

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"Of all social theories Anarchism alone steadfastly proclaims that society exists for man, not man for society."

—EMMA GOLDMAN.

HUNGARY

A HELPLESS GOVERNMENT

THE immediate fate of Hungary is still not settled. In spite of the (not unexpected) betrayal by Russia and the attempt to drown the revolt in blood, it still seems as though the impossible is happening. The Hungarian people are not accepting the inevitability of defeat; they are making the Russian military interventionists fight every inch of the way.

At the time of writing, the mass of Soviet armour has done no more than provide a semblance of order without depth. Russian tanks control the bridges, crossroads and key points of Budapest, but in every side street there remain the people in arms. And apparently every night the bulk of the tanks have to withdraw from the city, for the tactics the Hungarians have evolved for dealing with them make the night too hot.

The main weapons in the hands of the Russians now are food and time. Now that it is clear there will be no intervention by the Western Powers, the Russians can afford to sit and wait for the Hungarians to be starved back to work.

For although the invaders have been able to get on top in the military sense, they have not been able to persuade the Hungarian workers to go back to work. The general strike throughout the country has been solid in effect for a fortnight, and the inability of the Russian forces to use the ordinary labour

force of the country has seriously hampered them. So far only a very small minority of workers are reporting for work, and those do so only to obtain the food for their families with which they are being tempted back.

The last moves at the 'top', as we go to press, are that a top-rank deputisation of Soviet leaders (said to include Khrushchev, Mikoyan and Suslov) have arrived in Budapest and are attempting to persuade Imre Nagy to come out of the Yugoslav embassy where he is sheltering, to form a new government on a national basis. The Moscow-nominated Janos Kadar who replaced Nagy when the Red Army came back has been left severely alone. He is unable to find anybody willing to support him in a government—except those of the hated secret police who managed to escape the wrath of the people in the first week and came back to Budapest behind the Russian tanks.

Kadar has no civil police—they are on strike with the people!—no army, no civil service. He has only the remains of the secret police and Russian tanks.

Even Khrushchev realises that these are not quite enough with which to govern, and that the only chance he has of retaining anything out of the chaos is to bring back someone like Nagy who is accept-

able to the people even though still a Communist. But whether Nagy is prepared to come out while Soviet forces are still in the country, or Khrushchev withdraw his forces before a puppet government is firmly established, remains to be seen.

THE STRENGTH OF THE PEOPLE

THE one determining factor in the whole confused situation is simply—the strength of the people.

RELIEF for HUNGARY

IT has been suggested that a relief column manned by the anti-communist left be organised to go to Hungary. This is a way in which anarchists could give a practical demonstration of solidarity towards the Hungarian people in their hour of need, and we should very much like to see one or two anarchist units.

Ambulances, supplies and equipment will be supplied by the Red Cross, if crews can be formed. A crew must consist of two drivers, two orderlies and one person with medical qualifications—either a doctor or male-nurse.

Anyone offering their services must be prepared to go at very short notice.

ANY VOLUNTEERS?

Please write or phone Freedom Press—quickly.

Out of the smoke and dust of the battle have emerged four factors which have given the people the strength to resist the might of the Kremlin.

1. *Their organising genius.* From the very beginning, inexperienced youth and untrained workers have shown themselves capable of organising production and distribution. Liaison between various parts of the country, radio communication with the outside world, transport, distribution of food, first-aid—all this was organised at the same time as the armed struggle was disrupting ordinary life. People who had never had responsibility before showed themselves capable of the highest social responsibility.

2. *Their solidarity.* All sections of the community joined in the common struggle. The traditional tight-fisted individualism of the peasant, for example, was shown to be no more than the countryman's dislike of being bossed by the town, for when the townsfolk rose against the government they found the peasants were not slow in joining them. Peasants who a fortnight before had been telling the government collectors that they had no produce to spare were coming into the towns and giving away food to the students' and workers' committees, to the housewives and the hospitals.

From the very first the army was on the side of the people. Likewise the ordinary police. University students and professors, intellectuals and workers, old housewives and young children—all joined wholeheartedly in the common struggle.

3. *Their heroism.* It is impossible to tell how exaggerated or not are the many stories of heroism that have come out of Hungary. There are many incidents quoted of teen-agers tying grenades to their belts and throwing

themselves under tanks. But it is officially admitted that over one hundred Soviet tanks have been destroyed in Budapest alone. This could not have been done without the highest degree of courage on the part of mostly untrained youngsters equipped only with small arms. It is clear that once again the tremendous uplift of the spirit which a revolution releases has produced behaviour and uncovered courage which can only be described as heroic.

4. *Disaffection among Soviet troops.* A weapon which a revolutionary people can use, but not a State army, is the appeal to the conscience of the soldiers of the enemy. One reason why the massive Soviet forces in Hungary have been unable to crush the rebellion has clearly been that the Russian soldiers have no heart for such a struggle.

Many reports have been received of Soviet tank crews refusing to fight. Some have set fire to their own tanks. At least one case is reported of a tank crew being shot by their officer for refusing to fire.

As soon as they reached Hungary the Soviet forces could see that what they had been told about a 'Fascist counter-revolution' was a lie.

All the factors which make for a successful popular revolution have been present in Hungary. We can only hope that they will have learned the lessons that stand out in all this. That governments are helpless without the support of the people; that the people can organise themselves to run society whenever they so choose.

Whatever regime follows the present one in Hungary, there must be many who will never forget the lessons they themselves demonstrated so well.

Demonstrations, For What?

THE Hungarian tragedy is being used by quite a number of doubtful characters as a stick with which to beat the 'communists'. Enough has been said in FREEDOM about the brutality of Russian militarism in Hungary to make our position quite clear, but it would be foolish to suppose that all the protests which are heard in Britain at the moment from a number of elements are motivated by love of liberty.

A numerically impressive demonstration at Hyde Park last Sunday may have been supported by a few genuine people, but as far as we can verify the meeting was inspired by 'Common Cause', an organisation which is solely anti-communist and is reputed to have Sir Oswald Mosley on its executive committee.

The British student is not renowned for his political acumen, but they were in predominance at Hyde Park on Sunday shouting slogans which were not designed to usher in the free society; "burn the reds" has certain familiar connections and is reminiscent of heretic hunting in the middle ages.

An occasion like this, which for the Hungarians taking part in the uprising is real and tragic, creates a situation whereby all sorts of people can be encouraged by those with a vested interest to 'let off steam' under the guise of freedom slogans. Attempting to smash up the Communist Party London headquarters in King Street (windows made of glass brick four inches thick) will not help the cause of the Hungarians, nor will book-burning eradicate the crimes of the 'communists' or make the world a better place to live in.

Let us remember that many anti-communists of to-day were their supporters of yesterday in the respectable days of the party. Students who can be used for undisciplined rioting against communists can easily turn their attention to any organisation which is genuine in its attempt to make a social revolution.

Rational persuasion may take longer and may be less exciting for the neurotic, but it is necessary before a decent society can be built.

EGYPT—Another War to End War!

"We Went to War to Explode Nasser and Consolidate the Canal: We have Consolidated Nasser and Exploded the Canal"

THE Anglo-French-Israeli armed *coup* has failed as a result of a curious combination of forces which have been brought to bear on the aggressor governments. We do not wish to underestimate the force of world public opinion, and in particular that section of public opinion in this country which has condemned Britain's action in forceful terms. Compared with the virtual silence in Israel and France, the reaction in this country is perhaps the one healthy and positive aspects of this otherwise sordid affair. But it seems

Israeli 'Objectives'

A FORTNIGHT before Israel struck, Ben-Gurion had declared to the world that his country would never start a preventive war. At that time he had already set on foot the partial (?) mobilisation of Israel's forces, and when Eisenhower communicated to Ben-Gurion his "grave concern" at the information he had received that Israel was "now almost fully mobilised" (Oct. 27) the explanation given by the Israeli Ambassador was that it was no more than "intensified vigilance and preparedness" in view of the hostile attitude to Israel by her Arab neighbours and the increased activity of Egyptian commandos. After the attack was launched an Israel Foreign Office spokesman was reported as saying that

Israeli forces would return after mopping up the Egyptian fedayeen (commando) bases in the Sinai Peninsula. That alone was the intention of the operation.

(Manchester Guardian 31/10/56).

Yet according to the N.Y. Times

clear that the cease-fire and Israel's acceptance of the U.N. order to withdraw to her frontiers are the result of political, and in Israel's case economic pressures which the British and French could not easily ignore. Russian threats may have been pure bluff but how could Eden and Mollet be sure. Their own duplicity must have given them much to ponder over in assessing the value of the Russian warnings.

To decide whether the *coup* failed one should first establish what were the objectives of the aggressors.

correspondent with the Israeli forces,

Within four days of taking over the Sinai Peninsula and the Gaza Strip, Israel had started integrating the conquered territory into the nation.

Already workmen are busy laying new railroad tracks between Israel territory and Gaza. These tracks were torn up in 1948 when the Gaza Strip went to Egypt. Service between Tel Aviv and the northern end of the Gaza-Cairo railway is expected to be ready by Dec. 1.

As Israeli army units were cleaning out the last pockets of fedayeen (commando) squads between here and the Suez Canal zone, plans were being formulated in the Gaza Strip to make the switchover from Egyptian currency to Israeli money. A representative of the Israeli Ministry of Finance is due in Gaza to work out the details of the exchange.

Israel's intentions regarding the Sinai Peninsula were confirmed by Ben-Gurion himself in his speech to the Knesset on November 7, in which he declared that on no account would Israel allow any foreign or United Nations police-force to enter

the occupied areas of the Sinai Peninsula and then he went on to use what the *Manchester Guardian's* correspondent in Tel-Aviv calls "beguiling species of scholarly mumbo jumbo" to prove that Sinai was not really part of Egypt anyway and that the island of Tiran which had been a Jewish island up to 1,400 years ago had in fact only been "liberated". The following day in a broadcast Ben-Gurion announced Israel's willingness to withdraw from the Sinai Peninsula and in reply to a new message from Eisenhower in which it was pointed out that Israel policy might impair "the friendly co-operation between our two coun-

tries" Ben-Gurion expressed his support of a United Nations force in the Middle East and declared: "We have never planned to annex the Sinai desert". To Eisenhower's implied economic squeeze, and Anglo-French warnings that in the event of Russian direct intervention or the dispatch of "volunteers" they would not be able to come to Israel's aid, Ben-Gurion was obliged to eat his words and the trigger-happy section of the Israeli population must for the time being console themselves counting the military booty (estimated at £16 millions) captured in their so-called mopping up operations.

British 'Objectives'

WHAT of the British government's objectives? They are somewhat difficult to assess, officially, that is, since the justifications for the attack on Egypt—the war that he was at pains to explain was not a war but an "armed conflict"—seems to change from day to day, and from Minister to Minister!

On October 30 he justified the issuing of an ultimatum to Israel and Egypt on the grounds that

very grave issues are at stake, and unless hostilities can quickly be stopped free passage through the canal will be jeopardised. Moreover, any fighting on the banks of the canal would endanger the ships actively on passage. The number of crews and passengers involved totals many hundreds, and the value of the ships which are likely to be on passage is about £50 millions, excluding the value of the cargoes.

The following day he told the House: "In the actions we have now taken we are not concerned to stop

Egypt but to stop war", a statement which was greeted by "Ironic Opposition laughter and Ministerial cheers".

Again in the Debate on November 1 the Prime Minister declared:

We do not seek to impose by force a solution on the Israel-Egypt dispute—(Labour members: "What are you doing then?")—or the Suez Canal dispute—(Labour members: "No?")—or any other dispute in that area.

We do not seek to negotiate by ourselves alone, on any one of these disputes. The whole purpose of the Anglo-French intervention is to stop hostilities—(Labour members: "By starting them?")—and to prevent a resumption of them and to safeguard traffic through the canal.

Israel and Egypt were locked in conflict. The first and urgent task was to separate the combatants and stabilize the position. That was our purpose. If the United Nations would then be willing to take over the physical task of main-

London Anarchist Group Lecture on BASTARDS

QUITE a number of people connected with the anarchist movement are technically bastards because their parents have had more sense than to turn their free unions into what has aptly been described as Holy Deadlock. The term "bastard" however has a quite other significance nowadays. "Bastard" is one of the most offensive terms of insult among the working class; in this sense it means a hated enemy, someone regarded with loathing, fear or contempt.

It is interesting how many words in contemporary speech have a similar double function. The common word by which the act of consummation of physical love is designated is held to be so coarse that it cannot even appear in print—yet it is constantly and endlessly repeated by manual workers in their everyday speech without the slightest sexual significance. Many such words serve two functions which appear to have little logical connection. So it is with the word "bastard"; its double meaning reveals the psychological conflict which has been suffered, principally by the working class, with the evolution of our present form of society. The study of that conflict illuminates contemporary social strains, and the anarchist movement which contains many who are bastards in the legal sense, is interested in investigating these social strains. We are not, like the Marxists, solely interested in property relations; we are interested in all aspects of social dynamics and can throw a good deal of light on mechanisms of social change by the study of human problems which are largely neglected by political theorists.

The term bastard was not always one which had an unpleasant, dichotomous significance. In bygone times when marriage was still regarded as a legislative imposition of the Church, the common people had their children with little regard for lawful wedlock. Wedlock had its uses in the confirmation of the legal enforcement of inheritance of property, but to those possessing little property, it might simply serve to confer the servile state of villeinage on those who otherwise might be regarded as free. The legal wife and children of a villain were saddled with the bond of serfdom. For the upper classes marriage was arranged

according to the alliances of families, and not according to the natural wishes of the partners. Bastards were therefore more often the issue of free and voluntary unions and favoured by their parents more than legitimate offspring who were simply the outcome of doing one's duty. Figures like the Bastard of Burgundy had no shame in their title; it declared the independence of their origins of the sordid alliances of property or the political dominance of the Church. In Shakespeare's *King Lear* we have Edmund proudly boasting of his bastardy:

"Bastard—wherefore base?
Who in the lusty stealth of nature,
take
More composition and fierce quality
Than doth, within a dull, stale, tired
bed
Go to the creating of a whole tribe
of fops,
Got 'tween asleep and wake? Well
then
Legitimate Edgar, I must have your
land;
Our father's love is to the bastard
Edmund . . .
Now Gods, stand up for bastards!"

In later times, when serfdom had been abolished, marriage had no longer the snags attached to villeinage, and it became the usual accompaniment of domestic unions. In spite of the censure of the Church, however, bastardy did not become a shameful thing until the social changes wrought by the industrial revolution took effect. Since Tudor times the Church and State gained in power to coerce people into legitimate unions, but this power was applied most haphazardly. We read in Parson Woodforde's diary:

"1768 I married Tom Burge of Ansford to Charity Andrews of Castle Cary by Licence this morning. The Parish of Cary made him marry her and he came handbolting to the church for fear of his running away."

Yet as late as 1834 the Poor Law Commissioners found that in village life bastardy was perfectly well accepted. In some countries one baby in six was born out of wedlock. The fact was that the old tradition that children were to some extent the responsibility of communal care and not entirely that of their individual parents, meant that women could

raise a family with no permanent husband and look to the village community to see that her children did not want. The horrified Poor Law Commissioners found that a woman with several bastard children was even at a slight economic advantage over her 'respectable' neighbour as far as parish maintenance went. They reported:

"A bastard child is thus 25% more valuable to a parent than a legitimate one. The premium upon want of chastity is here very obvious . . . It is considered a good speculation to marry a woman who can bring a fortune of one or two bastards to her husband."

The ethos of industrial capitalism held that children were the sole responsibility of their parents, and if their parents were incapable of providing for them in times of trade depression then the whole family should be torn apart and individually segregated in the workhouses. Mixed with the utilitarianism of this capitalist philosophy was the spirit of Malthus. The Malthusians held that children were a danger to society as an unchecked growth of population threatened to bring famine. Malthus pointed out that in the past the growth of population had always been controlled by "natural checks" such as epidemic disease, war and local crop failures; as civilized man aimed to overcome these checks he must limit the growth of population. It is interesting to note the manner in which such limitation was proposed; even though mechanical contraception was by no means unknown (Francis Place campaigned for its wider use in the 1820's) the Malthusians in general directed their efforts against the sexual life of the working class. Continence and late marriage were advocated as the Malthusian remedy for population growth. The indigent man and wife were segregated in the workhouse where they would have no chance of copulation, and their children were taken from them to be brought up with the full stigma of pauperdom. A child's right to be born was very questionable—it depended upon the size of his father's purse.

In such a repressive and anti-sexual climate it is little wonder that the bastard became the most miserable creature on earth. It was assumed that no man would support a woman or children unless he was compelled by law to do so,

and few women could support children by their own earnings. The bastard child had simply no right to life, and if he died at an early age in the untender care of the workhouse, no particular injustice was felt to be done. A noble lord in his defence of the continued use of climbing boys for sweeping chimneys in spite of the high rate of their death, used the argument that such boys were not usually the sons of respectable working class families but were bastards and therefore did not merit ordinary humanity in view of their sinful origin.

Bastardy among the working class, although not so very uncommon in Victorian Britain, was associated with the worst of social evils, and the word "bastard" became a swear-word. A swear-word is of course an invocation of evil: when the Victorian workman called his powerful boss a "bastard" he did not mean it to be descriptive; he was calling down the curse of all misery on the head of his enemy.

It is interesting to note that the shameful misery of bastardy was essentially a working class phenomenon. The upper and middle classes by virtue of their economic security did not need to attach the same slur to those born out of wedlock. The literature at various periods is some indication of social attitudes. Jane Austen's Harriett Smith in *Emma* was a bastard but that did not preclude her from being accepted in genteel society. Dickens' middle class heroines were sometimes required to be bastards to make the plot interesting but his working class girls had to be legitimate to be respectable. Upper and middle class bastardy was an interesting theme for novelists of course because of its relevance to the inheritance of property; working class bastardy might throw a child into the gutter or the workhouse, but among the propertied classes it simply precluded the child from inheritance of titles or the inherited property rights as legitimate children. "Bastard!" has never really become a meaningful term of abuse for the upper status groups of society. There is a famous military family which bears the name of Bastard without a blush. Now although one can safely call oneself Lieut.-Colonel Bastard without an eyebrow being raised in the officers' mess, if there were a Lance Corporal Bastard the unfortunate N.C.O. would have the mickey taken out of him so constantly that he would have to change his name.

To-day legitimate status is often conferred on children by the ritual of Holy Deadlock, or its civil form, much in the same way that baptism is sometimes conferred on them by agnostic parents "just

in case". The practice of baptism is less common nowadays than it used to be, but parents who couldn't care less about religion sometimes have their infants baptised because they feel that anyhow it does no harm and the unbaptised state somehow makes the child peculiar. (I have not yet come across parents who insist upon Rabbinical circumcision as well so that their boy has a *carte d'entrée* everywhere). I am not so sure that baptism is so completely harmless: not so long ago I was at the hospital beside of a dying comrade who had to declare firmly (and untruthfully) that he had never been baptised, to keep at bay a Roman priest who was flapping about in the background like an expectant vulture.

The question of parents tying themselves together by marriage to confer legitimacy on their children seems to me to be a very questionable procedure. The legal tie between the parents is no benefit in itself to children; in practice if parents wish to separate they do so and the possessiveness which legal 'rights' over children engenders does nothing but harm. A woman who has her children out of wedlock has absolute right of maternity, no court can take them from her as in those distressing divorce proceedings where the court removes them to the custody of the 'wronged' husband—or divides them morally between two hostile ex-partners. The whole weight of evidence goes to show that in the years of dependency, children need the security of the maternal tie. The intervention of the law on behalf of the father's 'rights' to break this tie, is responsible for grave injury to the personality development in the child.

Young couples may say "But we couldn't separate—so we might as well marry for the sake of the children's legitimacy." To them one can only point out that if they could never separate, then the legal tie is quite redundant and the 'legitimacy' of their children quite meaningless.

We are told that an unbaptised babe cannot enter Heaven but goes to Limbo; a babe unsanctified by parental marriage also has one limitation too—he can never enter the House of Lords as a peer. But unless he intends to tread the path of Lord Attlee however, he will find the Limbo of common humanity pretty wide. G.

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 . . .

Picasso Frank Elgar 25/-
From the Other Shore
Alexander Herzen 15/-
A Way of Life
Peter Wildeblood 18/-
Second-Hand . . .
The Arab Awakening
George Antonius 3/6
Views and Reviews
(second series) Havelock Ellis 3/-
Blindness Henry Green 6/-
Across the River and into the
Trees Ernest Hemingway 3/6
The Goslings Upton Sinclair 4/6
History of Liberty in Germany
Rudolf Olden 2/6
Quite Early One Morning
Dylan Thomas 3/6
Six Seamen Mike Pell 2/-
Soviet Success Hewlett Johnson 2/6
The Bloody Traffic
Fenner Brockway 3/-
Imperialism J. A. Hobson 3/6
The Problem Family A. S. Neill 3/6
The Beautiful and Damned
F. Scott Fitzgerald 3/6
The Town Traveller
George Gissing 3/-
Crime and Punishment
Fedor Dostoevsky 3/6
When God Laughs Jack London 3/6
Essays and Lectures P. B. Shelley 3/6
The Road Jack London 3/6
News from Nowhere
William Morris 3/-

Pamphlets . . .

Middle East Crisis
Roy Sherwood 6d.
Egypt: Cross Road on a World
Highway Hugh J. Schonfield 4d.

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

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

PEOPLE AND IDEAS

In Leeds and York

"O, lead me not to Leeds."

—G. K. CHESTERTON.

YOU could hardly blame him, but isn't it an extraordinary thing that if you are asked to name a beautiful city, you think of some sleepy old town, bypassed by history, which contributes nothing to the country's economic life; while if you hear the name of one of the West Riding towns on whose activities our everyday comfort and affluence depend, you immediately think of mean and squalid drabness, 'dark satanic mills' and back-to-back houses on a sooty hillside? Even in decline the towns of the middle ages and the 18th century testify that they were built by people who would understand Lethaby's remark that the purpose of civilisation "is to build beautiful cities and to live in them beautifully". Even in prosperity the manufacturing towns tell us that they were built to house a race of industrial slaves, by people who thought that the whole purpose of civilisation was to make money and to make it quickly.

The woollen industry needed an area where soft water and a source of power occurred together, and found it where the rivers flow swiftly eastwards from the Pennines to join the Ouse, where the wool came from the Yorkshire Dales and Wolds. As the industrial revolution developed the motive power changed from water to coal and the fleeces came from all over the world, but the industry remained localised, and to-day four fifths of the country's woollen manufacture is concentrated in the conurbation of 1½ million people centred on Leeds and Bradford. To a stranger the wool towns look much alike apart from the size, the principal differences between them being their function in the industry—the manufacture of the heavier, carded woollens (serge, tweed, flannels and blankets) in Huddersfield, Leeds and Dewsbury, and the combing and spinning of worsteds in the Bradford and Halifax areas. Bradford is also of course a world wool market, and Leeds is the centre for the other industries serving textiles—machinery of all sorts, and a chemical industry pro-

viding soap, bleaching materials and dyes, and using the greases washed out of the wool.

Bradford seemed to me more attractive than Leeds; it isn't quite so enormous (300,000 as against 500,000 people), it is surrounded by wide high moors, and there seemed less sulphur in the air (it now has 20 'smokeless zones' covering 1,500 acres). But looking round a city of that size I couldn't begin to find an answer to the rather vague and portentous questions I was asking. Is Bradford a community? Does it provide those facilities for the 'good life' which begin where the amenities you pay for in the rates leave off? I bought a copy of the glossy magazine *Yorkshire Life* which was asking the question "what is wrong with Bradford?" Mr. J. B. Priestly was trying to answer it. "I cannot help feeling", he wrote:

"that the Bradford of my late teens offered an eager youngster, ready to try anything from Sophocles at the old Theatre Royal to the Alfresco Pavilion, from Nikisch and Richter at St. George's Hall to low comics at the Palace . . . a wider and richer choice than he has today. (I grant you the Civic Theatre, but to make up for what has dropped out of its life, Bradford ought to be happily running a Civic three times the size, twenty times as well-off). Also I have a suspicion that 45 years ago that teenage Bradfordians had a far better chance of meeting some interesting people, some ripe and original characters". And he concluded, looking at his native city to-day:

"No more bow-legs, rotting teeth, monstrously fat women, cadaverously unhealthy men, clogs and shawls, dirty scarves and caps, screams and curses and broken crockery late on Saturday back o't mill. Everybody taller, stronger, handsomer, healthier, with cars and refrigerators on the way, and the Groves, Mrs. Dale and Lady Barnett on tap. It's all nearly as good now as a town in the Middle-West. Indeed, it has only to lose another theatre and music-hall, a few more enterprises concerned with books, painting, and that sort of thing, to pull down two or three more old taverns and real shops to make room for more chain stores, to say goodbye for

ever to another hundred or two genuinely original characters, to be almost exactly like a town in the Middle-West".

★

I FELT still more perplexed in Leeds.

What generalisations can you make about a city that covers sixty square miles? It didn't seem like a town in the Middle-West but simply another great cosmopolitan city like Manchester or London, except that there is less to do on a wet Sunday afternoon. Leeds is the commercial and financial centre of Yorkshire, it is the home of the ready-made clothing trade, it is a university city, and it made a great deal of money out of the war. The older buildings in the city are so deeply clad in soot that they look as though they are cut out of black velvet. The *Leeds Journal* published last month a 144-page supplement on "Clean Air" in which it was declared that "Leeds intends to waste no time in translating policy into practice". It has wasted too much time already.

In the thirties an effort was made to tidy up the centre of Leeds by large-scale demolition and the forming of a new 80 foot wide street, The Headrow, leading eastwards from the great black town hall. All the buildings on the north side of this street "must conform to one architectural style" the style being that which Mr. Osbert Lancaster christened "Banker's Georgian". At the far end of the Headrow is the huge block of flats called Quarry Hill, the biggest in Europe when built just before the war covering 23 acres and housing 939 families. If you have a copy of the Penguin book *Design* you will see on the cover a photograph of the gleaming white model of Quarry Hill. It doesn't look like that now. It is grey at the top and black at the bottom. Although 82% of the site is open space, none of the open areas are large enough or isolated enough to permit children to play without annoying someone, and the grass doesn't grow on the lawns. At first sight a visitor would say that Leeds Corporation had pulled down its back-to-back slums only to

Continued on p. 3

IF . . .

AS if world events were not depressing enough it becomes harder than ever to speak to people who do not share at least some of one's own views on what it is all about. From right to left every-one talks of politics and current affairs at every opportunity—this in itself is a good thing, a welcome relief from self-satisfied apathy, but there is an objection—all are on the side of one government or another; all are vainly trying to prove the other government the cause of the trouble; all are making invidious comparisons, one government against another.

These comparisons and preferences are the expression of patriotism, nationalism and partisanship; the special pleading of those who always have to identify themselves with one of the sides, even though both may be wrong. Much is made of the fact that one side is more in the wrong than the other, is committing worse atrocities than the other, killing more, starving more, destroying more.

There seems to be some mechanism of the human mind which automatically switches itself from the tragic plane of events into the safer backwaters of commonplace thought—perhaps it is a form of escapism from the harsh realities which beset us all around—or more likely still, the only avenue of escape from a conscience which will not face the issue nor accept a share of the guilt.

The current of events is concerned with people—human beings of flesh and blood, who live and die, fight and suffer—it is not concerned with governments. Governments of whatever creed or form are institutions of power, they act according to a pattern and their actions take effect in various ways. All are guided by expediency and none count the cost in terms of human life or human happiness. Their actions are not relative to one another but have effects which are either good or bad.

The havoc which assails us from every direction in this world has mostly been created by governments in what they deem to be their interests; but the harvest of desolation and despair is gathered by people who have no choice of action, no stake to gain and little chance to win.

If we would speak of those things which are important for us all, of the issues which affect us all—if we would condemn all institutions which wield blind power over us regardless of our interests—if we subordinated partisanship to reasoned thought, withdrew support from either side. If . . .

S.B.

THE COMMUNIST PRESS ON HUNGARY GOLLAN IS LATE

Egypt Continued from p. 1

taining peace in that area, nobody would be better pleased than ourselves. (Ministerial cheers.) Police action there must be to separate the combatants and prevent a resumption of hostilities.

A week later Mr. Head, Minister of Defence was telling the House, as if it had been clear to them from the beginning, that:

the Canal cannot and must not be solely the concern of the Egyptian government (Labour shouts of "Oh"). That is what all this has been about.

The following day Mr. Thorneycroft, President of the Board of Trade, winding up for the Government declared that,

French 'Objectives'

THE French government, perhaps because its action in Egypt has met with little public opposition (apart from the Communists who are in any case thoroughly discredited by Russia's military intervention in Hungary) has adopted a much more brazen attitude throughout.

"Highly responsible and well-informed circles here—wrote the *N.Y. Times* Paris correspondent (Oct. 31)—cited evidence to-day to indicate that a British-French occupation of the Suez Canal zone has been planned for weeks and waited only a suitable occasion.

It is believed that the original project was to defer the occupation until after the United States election, but that events were precipitated when the uprising in Hungary, by giving Moscow something new to worry about, hastened Israel's military action.

Furthermore M. Mollet's views on President Nasser had not changed since August when he succeeded in getting the French National Assembly to adopt a resolution calling President Nasser "a permanent menace to peace". In the case of France, Nasser not only deprived French interests of their share of the Canal profits and threatened her economic interests in Egypt but he was used as the real or imaginary obstacle to a solution to the Algerian problem.

As recently as October 23, when the Canal "crisis" had more or less been forgotten—and more ships than ever before were passing through it quite safely—but frequent meetings were taking place between the French and British leaders, M. Mollet is quoted as having declared "Nasser knows already that he has not won; he knows he cannot win." While M. Pineau on the same occasion said "The game has begun, but it is not over." (*N.Y. Times* 31/10/56). The French navy's seizure of the ship *Athos* allegedly loaded with arms from Egypt for the Algerian rebels, and the under-

We intervened to stop the war and we perhaps stopped it in the nick of time before the Egyptian air force organized by Russia, ran amok in the Middle East . . . A great task remains to be done, and we have created the opportunity for the United Nations to do it.

At the time of writing (Monday) it seems likely that the government will begin to use the "official" disclosures that Russia has sent considerable military equipment and supplies to Egypt and Spria as a new argument in defence of their action in Egypt. It would seem that this is as good an argument as any given so far by the Government!

hand capture of the five Algerian leaders whose headquarters were in Cairo, by diverting their plane from Tunis to Algeria, all helped to prepare public opinion for the announcement of the Anglo-French ultimatum.

The announcement of the ceasefire by the Anglo-French forces therefore obliged the French government to cover up its failure. Following a cabinet meeting it was announced that the decision had been taken because "the two governments consider that their objectives have been achieved". And it was explained that there were two objectives

to separate the Egyptian and Israeli forces, and to remove from Egypt the control and unilateral management of the Canal.

The hypocrisy of this statement can best be judged by examining France's role in encouraging Israel's attack on Egypt in the first place. (We deal with the evidence of Franco-Israeli collusion elsewhere in FREEDOM) and French support for Israel holding on to her territorial gains.

Apart from that, there is no evidence of the second objective having been achieved. The Franco-British forces are in occupation of only a small section of the Canal. And furthermore what of Nasser whose removal from office has all along been the "allies" No. 1 objective?

As it was clear even to an extreme right wing paper, *Rivarol* last week:

"We went to war to explode Nasser and consolidate the Canal: we have consolidated Nasser and exploded the Canal".

And this, writes Nora Beloff in last Sunday's *Observer* is, "in one form or another, the leitmotiv of almost all comment right, left and centre on the Middle Eastern debacle".

★ "concerned that its predecessors' support for Israel had seriously hurt American-Arab relations",† Nasser was "an avowed nationalist but he seemed to be a moderate"‡. But during the past year the interests of Britain and France have gradually converged with those of Israel. Since however the interests of Britain are—as Glubb Pasha pointed out recently in the *Sunday Times* (Nov. 4)—"inextricably tied up with those of the Arabian Peninsula and of the still vaster world of Islam", it is clear that Eden's new awareness of Israel's frontier difficulties during the past ten years is a piece of opportunism to justify and win support for his campaign to overthrow Nasser rather than a reversal of the government's traditional pro-Arab alignment.

Compared with British oil interests in the Middle East, the Canal is a small asset. Politically however, it is obviously considered of tremendous importance in the struggle against the Nasser regime. Now it is curious that, unlike France which openly proclaims its desire to overthrow Nasser, Eden, as far as we have been able to absorb the non-stop barrage of words during the past fortnight, has refrained from mentioning him as the real objec-

*See *Egypt—the Unknown Quantity* in *Selections from FREEDOM*, volume 5, †*N.Y. Times Weekly Review* 4/11/56.

WITH his followers deserting all over England Gollan must make haste. He has not yet sent in, both to the Kremlin and to Janos Kadar as Prime Minister of the puppets calling themselves the 'Hungarian Revolutionary Workers and Peasants' Government', any resolution of official approval "on behalf of the toiling masses of England and speaking in their name" for Soviet military action and policies in Budapest. It is time he did; else he is likely to fall off the band wagon.

He must take a few tips from his fraternal parties. In *Pravda* (313/13976) a column and a half is devoted to just such support for Field-Marshal G. Zhukov, he being the leader who, at this moment, counts most in the Soviet. He is also the man most likely to plunge the world into war with all that that means in every kind of suffering for working people everywhere.

Chinese Communists who have no need really to show any interest in West European affairs and are a band wagon, so to say, unto themselves, have sent greetings to Kadar and thirty million roubles as a token of friendship.

Rumanian Communists are, on the other hand, closely affected by Hungarian events. Their People's Government also sends money as well as greetings and congratulates Kadar on having defeated the counter-revolution. As speedily as they may they are delivering oil, medicaments and other goods to a total value of thirteen million lei.

Albania is represented by *Tass* (Telegraphic Agency of the Soviet Union). Its headline is: "Albanian toilers acclaim the victory of the Hungarian toilers over the counter-revolution."

Puno is the name of the Party organ in Albania. It writes, and possibly the remnants of the English Communist Party can yet do the same: "Fascist counter-revolutionary elements wanted to tear away the Hungarian people from the mighty camp of socialism and once more to set it under the yoke of capitalism. The Hungarian toilers have achieved victory over the dark forces of reaction and have defended the democratic order of the people's society and its gains.

"Our people in Albania will intensify their revolutionary vigilance still more. The Albanian toilers will rally still more

to the *Observer's* (Nov. 4) editorial view that the

purpose which has underlain the policy of the British and French Governments ever since the beginning of the Suez crisis, has the destruction of the Egyptian regime . . .

The evidence at present is that recent events have not succeeded in toppling Nasser. In that respect the Israel, French and British plan has failed dismally. But one cannot discount the possibility that the British government and its advisers were aware of the fact that however successful the military operation, politically the most they could hope from it was to commit the United Nations to establishing a permanent military force in Egypt which by involving all the nations of the world would effectively clip Nasser's wings and temper his dreams of being at the head of a vast Arab continent. Thus the economic status quo would be maintained by the combined bayonets of the world, for the benefit of a few international oil interests.

Surely a new twist to the old story of Imperialism, if it comes off! And in the circumstances what are a few more thousand lives, or the "vital waterway" blocked for a few months, and a penny more on the price of milk to pay for it all?

closely round the Albanian Party of Labour, will strengthen their friendship with the Soviet Union which stands sentinel over our happy future."

Quite reminiscent of the days of Stalin worship.

Messages of good-will have gone to Kadar from the Mongolian Communists. They are also sending 2,000 tons of wheat, 100 tons of meat, and 15 tons of sausage.

You can be sure that if the Soviet reaction does win in Budapest that the sausage will go to the ration stores of the surviving secret police. There exists no larger single group of pathological cases in the whole world than we have in this organization, since most of the Gestapo has been dispersed. These beasts enjoyed their work. It gave them a sense of power, a sadistic thrill, to come in the dead of night to knock upon a door, quietly and courteously to invite the occupant to dress and take a few things with him as he had to be interviewed by a people's investigating judge, and then in the silence of their underground cellars to beat him up until their blood-lust was sated for the time being. Then there was the joy of restoring their victims to that state where he could be used in the uranium workings or sent to the Russian forests.

Here in the peacetime safety of Britain we have no right to express one iota of surprise at the profound hatred revealed by the Budapest workers for these parasites. We must try to understand why bullets were saved when dealing with them. Bullets were needed for sniping at armoured tank personnel of the Red Army. The Soviet prisoner inside the tank must sooner or later want to look out. It is then that the bullet saved can put paid to the ponderous tank, perhaps set it ablaze, and so save the lives of women and children in the nearby houses.

In ending this brief note readers ought to be reminded that the Basque country was made a training ground for Nazi troops. Likewise Buda and Pest and the surrounding countryside are being used by Zhukov for the blooding of his troops. It is for the workers of the West to carry this thought to its logical conclusion. Only the general strike can hamstring the armies of the different governments. This is why Zhukov is more than upset by the action, or rather complete inaction, of the railwaymen in Hungary. When the workers simply fold their arms the politicians are undone. Kadar is screaming hourly for the return of the workers to the factories. These same workers may yet destroy him and all his works. I.P.

In Leeds and York Continued from p. 2

create a giant barracks-slum. This would be unfair of course, since unlike the dwellings it replaced, Quarry Hill is weathertight, sanitary and by present standards, roomy.

"Do you feel that the place is a community?" I asked a tenant. "Not really," she said, "although it's quite a friendly place. There's the Social Centre over there, but we never go near it. But we are in the middle of things here. The kids don't cross any roads to go to school, and it's near for work and near for going out in the evening. I'd like a house with a garden if only for their sake, but I wouldn't live on one of the new estates miles from anywhere." So there you are. All the same Quarry Hill looks like the giant beehive that it is. And so does Leeds.

★ YORK with its 100,000 people seemed a much more habitable city. It was a rich town in the middle ages, declined until it became a residential country town in the 18th century. Spared the industrial revolution, it was saved from going to sleep by its function as a market, and by two industries personified by the Railway King and the Cocoa King. Before his downfall for misappropriation and fraud George Hudson had succeeded in his ambition to "mak' all 'railways cum to York", and his fellow-citizens let him down lightly (too many of them were involved), but having subscribed £20,000 for a statue of him, they erected on the same spot one of a rival railway promoter. Joseph Rowntree was a very different character, a shrewd Quaker manufacturer with a social conscience. At the turn of the century he transferred his fortune to three trusts, one of which was to establish a model village at Earswick. Another member of his industrious family, Seeböhm Rowntree had made in 1900 the famous social survey *Poverty: A Study of Town Life*, which was a house-to-house investigation of York. Joseph Rowntree, studying his nephew's book, conceived New Earswick as 'an experiment in social welfare' not as a paternalistic company town for his employees.

Is New Earswick a success? It certainly looks, with its grass and trees, a different world from Quarry Hill. The earliest houses, designed by Raymond Unwin are amongst the best looking and the primary school built in 1911 was thirty years ahead of its time. The newer secondary school and the post-war houses are much more ordinary. The 'Folk Hall' looks very folksy and is in continual use. Broadcasting on the village's 50th anniversary, Mr. Michael Young declared that:

"What Rowntree did was to provide the opportunity; the place was not over-endowed with institutions, and the people had to make their own. They have made their own history and their own community."

On the other hand the Trustees themselves confess that:

"However sincere the efforts to avoid paternalism, it must remain true that the community life of the village is largely dependent either directly or indirectly on money provided by the Trust."

One of the interesting activities of the Trust is to pay the salaries of additional teachers in order to reduce the size of classes in the schools. Probably places like New Earswick are most progressive and more exciting in their pioneering days, but the people I spoke to there said that they didn't know of a better place to live in.

★ IT was a threepenny bus ride into the heart of York, through a gap in the walls of the ancient city. As a contrast to Mr. Priestley's gloom over the decline of 'characters' in Bradford, Mrs. Robinson of York told Oswald Harland that the city had offered her more queer people to the square mile than any other place she knew. "Monastically inclined young men, fierce poets of both sexes, mild-mannered anarchists, absent-minded but brilliant women". I went to Ken Spellman's bookshop in Micklegate. "I used to be interested in anarchism," he told me, "but now I believe there is such a thing as original sin." This led me to the Minster, its great towers shrouded in scaffolding, to hear evensong (Byrd and Purcell). The congregation consisted of a few old ladies and churchy young men, and I recalled one of Philip Larkin's poems:

... wondering too
When churches fall completely out of use
What we shall turn them into, if we shall keep
A few cathedrals chronically on show
And let the rest rent-free to rain and sheep.

This actually is a problem in York which is full of beautiful and useless mediaeval churches. One of them has been carefully refurbished into the Institute of Architectural Study by the York Academic Trust which has also founded the Institute of Historical Research in the old St. Anthony's Hall. In the same way the old station has become the Railway Museum, and the prison has been turned into a 'folk museum', with its exercise yard converted into a 'street' of old shop and house fronts from demolished buildings, through whose windows you can see the characteristic trades and occupations of the city's past. It was the most ingeniously and wittily arranged museum I have seen.

As in Hull, I got the feeling that enough was happening in York to satisfy the rarest tastes. Herbert Read was talking about sculpture at the Art Gallery, Paul Millichip was exhibiting his paintings at St. John's College, and at the Tempest Anderson Hall I heard Dennis Brain, Jean Pougnet and Wilfred Parry giving a recital of Mozart and Beethoven. All the activities of this kind depend upon such bodies as the Civic Trust, the Academic Trust, the Music Society, the Friends of York Art Gallery, the Film Society and the Repertory Company, which in turn depend on the "cranks and cults, coteries and cliques" cherished by Mrs. Robinson.

It is the presence of these people in a city which give it life and vitality. C.W.

The Politicians should be made to come clean

Was It Collusion?

EDEN'S attempt to portray the Anglo-French armed forces as "forest fire fighters" might go down well with a Commercial T.V. audience whose intelligence had long ago been extinguished, but it carried little conviction among his hard-boiled counterparts in America and the rest of the political world. In spite of the firm denials by Eden and Selwyn Lloyd to suggestions by the Opposition in the House of Commons that Israel's armed sortie was all part of a carefully laid plan, such a view is strongly and widely held abroad. According to Claude Bourdet in last week's *Tribune* for instance: "Nobody here [in France] doubts that the whole scheme was minutely planned between Israel, Britain and France." And the *Washington Post* (3/11/56) deliberately refers to "collusion" among the three powers.

It seems unlikely that documentary proof will be forthcoming. It would be expecting too much of the political leaders to hand over the evidence which proves that the "forest fire" which they took upon themselves the task of extinguishing was in fact deliberately started by them! But even without the documents there is already enough circumstantial evidence to make one more than suspicious!

The *Washington Post* (3/11/56) points to the fact that not only was the American administration not informed of the Anglo-French decision to use force but that

"the Eden Government deliberately set out to mislead the United States. That this in fact occurred there now appears to be no doubt whatsoever, although some of the evidence is buried under top-secret labels, which probably will never be lifted."

The article goes on to suggest that the Middle-East action was decided upon on October 16, following Mr. Selwyn Lloyd's report to Eden on his conversations with Mr. Dulles, after the Security Council session of October 14 had ended. At this meeting

Mr. Lloyd found that whereas the British and the French had been hoping to use the Dulles proposed Suez Canal Users' Association as a punitive weapon

to force Egypt to a settlement, Mr. Dulles now viewed it as a means of conciliation with President Nasser.

The October 16 meeting, held in Paris, was attended by M. Mollet and Eden as well as M. Pineau who had just returned from the U.N. meeting.

The *Washington Post* draws attention to the fact that two days after this meeting, which it suggests was the "initial planning session" for last month's aggression, came the announcement of the retirement of Sir Walter Monckton as Defence Minister. This is considered a significant matter since, declares the American journal, Sir Walter was "definitely known" to have opposed Eden on the use of force when Nasser nationalised the Suez Canal on July 26. Equally significant is the fact that for some time the French and the Israelis had been moving closer together. Word began to reach Washington of secret French shipments of jet aircraft—60 was one figure mentioned—and tanks.

Around October 24 came the first word from American officials in Israel of Israel's mobilisation. The British about this time told the Americans they had talked Israel out of an attack on Jordan—a statement now believed to have been a ruse to cover the mobilisation. Mr. Dulles sent urgent cables to the American Embassies in London and Paris asking them to find out what was up. "It has now been published and confirmed that on Saturday, October 27, Mr. Selwyn Lloyd told the American Ambassador in London that he hoped for an agreement shortly with Egypt. The United Press said yesterday that Britain and France had led the United States to believe they were ready to meet with Egypt in Geneva on October 29. The United Press said plans were viewed here as so firm that Assistant Secretary of State William Rountree had bought his ticket to Geneva, where he was to sit in as an observer."

The *Times* correspondent in Tel Aviv declares that charges that "Israel had created the events which led to Franco-British intervention, as part of a conspiracy between the three governments are not supported by such evidence as can be brought together here". Yet he adds that

For some weeks, of course, it had become obvious that any action taken by Israel to secure its borders would have the support of France. Soon after the return to Israel of the French ambassador, M. Pierre Gilbert, from summer leave in France, Israel's Prime Minister, Mr. Ben-Gurion, told a gathering of his party's general council that Israel would soon be able to rely upon a "true ally". No one doubted that the Prime Minister meant France. Since then evidence has multiplied to indicate that the French Government would back the Israelis in any justifiable action they might take for the purpose of safeguarding their frontiers.

French support was obviously more than for safeguarding Israel frontiers, since in the event they were in favour of her holding on to the territorial gains in the Sinai peninsula. It was only when fear of Russian intervention loomed on the horizon that France informed Israel of her inability to support her if attacked by Russian "volunteers".

The *Express*, Mendes France's journal, declared that on Monday, October 29, M. Mollet was

saying that he had not expected the Israelis to move before November 6 at the earliest. But the Prime Minister, it declares, must have known that Israeli staff officers were discussing technical problems with French military leaders on the previous day at the Defence Ministry. The only surprise for the inner ring of French Ministers, therefore, was that the Israelis launched their attack a week before it was expected.

The same journal also recalls rumours which circulated more than three weeks ago that the Government had secured large quantities of Egyptian pounds for distribution to French troops (these rumours certainly existed according to the *M.G. Paris* correspondent), and that officers under orders to sail for an unknown destination were at about the same time saying goodbye to friends.

There appears to be no evidence of direct conversations between the three nations' representatives but it is interesting that while Israel and Britain have denied the charges, France apparently has not so far committed herself. And there seems to be evidence of contact at political and military levels between France and Israel. There certainly were continuous meetings between the British and French premiers and their foreign secretaries in London, Paris and New York during all this period. Are we to understand that they didn't discuss Israel's intentions or even the significance of her general mobilisation?

VIEWPOINT ON
70 YEARS OF FREEDOM PRESS

CONVICTIONS, if they are to materialise, need much courage. Not only physical courage in face of danger but also a spiritual courage that enables one to persist and resist with the knowledge perhaps that one cannot hope to win the battle, or even part of it. This must be true of anarchists all over the world, but more so of Britain.

Lately, much criticism has been levelled through the pages of FREEDOM suggesting how little anarchism, as a philosophy of political struggle, has found roots in the more politically conscious sections of the people. Generally speaking this observation is true. But because it is true that anarchism remains clean of average political politics with its chops and changes, *volte-face* and general underhand bigotry, would the critics have been more satisfied had the anarchist movement become a huge unwieldy organisation with executive committees ordering the right kind of attitude to this or that political upheaval in this or that country? Would the critics have been more impressed had the anarchist movement thrown up a few big literary names who might even have got into Parliament, or if we had entered the political field proper, with a party programme for the next election and an office in Mayfair?

The critic who levels this kind of criticism is thinking with a fettered mind and a fettered mind cannot understand anarchism. This is the most fundamental difference between the politically minded individual and the anarchist. Anarchist thinking cannot start off from fixed premises, apart from the 'generalisation' that everyone has a right to do the things they want to do.

In contemporary society the function of Government frustrates this basic premise, hence the anarchist opposition to Government. Apart from that, the anarchist accepts nothing which cannot be related in familiar terms to his own experience. Anarchism demands therefore, not the mere acceptance of a fixed political programme, but rather a rejection of all programmes and a re-examination of all that is accepted to-day under the guise of loyalty, patriotism, national socialism or communism.

If therefore, anarchism is a method of analysis of society and a world outlook no-one can really criticise it unless one is really part of it, and, what is more important, understands it. Hence to judge anarchism with capitalist values is like measuring atoms with a tape measure.

What then is the role of the individual once he has abandoned his fettered thinking and discovers that anarchism is what he really felt all along? What does he do then? That I think, depends upon the degree to which he has made anarchism part of his daily life, and the age at which he unshackles his thinking.

To some anarchists, anarchism is not only a world outlook, but brings together groups of people with a common outlook though not necessarily the same. To others anarchy begins 'at home', with no desire to put the ideas before the rest of the world. To many anarchists the desire to propagate is a means of expression mixed with the hope that what they say will be of some use to some people, who in turn, will make their newly found outlook available to others; and finally there are the individualists who are anarchists but tied to no group. Hence the kind of function the anarchist performs is a synthesis between his own atavistic individuality and his anarchist outlook. Age, no doubt, has a pacifying influence, and many a politician's antics may be explained in terms of his glands; active, inactive, dead of putrifying. Thus the so-called mystery of age changing outlook is no mystery at all, and variations on a theme do creep in with the passage of time. Anarchism being essentially an individual interpretation one cannot measure the success of anarchism on this level; one can never know whether the bus conductor isn't really an anarchist although he has not given himself a label. But even in the anarchist movement there is a tendency to decide what is or isn't anarchist activity.

FREEDOM has existed for 70 years, and I do not think that it has managed to survive because anarchism is a good thing to have, but rather because a paper is a good medium through which ideas reach a wider public and because the people who helped the paper to survive found expression in producing it. One does not prove a thing is good merely by stating so. That has to be judged by the people who come in contact with it, and if it can be related to their own experience in some way only then can they make it part of their world outlook.

Anarchist influence is so diverse and flows through many channels that one needs an altogether new yardstick with which to measure its effect. True, in terms of "daily politics" we cannot suggest a definite solution to the problems of Suez, etc., but that attitude which is governed by an anarchist outlook will do equally well for Hungary, Poland, Russia, Britain, or any other part of the uncivilised world. S.F.

LETTERS

The Anarchist Case

DEAR FRIEND,

What a Samson that Sansom is to anarchist thought. His strength is not in his hair but the sureness of him getting into the hair of others even to the roots.

I have not enjoyed a clearer statement of what is wanted from the anarchist and Freedom Press for some time, "to see the whole picture, and try to draw together all positive trends and aspirations into a coherent general philosophy".

We in the pacifist movement have been bewitched by the carefulness of the gradualist and have divided on simple purpose many times. The renouncing of war, is, I believe, our unique contribution to society, that war as a method for settling disputes is out. This is the limit of our pacifism, and our interest in anarchy, food relief or communities will

be created in the social consciousness that conscientious objection implies.

Pacifists reading your paper will welcome the warnings of Sansom and I for one would thank him.

Yrs.,

London, Nov. 7. SJNEY BILLSON.

★

Sincere congratulations to Philip Sansom for putting a breath of fresh air into the paper this week. There is nothing to add to what he says for it puts the whole case in a nutshell.

But what about exhibiting some of the "museum pieces" from time to time? I am sure that many readers would appreciate some of the articles contained in early FREEDOMS being reprinted to-day and after all, not everyone has a file of back numbers. And the unpublished section of Berkman's *A.B.C. of Anarchism* (Part 1 of the original book) would be of interest to those of us who have read Sections 2 & 3. Godwin's *Political Justice*, often mentioned, is unobtainable. This could be run in small doses with a commentary giving later developments, as also much of Bakunin's work.

True there is probably so much current material that it would not always be easy to find room, but it is no good talking about basic principles unless readers are occasionally given the opportunity to find out what those basic principles are.

Bletchley, Nov. 6. RUSSELL SPRUCE.

★

Congratulations on the 70 years feat. I was involuntarily moved by the optimism with which the Editors look forward to the next 70 years of publication of FREEDOM and know that their faith in this is their justification. I can only reproach myself that such faith and devotion to the task is so frequently lacking in myself who am of the younger generation.

Best wishes to you all,

Bath, Nov. 7

H.J.C.

SELECTIONS
from FREEDOM
VOLUMES
1-5

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

FIVE SHILLINGS
each volume

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

ORDER NOW!

TO THE EDITORS
ANARCHISTS IN THE STREET

DEAR COMRADES,

It is a great loss to the encouragement of clear thinking that FREEDOM does not enjoy the circulation of 'popular' newspapers. This particularly applied to last week's issue (November 10th) when in the midst of cant from newspapers and politicians, clarity and humanity graced the columns of FREEDOM.

It seemed a pity however, for the benefit of those living outside London who are not acquainted with the outdoor propaganda of the anarchists, that your contributor, C.W., in his article *People in the Street*, omitted to draw attention to the anarchist platform.

Discussing the various factions now vocal in the present international crisis (including the *News Chronicle* and *Manchester Guardian*), he writes:

"It was left for one of the 'hotheads', 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 pacifism: Wars will cease when men refuse to fight."

It is right that attention should have been given to the words of a consistent propagandist against war, but was it modesty or ignorance which made C.W. fail to point out that on the previous night the London Anarchist Group (which holds regular Saturday night meetings at Manette Street), held a large meeting at the same spot and carried the crowd with them on a straightforward anarchist 'line'? The speakers' eloquence was not the only reason for the enthusiastic response from the crowd, but the wisdom of the anarchist case which seemed even more rational emerging from the chaos of last week.

Your readers may be interested to know that the police made an attempt to interfere with the meeting, ordering the speaker to stop as he was causing an obstruction. I am glad to say that your speaker—Philip Sansom—refused to be intimidated and quickly got the crowd on his side by pointing out that the LAG has been holding meetings on that pitch for over a year without interference and that their freedom of speech was bound up with him. By this time the crowd was too big for one policeman to tackle, and even bigger when his reinforcements arrived; they contented themselves with directing the traffic through the now massive crowd, and ended up by protecting the platform from a drunken young soldier who wanted to take a swipe at Sansom!

My real point is that the anarchists have been calling for individual resistance for a long time from their platform in Manette Street and Hyde Park. If Donald Soper is now staying the same things that is excellent—but in praising him, don't be too modest about the consistent, if less spectacular work that is done by your comrades outside the columns of FREEDOM!

'SYMPATHISER'.

WILL YOU GIVE
A HAND?PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!
WEEK 45

Deficit on Freedom £900
Contributions received £741
DEFICIT £159

November 2 to November 8

Birmingham: G.O. 12/6; Waco: H.H. 7/-;
London: D.R.* 10/-; Sheffield: G.P.* 5/-;
Sheffield: Anon* 2/6; London: J.A. 6/3;
London: A.M. 5/-; London: Hyde Park
Sympathisers 3/-; Cromer: M.J.S. 10/-;
Newcastle: R.E.W. 5/-; New York: E.L.
£1/15/0; Oxford: Anon* 5/-; Gt. Bookham:
M.V.D. 13/-; Buenos Aires: E.E.T. £1/15/0.
Total 7 14 3

Previously acknowledged ... 733 18 9

1956 TOTAL TO DATE ... £741 13 0

GIFTS OF BOOKS: London: V.B.; London: Mr. P.

*Indicates regular contributors.

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. 18—Harold Walsby on
ASPECTS OF AUTOMATIONNOV. 25—Mary Richardson on
THE DEPRIVED PARENT IN THE
PROBLEM FAMILYQuestions, 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

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