whoever they may be, will not be anxious to invest capital in Egypt now that there is a possibility of losing it overnight. No doubt the West will encourage countries not to invest, and this may well mean the complete economic blockade of Egypt by practically the whole world—with one major exception; the U.S.S.R.

It is therefore difficult to see how Nasser is to avoid being thrown upon the mercies of Russia, although he has proclaimed his unwillingness that this should happen. One must assume that the Western Powers realise that Nasser has very little choice. Even before he took control of the Canal they put him in the position of having to deal with the East or no one. If economic pressure is brought upon Egypt in the manner envisaged, Nasser cannot escape the East, for he cannot exist with no one.

What has Egypt on her side? There is a great wealth of French capital invested there, amounting to some £450 million. This may cause some heartburning in France, and at the same time provide Nasser with some of the financial aid he so badly needs.

Also, while the Canal continues to operate with Egypt respecting the international conventions governing it, Britain may swallow her pride, as she has done in the past, and give Nasser time to negotiate. When the initial shouting has died down a number of actions and words may be forgotten. Britain imports a total of 28 million metric tons of oil per year, of which 20 million come through the Suez Canal. Whatever else may happen, should the Canal be closed, Britain would certainly be in a difficult

position due to a shortage of oil for a period of time. Economically this would be a bitter blow, and would probably mean importing oil from across the Atlantic, which would cost many millions of dollars—dollars with which Britain is not well provided.

Signs of Anxiety

Already there are signs of anxiety in Egypt itself; Nasser's speeches are not having quite the effect which they had a week ago. The Egyptian Press and radio are beginning to think more seriously of the dangers ahead, and a slightly questioning note can be perceived.

An order banning Egyptian exports to the Sterling Area was issued and then cancelled a few hours later by Dr. Abdel Kaissumy, the Finance Minister. Unloading of ships about to leave Egyptian ports for Britain was started, and then they were re-loaded again. This seems to indicate some slight panic at least.

Garrisons in the Canal Zone are on the alert, all leave for Army officers is cancelled. Similarly the Parachute Brigade in Cyprus has been alerted. Neither of these actions however can be regarded as very serious at this time.

What Next?

The Suez Canal was due to become officially Egyptian property in twelve years time anyway, for the 99 years lease would have run out in 1968. Benjamin Disraeli purchased Britain's three-eighths of the Canal in 1875, with £4 million he managed to borrow from Rothschild as a gamble. The possibility of the politicians ironing out the British share of the Canal for £4 million now, seems remote in the extreme.

Who can tell what will happen? By the time you read this, some world-shattering event may have occurred. Perhaps Russia will prove to be the key to the problem within the next weeks; or Nasser's enemies within Egypt may succeed in removing him from power in a few months. Whatever it may be, there will probably not be much improvement in the direction of freedom.

H.F.W.

Summer School

To be held at the Malatesta Club, London, August Bank Holiday week-end (August 4-6).

This year's theme:

IS HISTORY ON OUR SIDE?

PROGRAMME

Saturday, August 4.
2.00 p.m. Informal gathering.
2.30 p.m. Lecture: F. A. RIDLEY
5.30 p.m. High tea
Social evening
8.00 p.m. Lunitas presents:
The Tuppenny Ha'penny Opera

Sunday, August 5.
11.00 a.m. Lecture:
ALEX COMFORT
1.30 p.m. Lunch
3.00 Open-air meeting in Hyde Park
7.30 p.m. Lecture:
JACK ROBINSON

Monday, August 6.
11.00 a.m. Lecture:
PHILIP SANSON
1.30 p.m. Lunch

COSTS

LECTURES: Admission 1s. per lecture, four for 2s. 6d.

MEALS: Must be ordered in advance. 2s. 6d. per meal.

Refreshments available at club prices on Saturday and Sunday evenings.

ACCOMMODATION: Free, unless hotels have to be used. *Must be booked in advance.*

All enquiries to Joan Sculthorpe, c/o Freedom Press.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

LECTURE-DISCUSSIONS
Every Sunday at 7.30 at
THE MALATESTA CLUB,
32 Percy Street,
Tottenham Court Road, W.1.
AUGUST 5—SUMMER SCHOOL
(see above)

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
At 200 BUCHANAN STREET,
GLASGOW
OUTDOOR meetings at Maxwell Street,
every Sunday 7.30 p.m.

Exhibition

SOME ENGLISH AND FRENCH
ANARCHIST POSTERS
At the Malatesta Club, from
Monday, August 6th.

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 19/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)
6 months 9/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)
3 months 5/- (U.S.A. \$0.75)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies
12 months 29/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)
6 months 14/6 (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

Letters to the Editors

No Freedom in Sheffield Libraries

DEAR COMRADES,
The following communication is a copy of the reply received to a second application for copies of FREEDOM to be made available in the reading rooms of the Sheffield City Public Libraries.

SHEFFIELD CITY LIBRARIES
CENTRAL LIBRARY,
SHEFFIELD, 1.
12th July, 1956.

"DEAR SIR,
The Libraries Sub-Committee at their meeting on Tuesday last had before them your letter of 14th June and the letter signed by yourself and five other persons asking for the periodical, FREEDOM, to be taken in the City Libraries.

I have to inform you that the Committee decided that the suggestion could not be accepted.

With reference to your complaint that the Committee did not give reasons on a previous occasion for not accepting this periodical, I have to inform you that it has never been the practice to give reasons for their decisions and this applies to all periodicals submitted.

Yours faithfully,
J. P. LAMB,
City Librarian."

Well, there we are! The passage I have italicised shows the high-handed and authoritarian attitude of the Sheffield Labour City Council which decides what the people can, or cannot read via the City Libraries.

A further item which may be of interest is that on this coming Sunday (July

29th), the few comrades here in Sheffield are trying out our first venture of a Libertarian platform on Sheffield's open-air site for public speaking in Barkers Pool.

What we particularly lack in this new venture is the experience plus the ability of our London comrades to put the case adequately for libertarian thought and philosophy; a good speaker would be an invaluable asset to us at this present time: A situation which we hope will be remedied in the not very distant future—money and circumstances permitting, when a visit or visits by the London Group will be possible.

Yours fraternally,
Sheffield, July 26. G.P.

IS THIS JUSTICE?

DEAR SIR,
"IS THIS JUSTICE"?

In the *Daily Record* of 24/7/56, there is the report of a case, heard at the Birmingham Assizes, in which Mr. Justice Finemore sentenced two young blackguards, one aged 17, and the other 16, to 3 years probation (they both came from Kidderminster, Worcs.), for black-mailing a headmaster. They accused him of indecently assaulting his pupils.

In the same paper there is a long report of two coloured U.S. Army privates, sentenced, at the same Birmingham Assizes, by the same Judge, for raping a girl. They were both aged 17 and both were sentenced to 5 years imprisonment. In their defence it was stated that these boys came from broken homes in the Southern States, where there is much promiscuous lovemaking, and that on the night of the attack both had been drinking.

With the possible exception of Murder, Rape and Blackmail are the two most serious offences in the Calendar. Neither is more, or less, serious than the other. Yet in one case the Judge thinks probation the proper punishment, and in the other, 5 years imprisonment.

Both these cases want looking into.
Yours faithfully,
Elinburgh, July 26. ANATOLE JAMES.

DISTRACTED CORRECTION

In the review of *The Power Elite* in FREEDOM for July 21, T. S. Eliot was credited with only three-fifths of his actual words. What he wrote was "distracted from distraction by distraction".

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!

WEEK 30
Deficit on Freedom £600
Contributions received £526
DEFICIT £74

July 20 to July 26

Paris: S.K. £1/18/4; London: J.S.* 3/-;
Welwyn Garden City: Joxer* 10/-; Eltham:
Anon. £1; Capetown: M.L. £1; Los Angeles:
"Man" Group per A.R. £5/15/6; North-
wood: E.H. 6/-; Denver: R.B. 7/-; London:
Hyde Park Sympathiser: 6d.

Total ... 11 0 4
Previously acknowledged ... 515 13 3

1956 TOTAL TO DATE ... £526 13 7

GIFTS OF BOOKS: London: A.U.; Fal-
mouth: R.W.

*Indicates regular contributors.

FREEDOM PRESS

VOLINE:
Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed) cloth 12s. 6d.
The Unknown Revolution
(Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21)
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 6d.
Barbarism & Sexual Freedom
boards 3s. 6d.

HERBERT READ:
Art and the Evolution of Man 4s.
Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism 3s. 6d.
Poetry and Anarchism
cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d.

The Philosophy of Anarchism
boards 2s. 6d., paper 1s.
The Education of Free Men 1s.

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

PHILIP SANSON:
Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step 1s

TONY GIBSON:
Youth for Freedom paper 2s.
Food Production and Population 6d.
Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.

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

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

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