

The Function of Science - p. 2  
 Political Parties Analysed - p. 2  
 The Egyptian War - p. 4

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"It is excellent to have a giant's strength; but it is tyrannous to use it like a giant."

—ANTHONY EDEN, March 21, 1945.

"We have the might and shall use it to the limit if you do not give in."

—LEAFLET dropped by R.A.F. over Egypt, November 4, 1956.

## STRIKE NOW

# AGAINST BRITISH AND RUSSIAN IMPERIALISM

THE labour movement of Britain is rising in protest against Sir Anthony Eden's war policy. A fine indignation is sweeping the workers and even many Conservatives are shaken in their faith in their leader.

But what are the terms on which the Labour Movement protests? On the illegality of Eden's action! Their slogan is 'Law—not War!' And by their own slogan they cripple their own protest, for just as they demand that Eden curbs his power by international law, so they are telling the workers to curb their power by internal law.

'There must be no industrial action' cry the Trade Union bosses. Protest must be limited to sending postcards to your Members of Parliament!

By so curbing the feelings and effectiveness of the workers the Labour leaders demonstrate that they are more concerned with maintaining themselves as leaders than with encouraging their followers to take effective action to stop the war. The Labour leaders are as concerned as the Conservatives that the people should not discover their own strength, for when the people organise themselves to bring down a Tory government by direct action they will be building the means of running society themselves without the dubious assistance of Labour misleaders.

'Law—not War' cry the Labour Party. Which means that when war is declared legally it is all right for the people to fight and die. 1914-18, 1939-

NEVER before has one week provided the peoples of the world with such object lessons as they had last week. Never before has the brutality of imperialism been demonstrated so clearly by supposedly opposite ideologies at the same time; never has the deceitfulness and criminal hypocrisy of governments of 'Right' and 'Left' been so exposed for the whole world to see.

The British and French Governments' action in Egypt has shown that they are prepared to pretend to recognise international law only so long as it suits them; the Russian Governments' action in Hungary shows that it will pretend to encourage 'liberalisation' only so long as the people don't demand freedom. The actions of all three governments show that they are all prepared to resort to trickery and lies, and when these fail, to crush ruthlessly by tank and bomber all those who stand in their way.

45, the Korean War, bombers in Kenya, the Army and Navy against the Jews in Palestine, the troops going into British Guiana (and the London Docks), the building of the Atom-bomb—all these have been done with the

When the Russian leaders did their arms deal with Egypt last Spring we declared that, by entering the international market in the weapons of destruction, they were tearing to shreds the last vestiges of the myth that they were different from the imperialist capitalist West. Last week the tracks of Russian tanks ground those shreds into the bloodstained dust of Hungary. The wheel has turned full circle. The regime that was born in the revolt of a people has drowned in blood the revolt of a people.

NEVER AGAIN MUST THE COMMUNISTS BE ALLOWED TO PRETEND THAT THEY HAVE ANYTHING BETTER TO OFFER TO THE PEOPLES OF THE WORLD THAN THE IMPERIALISTS OF THE OLD ORDER.

When the Governments of Britain and France issued their obviously unacceptable ultima-

tum to Egypt and twelve hours later launched their bombers, they tore to shreds the myth that democracies are governed by higher moral considerations than dictatorships, they destroyed in twelve hours all they had endeavoured to build up in the United Nations over ten years and showed as fine a scorn for international law as ever Hitler did in his heyday. In one stroke the democracies of Britain and France have thrown away all claim to moral superiority over the dictatorships.

NEVER AGAIN MUST THE LEADERS OF BRITISH OR FRENCH IMPERIALISM BE ALLOWED TO PRETEND THAT THEY HAVE ANYTHING BETTER TO OFFER TO THE PEOPLES OF THE WORLD THAN THE IMPERIALISTS OF THE NEW ORDER.

thing, you are told and leave the talking to your leaders. Don't do anything unconstitutional!

What a bankrupt policy! NOW is the time for the people to act upon their convictions. NOW is the time for responsibility in the true sense of the word. NOW is the time for the British people to show to the world that they no longer support the brutal use of the tank and the bomber as a weapon of imperialist domination—whether used by Britain or Russia.

End This Bloodstained Chapter

CYPRUS, Kenya, Guiana, Malaya, Indonesia, Korea, Algeria—the post-war story of European domination and destruction in the rest of the world has got to have an end. NOW is the time for the British to show the peoples of the world that we are anxious to close this blood-stained chapter of our history. And we can do it by clawing away the support on which the Government depends.

We can do it by withdrawing our labour power. We can show to the peoples of the world that we want a better way of life than the imperialists of either East or West can provide. We can demonstrate that we are prepared neither to fight nor to work for social and political systems which show themselves to be contemptible.

General strikes have stopped wars before. The workers of Britain have a special responsibility to the rest of the world to strike now against the criminal folly of the Government. To put an end to the British misadventure in Egypt will bring the Russian terror in Hungary once again nakedly before the world.

For the sake of our own integrity, for the sake of our future, for the sake of humanity—STRIKE NOW!

### The Struggle Halted in Hungary

## But All Is Not Lost!

IN certain respects, and in spite of the fact that at the time of writing it is reported that resistance is at an end in Hungary, the situation is as confused as during the first days of the insurrection when the channels of communication were limited to government-controlled Budapest radio and the rumours that reached the Austrian frontier. With the occupation of the country by Russian troops, estimated to be more than five times as numerous as the original occupying force, and the appointment by the Russians of a puppet government led by Janos Kadar the former "Titoist" who became first secretary of the Communist Party during the insurrection, channels of communication have once more been closed to all but official pronouncements. And they are that resistance—the "counter-revolution" as Moscow called it—is virtually at an end.

It would appear that armed resistance was halted following the Russians' agreement to withdraw all troops from Hungary. A statement broadcast from Moscow (October 30) declared that:

Since it [the Hungarian People's Government] consider that the further presence of Soviet Army units in Hungary can serve as a cause for an even greater deterioration of the situation, the Soviet Government has given an instruction to its military command to withdraw the Soviet Army units from Budapest as soon as this is recognized by the Hungarian Government to be necessary.

At the same time, the Soviet Government is ready to enter into corresponding negotiations with the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic and other participants of the Warsaw Treaty on the question of the presence of Soviet troops on the territory of Hungary.

Actually the "cease-fire" was a tactical measure, aimed at allowing

the Russian troops to withdraw from Budapest, and not a weakening of the insurgents in their determination to continue the struggle to the end. Previous attempts by Nagy to get them to lay down their arms in return for a promise that the Russians would withdraw, were rejected. Only the day before the Russian statement, the *Manchester Guardian's* correspondent reported that:

To-night in an attempt to persuade the freedom fighters of Budapest that it has acceded to their most important demand—for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from the city—the Government announced that the withdrawal would begin twenty-four hours after the insurgents had handed over their arms. To many of the freedom fighters this can only mean that they are being asked to disarm and to abandon themselves to the tender mercies of the Russians—if only for twenty-four hours—whom they have fought with such fury for a week.

It is hardly a demand that many are likely to heed, even though the Minister of Defence has announced on the radio that agreement has been reached with unidentified 'leaders of resistance groups' that rebel arms should be handed over to those Hungarian troops which are relieving the Russians.

But by the Saturday (Nov. 3), when the 12 Russian divisions which had been coming into Hungary after the announcement that all troops were to be withdrawn, had occupied strategic positions throughout the countryside, the orders from Budapest according to Lajos Lederer, the *Observer's* correspondent in the Hungarian capital, were "Stand by and do not, for the present, provoke the invaders". He was convinced, however, that "the Hungarian forces are ready to fight as soon as Budapest gives the order". It would seem that the spirit of the rebels remained high to the end, and we cannot help

approval of the Labour Party in power or in official opposition. Because they were done legally.

And if the British and French forces now in Egypt cease to be independent national forces and are turned by United Nations decree into a police force under UN control—the Labour Party's opposition to their presence in Egypt falls to the ground. An international police force can take over where Britain and France leave off, and since it will be

done by international law it will be acceptable to the 'socialists' of the Labour movement.

The Labour leaders want us to show our opposition to Eden's Government by demonstrations in Trafalgar Square and by letters to our M.P.s. Come out on the streets on Sunday—but on Monday morning report for work. Fill the shells with gunpowder, carry the guns on the trains, load the ships with tanks, turn up when you are called up—do every-

## People in the Street

"When enough people respond to invitation to die, not with a salute but a smack in the mouth, and the mention of war empties the factories and fills the streets, we may be able to talk about freedom."

—ALEX COMFORT.

LAST Sunday in the streets of Budapest people were fighting tanks with hand-grenades. In the streets of Nicosia RAF men, returned from bombing Egypt were walking with their wives. "We're really continuing our normal training," Wing-Commander Douglas Haig told a reporter, "except that it's the first time some of the boys have dropped a live stick of bombs." In the same city on the same day another serviceman was killed—a bomb was thrown at him.

In the streets of London 30,000 people demonstrated against the government's war on Egypt. On the same day, according to the RAC, two million people lined the route of the veteran car run from London to Brighton. If the figures had been reversed British troops would not be in Egypt. But the government could count on public apathy just as it could count on its opponents to 'stick to the rules of the game' and to do nothing 'unconstitutional', as though there was any legal, let alone moral sanction for the war which in the Prime Minister's words was not a war but an armed conflict.

"It's just a few trouble-makers. They're all loyal really," said a policeman in Trafalgar Square on Sunday. And the government was able to comfort itself with the same thought. Its fiercest opponent among

the newspapers, having condemned its action in the strongest possible terms, published a leading article on "Conscience" explaining the position of soldiers who refused to participate in the 'armed conflict' concluded with the hope that those who object to fighting over Suez "may be few". (*Manchester Guardian* 1/11/56). And the National Council of Labour, speaking in the name of the Labour Party, the TUC and the Co-operative movement, called upon the Labour movement "to refrain from taking industrial action as a means of influencing national policy in the present crisis".

Business as usual—with protests, has been the watchword of the opposition. Speaking in a 'statesmanlike' fashion, conscious of their roles as future prime minister and foreign secretary respectively, Mr. Gaitskell on the radio on Sunday and Mr. Bevan in Trafalgar Square demanded a change of government or a change of heart in the government. And meanwhile the military adventure of Britain and France went ahead like clockwork. And the *News Chronicle*, after a lot of appropriate words like revulsion, anger and horror, smugly concluded that "happily there have been remarkably few instances of hotheads running wild".

It was left for one of the 'hot-heads', Dr. Donald Soper, the Methodist leader, to declare at Manette Street on Sunday, "You must refuse to fight, refuse to make munitions, and refuse to manipulate transport". Dr. Soper was simply restating one of the truisms of paci-

list propaganda: Wars will cease when men refuse to fight. There are no indications at all of men refusing to fight, nor has the mention of war emptied the factories or filled the streets. "It's just a few trouble-makers. They're all loyal really!"

★

ONE of the things you must have noticed during the events of the last fortnight is that people enjoy the atmosphere of tension and troop-movements. Evening papers selling like hot cakes with interviews with 'our boys' on the eve of departure, 'bronzed' and fit in the Cyprus sunshine; military experts weighing up form; a sudden discovery of the grievances of Israel which have been ignored for years in a bid for Arab support; it's all, in the phrase used by Churchill at the time of the flying-bombs, 'just like old times'. Three weeks ago we assumed, despite the ominous minutes of cheering in parliament when Eden first announced his call-up of reservists, that the sabre-rattling over Suez would die out in the face of world opinion, especially since the canal would be Egypt's in twelve years' time anyway. We assumed that the Soviet government would not dare, at the cost of the laboriously built-up 'goodwill' accumulated by the 'thaw' and the B. & K. circus, to crush the revolt in Hungary by armed force. Both sides of the iron curtain have now discovered that you can flout the opinion of the world with impunity. And the *Daily Express* is as sickeningly

Continued on p. 4

Continued on p. 3

# THE FUNCTION OF SCIENCE

ALEX COMFORT'S optimistic contribution to the Anarchist Summer School on the rôle of science in the evolution of the libertarian society and the sober critical comments of Alan Albon (FREEDOM, August 18, 1956), arising from this viewpoint indicate the necessity for further analytical comment to clarify the state of confusion which reigns in so many discussions on the social morality of scientific investigation and application.

Quite simply, the word science means knowledge but to-day it is generally taken to signify the systematic investigation of all forms of natural phenomena. Straightforward investigations, without any immediate practical aims have come to be called *pure science* whereas all exploitation of the knowledge gained for practical purposes has been designated *applied science*. It is unlikely that this straightforward definition of terms will give rise to any deeply critical comments since the real split occurs only when we consider the attitude of scientists to their own discoveries.

For the purposes of analytical comment it is also valuable to have some working definition of the scientist *per se*. It is by no means sufficient to have a picture of a high-grade laboratory worker dealing specifically with complicated apparatus producing effects spectacular to the layman. Leaving out the purely mechanical aspect of the scientist, without however pretending that it is irrelevant, we see the scientist essentially as a person capable of wide and accurate observation and endowed with a clear analytical understanding of the phenomena which he observes.

If Man's means of observing and recording his total environment and of assessing his place within it were subject to no sort of error and if Man himself had an infallible and infinite capacity for seeing all things in perspective, then no problem would arise and Man would be a kind of God with limited powers but with a controlled capability for discovering himself. As this is clearly not so we must proceed to consider the two principal conceptions of the rôle of the

scientist in human society, or, if you prefer it, the rôle of Man as scientist in a partially explored environment.

## Science the Guide, Philosopher and Friend

Thoughtful and kindly people almost without exception hate war, but many of them cannot escape from the habitual attitude of mind which accepts it as inevitable, being, they assume, the ultimate natural expression of Man's inherent aggressive tendencies. This has given rise to the viewpoint that this aggressiveness can be sublimated, especially through scientific endeavour, by directing it outwards from Mankind to the animal world and to the impersonal inanimate forces operating throughout the Universe. Thus, we have the concept of a united human race engaged in a universal total war against a common enemy.

Science is conceived of as the super-weapon with which natural forces will be frustrated, exploited or at worst kept permanently but definitely at bay. In its capacity as explorer Science will be Man's *guide*; as interpreter and formulator of plans it will be his *philosopher*; and in the ultimate success of its application, it will be his *friend*. This attitude is especially acceptable to those humanitarians whose conceptions of reality and realism leave them no alternative but to assume that Nature is uniformly hostile to Men. It is implicitly taken for granted that Man, and most especially Man's mental aspect are something almost beyond nature, a kind of isolated outgrowth of it. Among others, the Communists incline to this interpretation of the function of science.

There can be little doubt that this is a very altruistic approach since it is evident that Man is constantly striving in a multitude of ways to keep himself alive in the face of natural disasters (storm, earthquake, floods, etc.), attacks by various forms of predatory creatures (germs, insects and animals), and the perversities of his own egoistical nature. The contradictions in this outlook which become evident to the critical mind rest upon the making of certain assumptions which may not be fully justified. Perhaps it may be justly said that sufficient room has not been left for sincere and intelligent *scientific agnosticism*. Science-worship frequently leads to the belief that Man's mental powers are capable of infinite expansion and that consequently the conquest of the Universe is merely a matter of time. What is overlooked here is that scientific investigation itself may indicate that science itself has a very definitely limited field of application and that this latter may in turn arise from Man's strictly circumscribed intellectual gifts. It is unfair to give the impression that scientists are unaware of this, but what has to be guarded against is the facile acceptance by many laymen of the

infallibility of science. Every person engaged in scientific work is aware that many fine projects are foredoomed to failure as the result of precise theoretical investigations undertaken before embarking on any major programme. Estimates of possibilities have always to be made in any localised scientific or technical work, and unless the same approach is adopted in trying to assign to science its proper rôle in human affairs the result is likely to be chaos in both philosophy and in practical matters.

## Nature the Omnipotent

The view, stated and briefly analysed in the foregoing section, of science as a kind of St. George going all out to slay the dragon Nature is countered by the notion that Nature is, in fact, benevolent and that what is lacking is Man's understanding of it. In this concept of things the natural world in its entirety is taken to be a kind of jigsaw puzzle with an infinite number of pieces which, were it ever completed, would extend to infinity in all directions. In other words, for those unaccustomed to technical language, there would be no end to it.

It is assumed that no parts of the puzzle are missing (even though they may be difficult to locate) and that, once they have been assembled (as they will be), then the overall picture will begin to take shape, possibly in isolated

patches which will spread and ultimately coalesce to give a better impression of the whole canvas. Basically this is, in analogy form, the structure of the type of philosophy to which Nature Cure enthusiasts subscribe. It embodies the notion of science, not as a weapon, but as a means of exploration. It is not the struggle of Good against Evil, but the gradual dispersion of the mist of Ignorance to reveal the face of Truth.

In formulating a criticism of this concept of Nature as being infinitely coherent and capable of direct and complete revelation, it is possible to adhere to the jigsaw puzzle analogy. Granted that some pattern or picture will emerge, who can say that it must of necessity correspond to our understanding of things. What, if, for example, it turns out to be a Surrealistic maze of colour or an enigma à la Bosch?

The weakness of this point of view lies in its tending to carry certain observations to their 'logical' conclusions, which are, in fact, *speculative* and not *actual* conclusions. There is, after all, a certain naive pride in assuming that the natural jigsaw puzzle is simply waiting to be assembled, and that there will be no voids in it. Coherence in parts is no evidence of coherence in the whole, nor does the revelation of localised colour and pattern justify a belief in the existence of a completed canvas.

## Co-Existence

This fashionable political term with its inference that co-existence is a desirable

aim (although some dispute it), and its close similarity in meaning to the biological concept of symbiosis, expresses the ideal state of the relationship which should exist between Science and Nature. By this it is not intended to imply that there should be a sort of 'armed truce' between two schools of thought, but rather, that a synthesis of the two viewpoints should be the most laudable aim. By 'synthesis' is implied, not a sentimental compromise in which each side foregoes something of its viewpoint for the sake of peace, but rather a complete re-assessment by each set of exponents of the validity of its own particular interpretation. By this means it should be possible to reject dogmatic rubbish and eliminate the scornful intolerance which pervades the arena.

## The Relevance of Anarchism

Anarchism becomes a relevant force in all fields of human activity in which its adherents engage. This can be as true in the field of science as in any other. Just as pacifists believe in the existence of a Third Force which detaches itself from the outworn political attitudes of the East and West (so-called), so should anarchists be aware that they are a permanent Third Force in the field of many human struggles. The Anarchist-scientist has a wonderful opportunity, by reason of his beliefs, to render himself immune to the prejudices which come of being indoctrinated in scientific dogmatism or its anti-scientific equivalent.

Continued on p. 2

## BOOK REVIEW

# Political Parties Analysed

**POLITICAL PARTIES** by M. Duverger. Methuen, 30s.

TO many people, the failure of those political parties which aspire to be democratic is self-evident; but the majority, while admitting certain faults in the party of their choice, believe that only through such parties can democracy be achieved. Because of this faith in democracy as an end and political parties as the means to achieve it, all those abuses of power which shelter behind the façade of "politics" are excused as expediency and condoned as necessary evils of the democratic present (in the conservative philosophy) or the democratic future (in the social-democrat philosophy). Thus idealism must play a large part in the motives of anyone actively engaged in politics for reasons other than those of self-interest, because the reality is so far removed from anything that could be called government by the people. But do such people, and indeed anyone with any hopes for a more peaceable and juster world, realise how small is the chance of progress when they put their faith in political parties? Professor Duverger provides ample

"anti-politics" ammunition; in what is virtually a pioneer work he studies in detail "the party institutions" of Europe and America and "their place in the State". In so doing he inevitably reveals the anti-individualism, the power-hunger, and the special interests at work in parties. In this country, with only two parties of consequence, who each claim to represent nearly one-half of the electorate, we are apt to forget how important a part these special interests can play. In fact such interests, whether they are philosophical societies, working men's clubs, newspapers, ex-servicemen's associations, or churches, have been responsible for the formation of innumerable political parties.

Although their origins may be many and varied Duverger finds each party falls into one or two groups—cadre and mass. The former are dependant on personalities, "experts", financiers, etc., while the latter depend on their mass membership on whom they rely for money in the form of subscriptions. Of course the mass party is a comparatively recent phenomenon, dating from the introduction of universal suffrage, and the cadre parties of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, realising how the shift in voting power might affect their fortunes attempted to make their organisation more flexible by pretending to open their ranks to the masses.

unions control the votes of all their members.

## Leaders

Professor Duverger deals trenchantly with the leaders of mass parties who, he says, have "systematically acted so as to obtain from members obedience as complete as possible". The prime reason for this is "the taste of power: he who possesses a little power always tries to increase it. This natural authoritarianism seems moreover to be particularly strong in the case of working-class leaders". He gives a remarkable example of the lengths to which a leader will go in identifying himself with a party in order to retain power. He reproduces in his book a membership form used on the occasion of the 50th birthday of Maurice Thorez (leader of the French C.P.) which reads in part:

*Cher Maurice Thorez.*

*Je vous souhaite longue vie et bonne santé, et, à l'occasion de votre cinquantième anniversaire, j'adhère au Parti Communiste Français dans la promotion de la Paix.*

(I wish you long life and good health, and on the occasion of your 50th birthday, I hereby join the French C.P. in the promotion of peace).

and at the top, in bold letters:

**J'adhère au parti de Maurice THOREZ**

## More government—or less?

In his concluding chapters the author points out that the "pure" theory of democracy, that of a direct elector-governor liaison, is an impossible ideal to-day. The party intervenes so that before being chosen by the electors the deputy must be chosen by the party—the electors only ratify the party's choice. The political apologist might reply that the party is itself an expression of public opinion and the deputy is thus a choice of the people; however, discounting the undemocratic nature of political parties, it is the parties themselves who are largely responsible for "public opinion" and not the reverse.

From the quotations I have given here (which are typical of the critical tone of the book) the reader may imagine that Professor Duverger will have some very radical suggestions to make about political parties. Unfortunately he has not. Although he says "the distribution of votes is not public opinion itself but only one way, amongst many others, of expressing it, and one which always distorts to some extent", he also says "all who vilify the party system denounce such distortion without comprehending that it is inevitable and really is much less deformation than formation. They fail to realise that raw opinion is elusive, that formed opinion alone can be expressed, and that the method of expression necessarily imposes on it a form which modifies it".

Finally in his (very brief) "Conclusions" he says "The formula 'government of the people by the people' must be replaced by the formula 'government of the people by an élite sprung from the people'." He says this in spite of the words I have quoted in the paragraph under the heading "Leaders" above! Perhaps some of the trouble is to be found in the idea of government?

M.G.W.

## FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

Open 10 a.m. to 6.30 p.m. daily; Saturdays till 5 p.m. All books sent post free, so get your Christmas books from us and make a Christmas present to the Press Fund. 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 — and frequently found!

### New Books . . .

- Sexual, Marital and Family Relationships of the English Women Eustace Chesser 75/-
- Sexual Behaviour in the Human Female A. C. Kinsey 56/-
- Reflections on Woman R. Curle 15/-
- Reason in Action (ed.) Hector Hawton 8/6
- Passive Resistance in South Africa L. Kuper 21/-
- The Easter Lily S. O'Callaghan 15/-
- Picasso (with 398 illus., 75 in colour) 25/-

### Second-Hand . . .

- Caleb Williams William Godwin (1838) 10/-
- Woman's Experience of the Male Sofie Lezarsfeld 15/-
- Propaganda in the Next War Sidney Rogerson (1938) 3/6
- To-morrow is Already Here Robert Jungk 5/-
- Man on Earth Jacqueline Hawkes 6/-
- Autobiography of a German Rebel Toni Sender 3/6
- The Face of Spain G. Brenan 5/-
- Morality Fair Geoffrey Williamson 5/-
- The Big Puff Thomas Whiteside 4/-
- The Life and Death of Jason William Morris 2/6
- The Affable Hangman Ramon Sender 3/6
- The Deadlock V. V. Vieresseov 2/6
- Russian Literature Ideals and Realities P. Kropotkin 7/6
- Imperial Majesty Alexis Tolstoy 2/6
- The Wisdom of the Heart Henry Miller 8/6
- The Genius and the Goddess Aldous Huxley 3/-
- Russia and Ourselves Victor Gollancz 2/6

### Periodicals . . .

- Liberation, October, No. 8 1/9

Postage free on all items obtainable from

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

## COMMENT

# Churchmen on the Middle East Crisis

THE Archbishop of York, Dr. A. M. Ramsey, has spoken up in defence of Government action on the grounds that the policy can be supported with Christian convictions. Skilled however, in the art of double-think, this learned gentleman also states that the opposition case can also be supported by Christian principles. He has taken up his position on the fence on the grounds that both sides have been motivated by honest conviction, a specious argument which, if the Archbishop had stopped to consider, could also be applied to the Russian behaviour in Hungary and Nasser's policy over the Suez. Both these countries are no doubt honestly convinced that the actions they have taken are in their best possible interests. Honest convictions which are based on false premises are invalid and in relation to Britain's actions in Egypt can only be put forward to whitewash the Government or ease the conscience of those Christians who are slightly worried on moral grounds by Government action.

In view of the high-handed action taken by Eden, the Archbishop's plea that "the first duty of Christian people is to stand firmly for patience, charity and rational discussion" seems to have been made rather late. How different is the stand taken by Dr. Donald Soper, who has consistently opposed war, even when it was unpopular to do so.

The 'Londoner' in his Diary in the *Evening Standard* (5/11/56), commenting on Soper's inflammatory speeches has suggested that the authorities are entitled to use their power to take action against "hot-heads" who go too far. We are told that the law on sedition permits "the

freest public discussion, comment, criticism or censure" of public matters. BUT, words are seditious if they are intended:

- 1—To bring into hatred or contempt, or to excite disaffection against the Queen or the Government and Constitution of the United Kingdom, or either House of Parliament, or the administration of justice;
- 2—To excite the Queen's subjects to attempt, otherwise than by lawful means, the alteration of any matter in Church or State by law established;
- 3—To incite persons to commit any crime in general disturbance of the peace;
- 4—To raise discontent or disaffection amongst Her Majesty's subjects;
- 5—To promote feelings of ill-will and hostility between different classes of those subjects.

It is also an offence to incite a Reservist to fail in his duties.

Readers will be happy to know that most of these laws are broken regularly every week at Hyde Park by our outdoor propagandists. We are aware that it is not the tolerance of authority which stops us being "done", but the conviction of those in power that only a very small minority are likely to heed our words. They have faith in the complacency of the British public. (So have we!) People are however, under certain conditions, easily roused, and the events of last week show that even the British can be shaken out of their apathy. Perhaps in future, at any rate until we are back to "normal" with only the usual amount of crisis, the anarchists will not be viewed with such benevolence.

**BUT ALL IS NOT LOST!**

Continued from p. 1

feeling that armed resistance was not resumed because the odds were too great, rather than as a result of demoralisation among the people. Indeed the impression one gains from the reports is that if anything the insurrectionary movement was gaining all the time in momentum and revolutionary experience.

In spite of the fact that the movement looked to governmental methods, and free elections and the trappings of democracy for its salvation, it maintained a healthy scepticism so far as the political leaders were concerned, and was going about the task of creating its own local councils which would provide the representatives for a temporary "Parliament" whose function it would be to draft a "genuinely democratic election law". Nagy, in spite of his apparent willingness to accede to all the wishes of the people was already busying himself with counteracting any possibility of these revolutionary councils constituting themselves into an effective country-wide organisation, by "instructing" the local committees, through Budapest radio, to subordinate themselves to the "Patriotic People's Front".

The *Times* correspondent (Oct. 29) reported that at the time of writing two elements were asserting themselves among the insurgents: those who want a restoration of the parliamentary system after free elections, and those who are content with the continuance of Hungary as a People's Democracy, provided it can choose its own way to Socialism. Nobody has yet emerged who claims to speak for Hungary as a whole, and this is strong confirmation that the uprising was quite unorganized.

But their methods in the interim period were to rely on their own efforts which were those of direct action and a strong sense of communal responsibility. Thus while a general strike was effectively called throughout the country from the beginning "food producing and distributing establishments were working at full pressure" (M.G. 31.10.56).

The *Times* also reports (Oct. 29) that:

A beginning appears to have been made to-day with the restoration of normal life in Budapest, although the radio was still warning people to keep off the streets unless they had to be there, and not to form crowds. It stated this morning that there was enough meat in the city, but an appeal was made to farmers in the surrounding districts to resume deliveries of milk, vegetables, and fruit.

This appears to have been done. The radio station reported to-night that there was now enough bread, and that it was possible to buy milk, butter, and cheese. Although supplies were short, they were improving. Small issues of coal were promised to consumers. It was also broadcast that telephone and postal services were being resumed to-day, and that the transport department was surveying the damage to the tramway system. Some trams were said to be running, and it was hoped to restart the bus services.

The co-operation of the peasants is of particular interest, and receives further confirmation in the report of the *New York Times* correspondent (Nov. 2) from Miskolc, an industrial centre in E. Hungary with a population of 200,000.

In the Miskolc area there appeared to be almost complete solidarity with the Revolutionary Committee. A few districts had not yet accepted its authority, but the committee is confident the districts will be won over.

The peasants appear to be joining the anti-Communist, anti-Soviet movement with enthusiasm. Officials said the peasants were delivering their food to the town although not long ago they were telling Communist officials they could not make deliveries because they did not have enough to eat themselves.

**Israel, Arab Nationalism and the Great States**

ISRAEL is very probably preening herself to-day on the destruction that has befallen Egypt. By her invasion of the Sinai Peninsular Israel provided Britain and France with their opportunity to seize the Suez Canal—even supposing that she did not act in actual collusion with the two major powers. By a spectacular victory in Sinai and the Gaza strip the Israelis have smashed Nasser's forces there, while the heroic forces of Britain and France have destroyed nearly all the Egyptian air force on the ground before it even became airborne.

From the Israeli point of view it has been very slick and effective exercise and they are no doubt highly elated at having seen the annihilation of the fighting strength of their main enemy. But have they? Is—or was—Egypt the main enemy?

Israel came into being against the bitter opposition not only of the Arab world, but of Britain as well. When, after the war, the Jews wanted—most understandably—to leave a Europe stinking of Buchenwald and Belsen, it was the Labour Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin (operating his foreign policy of 'continuity') who sent British gunboats to stop them. The Jews put up a most heroic struggle—and won; but it should never be assumed that Britain has become reconciled to the existence of Israel except as it can be used in British interests.

Now it is clearly not in the interest of Israel to do anything to aggravate or encourage Arab nationalism. And yet that is going to be the one lasting effect in the Middle East of the present war.

It is worth considering the grounds on which Arab nationalism has

grown. For decades the whole of the Middle East has been subject economically and militarily to the Western Powers, Britain in particular. Britain has developed these countries economically only as far as was necessary to plunder them. Fine ports, modern oil installations, roads and railways—the means of extracting the mineral wealth and transporting it to Britain or her markets. She has paid royalties to a handful of sheikhs who have waxed fabulously rich—but the peoples of the Arab states have suffered the direct poverty. Dirt-ridden and diseased, they have seen the Europeans flourish on their misery.

Here was fertile ground for nationalism, and the ambitious young Arab politicians and militants cultivated intensively the seed of nationalism. Then came Israel. A whole state with different traditions, different culture, religion and techniques, pushed itself into their midst and began to open up the desert. The Israelis made the desert flourish as neither Arab nor British overlords had ever done before.

Envious of Israeli success and independence, jealous of her victory over British obstructions, the Arabs began to vent upon Israel the frustrations and resentment born of years of Western exploitation and insult. Nationalism had a rallying-point, a scapegoat. Unable at first to challenge openly the might of the West, the Arabs challenged Israel—and the ignominious defeat of '48 sowed further seeds of resentment and hate.

When Nasser arrived he began to look around for sources of strength other than those of the West. Russia stepped in, and modern Czech and Russian arms flowed into Egypt, which began to feel at last—mistakenly we now see—strong enough to challenge European hegemony.

Where, then, lies the fault for the present position—with all its terrible potentialities?—First with the imperialists of the West. Had the British ploughed back into the Arab countries only half of the wealth they took out; had they introduced industries and built dams on the Nile; had they irrigated the desert and provided modern agricultural machinery; had they educated and raised the living standards of the Arab peoples; had they treated them as equals instead of inferiors—there would have been less ground for Arab nationalism to feed upon. There would have been less difference between Israeli and Arab standards of living, less reason for envy and hatred.

**Strait Path for the Georgians**

We used to be taught *politigramota* or the ABC of (Communist) politics. This would be civics, shall we say, in the States. The Party has now found it necessary to send its members back to school after work hours to prevent them straying too far from the Stalinist path. A new name had to be given to the new schooling. It is called Concrete Economics for short. (Gollan will have to adapt it to English conditions as soon as he gets the hand-outs from Moscow.)

This refresher course in politics is being applied heavily—that is the word—in Stalin's homeland. Trouble is still brewing down there. Neither the bucolic Khrushchov nor the stylish Bulganin ventures to show his person in Georgia. These Georgians are quite as independently minded as the Poles. Your true Georgian, furthermore, wears a handsome dagger like a very prince of Mecca. The Georgians are of all nations the politest. Between Damascus steel and courtliness of behaviour there may be a connexion, but B. & K. fear all Georgians. The ghost of Jugashvili haunts them.

Anyhow, an effort is being made to condition people's minds in Georgia to the destruction of the Great Myth that was Stalin. In *Pravda* (279/13942) its correspondent writes from Tbilisi the capital that thousands of communists are studying this fascinating subject of concrete economics. Our tame C.P.ers here will be delighted to know that:

"Over ten thousand communists have begun the study of political economy and the concrete economics of industry in the Party organizations of Tbilisi. The number of study circles and seminars has more than doubled.

"In addition, two-year economic courses have been set up under the auspices of all district committees of the Party.

"On the request of Communists more than two hundred circles for the study of current politics have been set up; also for the study of the history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, etc." How nice! I.P.

Had they even, last Summer, carried out their promise of loans for the Aswan Dam, the immediate impetus for Nasser's grab of the Canal would not have been provided, and if Russia had not fed the flames, and if providing armaments the appearance of power would not have been there to give Nasser the courage to act.

But imperialists never care about the standards of living of the people they dominate (or their own people at home for that matter). Britain has for decades played a despicable game in the Middle East, playing off Arab against Jew, Jew against Arab. Now she has been joined by Russia, also playing upon the troubles of the poor, for her own imperialistic ends.

In this game of power politics—whether carried out through naked aggression or behind the façade of United Nations legality—only the big powers stand to gain. Small powers are used as the pawns in the game. 'Gallant little

Belgium', Czechoslovakia and Poland, Korea, Middle East and now Hungary—all are used to serve the power struggles of 'great nations', beneath whose marching feet the small nations are destroyed.

Israel for the moment is on the 'right' side—i.e. the winning side. Egypt is being ruthlessly smashed. But the Israelis would do well to remember that the powers that have so cynically used them this week, can turn against them next week.

The Western Powers will not feel they owe any loyalty to Israel once it has served its purpose. Israel may still be branded the aggressor. And whether it is or not, the moment it suits the interests of Britain, France, America or Russia they will destroy Israel as ruthlessly as Egypt has been destroyed.

The real enemies of Arab, Israeli and European alike are the monstrous states which bedevil all our relationships. The peoples of all countries should unite to fight the states of all countries.

**REVIEW**

**An Unknown Educator**

MR. LYWARD'S ANSWER by Michael Burn. Hamish Hamilton, 21s.

THE name of Mr. Lyward is hardly known outside educational circles: it ought to be. Mr. Lyward is a remarkable man, "A life-giver", who, at a country house in Kent, restores mentally sick adolescents to a true knowledge of themselves. His methods are unconventional: at Finchden Manor there is no forced discipline, no corporal punishment, no fixed hours, no bed-time, no fixed terms or holidays, no old boys' ties, no uniforms, no curriculum, and no conventions of correct behaviour. The meals are cooked and served by the boys, the staff are mostly ex-pupils (or patients? it is difficult to find the right word) of Mr. Lyward's. In spite of (or perhaps because of) this lack of the conventional bonds there is a strong sense of community at Finchden:

"What they too artificial [at Finchden] was a self too artificial to have personal relationship with anyone. What they accepted was an idea. 'I run a community' Mr. Lyward wrote . . . of which no-one is expected to be a loyal understanding member. I have had the joy, in consequence, of continually watching a larger proportion of people co-operating, without stimulants, than in any community I have known, where 'community spirit' is preached in and out of season as an ideal, to be achieved by all and sundry from the moment of entry, regardless of their capacity or their prior needs."

There is no definite Lyward method, his approach to each boy differs according to the boy's intelligence and upbringing, and according to the symptoms and suspected causes of his sickness. There are however certain important assumptions which underlie his work. Firstly Mr. Lyward believes in the ability of adolescents to cure themselves, provided they have the right guidance. At Finchden he takes boys of between fourteen and twenty—that is, at an age when the more conventional institutions who cater for delinquents begin to give up hope of a "cure"—and gives them a "respite" from their previous life; a complete change (in the deepest sense)—a change from the routine of lessons, or the routine of institution life, a change from being morally judged, a change from anxious parents.

Secondly, and this is complementary to the first point, Mr. Lyward is an educator. Education, he maintains, means

**SELECTIONS from FREEDOM VOLUMES 1-5**

Covering the years 1951-1955 are available to FREEDOM readers at FIVE SHILLINGS each volume

(The complete set is offered at the Special Price of £1 post free)

**ORDER NOW!**

"a nourishing"; a nourishing of the whole man into fulness by smoothing the transition from childhood to adult life. It is through such education that boys were led "from habit to spontaneity, or unaffectedness, from unhuman perfectionism to imperfect humanity"; that the "accumulating crust [of defensive behaviour] gradually crumbled, the delicate defended heart was gently touched, until the boys began to find their natural way; until in place of a lifeless protocol of obligations, there could grow a spontaneity in human relationships, the revelation that 'I count' into the revelation that other people count . . ."

★

Mr. Burn, the author of this book, is a journalist, a novelist, and a poet, who, after visiting Finchden Manor, was so impressed by what was being done, that he asked to join the staff. While he was there he wrote this account of Mr. Lyward's work. It makes an exciting book, but it is a pity that Mr. Burn's positively poetic enthusiasm and admiration leads him to overstress the uniqueness of Mr. Lyward. He does not suggest that any other persons within this field have worked along similar lines, and although Mr. Lyward's approach differs in a number of important ways from both these pioneers, he has much in common with Homer Lane and A. S. Neill (the former particularly).

However, this criticism apart, it is well worth reading both for being the first detailed account of Finchden and for Mr. Burn's skilful and sympathetic interpretation of it. M.G.W.

**The Function of Science**

Continued from p. 2

which so often turns out to be a mess of mystical suppositions and sentimental worship of the wonders of Nature. The layman who criticises the scientist is often at a disadvantage by the very fact of being a layman, for it is possible to charge him with the sin of technical ignorance. This is where the non-technical anarchist must look to his comrades in the scientific world to contribute their share to the mutual aid among us whereby we and our ideas will and must survive. This article is not an attempt to dictate a line of action but rather it is a call for greater objectivity, less emotionalism and a greater examination of conscience on the part of all those who engage in the battle over the rôles of both Science and Nature. It is also intended plainly to point out that one of the great virtues in all forms of controversy is tolerance.

Envoi

It is not unlikely that a great deal of what has been said may appear to seasoned thinkers as elementary, but it must be borne in mind that it is not only the business of an Anarchist paper to keep going ahead with the times and events; it must also be prepared on occasion to once again go over the elementary ground of current controversies, so that it can attract those of the younger generation who are drawn towards libertarian ideas. Bearing in mind that we live, and are likely to go on living, in a scientific age, it can hardly be objected that a survey of the principal divisions of opinion over scientific matters is of no importance or interest to anarchists—especially the younger ones who may themselves be scientists in the near future.

# THE EGYPTIAN WAR

We wish to make an apology. Five weeks ago we remarked that, although we knew our Government would not make a military attack in defiance of its solemn international obligations, people abroad might think otherwise. The events of last week have proved us completely wrong: if we misled anyone, at home or abroad, we apologise unreservedly. We had not realised that our Government was capable of such folly and such crookedness.

Observer Editorial—  
4th November, 1956.

WE must congratulate *The Observer* on its honesty in this issue, and fervently hope that the public at large will also observe that the Government has always been capable of defying obligations, whether they have been solemn or international, or simply quite ordinary moral ones. And lest it should be thought that we are taking sides we hasten to add that the defiance of obligations has always been a practical necessity for all governments; guided as they are by expediency, which so often runs counter to their supposed beliefs.

Much has happened in the last week; many people who had considered themselves loyal supporters of the Government have been forced to think about the actions which Eden has taken in the Middle East in their name—and having thought have not liked those actions at all. Perhaps this may be the beginning of an era in which people will take the trouble to question their leaders, rather than just follow them unthinkingly, regardless of reason or ethics.

Unfortunately people have become so accustomed to shifting their responsibilities onto the willing shoulders of politicians and then forgetting all about it for five years, that it will require more than one jolt to convince them of the need for thought, and the dangers of allowing political lunatics to imperil the whole world with their suicidal policies.

WE suggested last week, writing before Britain and France embarked upon their policy of aggression in the Middle East, that there might be a "deep-laid plot" between Israel and the British. Everything which has taken place since the original attack has seemed to confirm this, so much so as to make it almost a certainty.

Whatever arguments may be advanced either for or against Israel in her attack upon Egypt, at least there is no question that she has been subjected to provocation over a period of years, and Israeli's have had good reason for being nervous of their security. The existence of Arab hatred for the Jews is beyond question, and no secret has been made by the Arabs of their intention to throw the Jews out of Israel. Feelings on these matters have run higher and higher, and are mutual; border incidents have been a constant reminder of the delicate situation, and it would be absurd to suggest that an attack in one direction or another was not a probability at some time under existing conditions.

Therefore whilst one may deplore the Israeli attack, the reasons for it are to a great extent understandable. However, the blatant gun-boat type of imperialism

in which Britain and France have seen fit to indulge is quite another matter. Under the hypocritical cloak of stopping two small nations from waging war they have thrown in their military forces in the most immoral manner against the country which was actually attacked, and have placed themselves in an ethically indefensible position.

Their reasons for doing so are quite obvious, and their intentions quite plain. To control the Suez Canal and if possible destroy the present Egyptian government, and maintain a firm foothold in the Middle East at whatever cost. There appears to be nothing which can stop the two powers from gaining control over Suez, even if that control is subsequently passed to the United Nations. From a British point of view this would not make much difference since it would still have the desired effect of securing free access through the Canal, and at the same time divide Egypt from the rest of the Arab states. The downfall of Colonel Nasser could then be worked for through diplomatic channels and by economic methods, although his regime is unlikely to survive military defeat.

But there have been other results from British and French actions in the Middle East, results which could have disastrous consequences upon the rest of the world, and in the case of Hungary have, at the very least, contributed to her downfall through the treachery of the U.S.S.R.

Whereas the timing of the attack upon Egypt was carefully calculated, and insofar as Russia was too busily engaged in Europe to take forceful action elsewhere, it is equally true that at the same time Britain and France were too busily engaged with Suez to assist the Hungarians in their struggle for independence.

These facts by themselves were not necessarily decisive however, for the U.S.S.R. might well have hesitated in her own imperialist designs against Hungary if it had not been that both Britain and France were already branded as aggressors before the rest of the world. In effect this gave Russia the lead she wanted, here were two great powers of the West behaving as she wished to behave, two "pillars of the United Nations" acting without sanction from the "parent body" and using the veto for their own evil purposes. No longer could the entire Western world stand horrified at the sight of Russian aggression, for this weakening of the "democratic position" and U.N. gave Russia the weapon she wanted. It did not give her strength for this was not what she required, but it took strength from the opposition, which had the same effect. *Carte blanche* to attack Hungary just as Egypt was being attacked.

But there has been one important factor in this series of crises which quite radically differentiates it from previous ones, that is the American position. Instead of the usual concerted line-up of the Western democracies, the principal power has relegated itself to a relatively minor role. The main reasons for this are not hard to find. First and perhaps foremost is the presidential election (which has not been held at the time of writing—Monday), before which the U.S.A. always becomes particularly isolationist and peace-loving. Secondly, American foreign policy towards the Middle East has differed from that of the British and French for a long time, and for the reason that American interests in the area have also differed.

A good deal of the responsibility for the present Middle East situation rests squarely with Dulles' policy towards Egypt in recent months. The deterioration of American-Egyptian relations does not only belong with Nasser, negotia-

tions on economic aid and the Aswan Dam were the combined responsibility of Nasser and Dulles as well as Britain and the U.N. The differences which eventually came about over the Dulles proposed Suez Canal Users' Association (whether it was right or wrong) were the culmination of a considerable amount of American shilly-shallying.

It is not our intention to try to shield the British Government by mentioning these facts, but to point out that America's present innocent and sanctimonious attitude, through the U.N. and in statements to the world at large, cannot in fact be ethically justified. It is simply that she finds herself without the same interests as Britain and France and therefore sees no reason to adopt the same line.

Since the U.S.A. is well-endowed with her own resources of oil and is geographically situated many thousands of miles from Europe and the Middle East, it is irresistible for her to play the role of peace-lover, even though, in the words of an eminent American diplomat, we "... can only pillory our oldest friends before world opinion ...". Besides if Britain cannot obtain sufficient oil through the Suez Canal she must purchase it from America for dollars!

It would seem at this time (a ceasefire has just been ordered in Port Said), that the Egyptian war (which Eden likes to call an "armed conflict") will not last for very long. Presumably British and French troops will occupy the Suez Canal strip until such time as a United Nations force takes over, the Israelis will sleep more peacefully at night and Colonel Nasser's prestige will be lost or sorely shaken. If the U.N. refuses to take over custody of the Canal it is unlikely that Britain and France will leave.

After Tuesday's American election, if as is probable Eisenhower is re-elected, we may expect to hear a more vociferous America. But we may also anticipate hearing more from Russia.

Theoretically they should adopt similar attitudes in relation to the Suez Canal, but the problem is complicated by the fact that America and Russia have for so long disagreed on almost every issue, that agreement now is unlikely, particularly in view of developments in Hungary. Neither is it likely that America will continue to reckon it in her overall interests to split the Western alliance at this time.

## People in the Streets

sanctimonious about 'gallant little Hungary' as *Pravda* is about 'gallant little Egypt'. But peace has gone on long enough (because one doesn't count Korea, Indochina, Malaya, Kenya, North Africa or Cyprus), for people to welcome a change. You can see this on any railway book-stall. It isn't thrillers or science-fiction any more, it is War Stories. Any old book of reminiscences of

# THE H-BOMB Heed These Warnings!

WITH talks of a third World War emanating from the present plight of Hungary, we would do well to heed the warnings of responsible scientists against the effects of continued H-bomb tests, and to do more than merely consider the horrifying results if these weapons were used in warfare.

In this respect we can more or less discount the electioneering expedients of Adlai Stevenson who, without much of a policy with which to appear different from the Republicans, has evoked the argument opposing further H-bomb tests. But, even he may be shaken by the support he might get on this issue, thus compelling him to try and do something about it should he get elected! He can, however, always say that the political situation has changed in such a way to make such an action ill-advised (as we remarked in *FREEDOM*, Nov. 3).

Ritchie Calder, writing in the *News Chronicle* (October 19) gives some impressive data on the effects of radioactive substances already being felt as a consequence of H-bomb testing, and his pertinent observation that we cannot leave judgment on this issue to politicians—"who are prepared to hazard the human race just to prove they can make bigger and better Hell-bombs than the other people"—we hope will not go unheeded.

When in Britain—12,000 miles from the Pacific bomb-test regions—we find our Atomic Age babies with traces in their bones of radioactive strontium (which Stevenson has called "the most dreadful poison in the world") and when we find even bigger concentrations in the bones of sheep innocently pasturing on the hills of West Wales, we ordinary people should cry "Halt!"

But radioactive strontium continues to emit dangerous rays for at least 28 years.

The dangers inherent in the Hungarian tragedy depend largely upon the attitude taken up through the U.N. by America. They could fizzle out and Hungary be sacrificed on the altar of expediency, or a situation could be brought about which might lead to the crisis which the whole world fears most of all—direct conflict between the forces of the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. If Hungary is sacrificed, as is probable, more will be made of Egypt, Israel and the Suez Canal.

Every time a hydrogen bomb is tested—no matter how high up in the air—more strontium and other dangerous radioactive substances are spread through the world's atmosphere.

It comes back to earth at a rate of about 10 per cent. per annum—still "kicking", still putting dangerous radioactivity into bones.

And the Welsh sheep will eat the grass contaminated by radioactive dust and it will get into the water we drink and into the food we eat.

That is what we have got to remember when, ignoring the special pleading of generals and politicians and their hiring "experts"...

Future generations are at risk, but so are present populations. These radioactive poisons can kill by stealth. They can—as in the case of enough radiostrontium—cause bone cancers...

The Devil's Auction goes on. The Americans make a bid. The Russians take it up. The British, next year from Christmas Island, are prepared to drop two to four H-bombs.

And so we shall go on—outbidding.

More competitors, more frequent and bigger bombs.

When Admiral Lewis Strauss, Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Commission, justifies America's continuation of tests in the following terms—"the current series of tests have produced much of importance not only from a military point of view, but from a humanitarian aspect"—we can no longer regard such people as entirely sane. Calder points out that what Strauss meant was that they had reduced the hazards of widespread fall-out, "the radioactive dust which burned the 23 Japanese fishermen two years ago". Calder endorses the view, only much more strongly, of a member of the Congress Committee on Atomic Energy, who said: "To issue this statement a distortion of fact was necessary".

Elsewhere in this issue we call upon the British people to organise themselves against the policies being carried out in their name in Egypt and elsewhere. Let it be a combined purpose—a general strike to end the lunacy.

## 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.

NOV. 11—Tony Gibson on  
BASTARDS

NOV. 18—Harold Walsby on  
ASPECTS OF AUTOMATION

Questions, Discussion and Admission  
all free.

### OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting  
HYDE PARK  
Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

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

### MEETINGS IN SHEFFIELD

Every Sunday at 8 p.m., outdoor  
meetings are held by the Sheffield  
Libertarian Forum at BARKER'S POOL

### Malatesta Club

### AFRICAN FORUM MEETING

ISLAM & POLITICS IN AFRICA

by Prof. Thomas Hodgkin

(of Oxford University)

NOVEMBER 13 at 7.30 p.m.

## FREEDOM PRESS

SELECTIONS FROM FREEDOM  
Vol. 1, 1951, *Mankind is One*  
Vol. 2, 1952, *Postscript to Posterity*  
Vol. 3, 1953, *Colonialism on Trial*  
Vol. 4, 1954, *Living on a Volcano*  
Vol. 5, 1955, *The Immoral Moralists*  
each volume paper 7s. 6d.  
cloth 10s. 6d.

The paper edition of the Selections is available to readers of *FREEDOM* at 5/- a copy

VOLINE:  
*Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed)* cloth 12s. 6d.  
*The Unknown Revolution*  
(Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21)  
cloth 12s. 6d.

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

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

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

RUDOLF ROCKER:  
*Nationalism and Culture* cloth 21s.

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

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)

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

## Do You Believe Us?

SEVENTY years of Freedom Press

No less  
And what is achieved?  
Is FREEDOM believed?  
At a guess ...  
More or less

Whether you believe what is written in these columns or not you probably think it would be a pity if *FREEDOM* couldn't keep going. For 70 years the pounds, shillings and pence of ordinary people have kept *Freedom Press* going. Wouldn't it be a pity to enter our 71st year with such a whacking deficit?

## PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!

WEEK 44  
Deficit on Freedom £880  
Contributions received £733  
DEFICIT £147

October 26 to November 1  
Exmouth: A.B.H. 4/-; Frieth: I.I. 5/-; London: K.M. 10/-; London: F.L. 2/-; Dundee: A.S.L.R. 5s; Glasgow: Anon. 2/6; London: Hyde Park Sympathisers, 3/-; London: H.M.\* 1/6.  
Total ... 6 8 0  
Previously acknowledged ... 727 10 9  
1956 TOTAL TO DATE ... £733 18 9

GIFTS OF BOOKS: London: C.W.; London: Anon.; London: M.C.

\*Indicates regular contributors.

the last war is sure of a new market in the *Pan* or *Corgi* series which now have a list of titles about war as long as your arm. If you don't believe me, have a look. Nor is it without significance that a new magazine started publication this month, *Combat: True War Stories*. "Britain's top *Action Magazine*", it says on the cover of Volume 1, No. 1.

We often make use of such aphorisms as "War is the trade of Governments" or Randolph Bourne's remark that "War is the Health of the State", in this paper. But the truth is much worse. It is that war and the idea of war fulfil a need in the twentieth-century mass society that it is not satisfied by any other form of excitement. "We were busy mopping-up terrorists in Cyprus, but this is what we really came for," said a paratrooper to a reporter before he dropped at Port Said. And the dear old folks at home got such a thrill. This is what is known as loyalty, or by Freud as the death-wish.

IN the wartime essay of Alex Comfort's from which I quoted at the head of this column, he wrote: "Up till now, it has been an article of pride among English politicians that the public would shove its head into any old noose they might show it—unflinching steadfast patriotism, unshakeable morale—obedience and an absence of direct action."

That this is still true is shown by the events of the last fortnight. And the limits set to the opposition by the 'Opposition' show that it is their assumption too. And the public? Thirty thousand demonstrated, and two million turned out to see the old crocks' race.