

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

## SPEECHES WE NEVER HEARD MADE

# A 100% SURE BIRTH CONTROL METHOD?

With Christmas just passed the time seems appropriate to report another speech I haven't heard. This is not a speech I am waiting to hear from a politician but from a doctor or a biologist. I am told that the information has been available for over a year. The factual information he includes in his paper, only the uses he suggests the facts be put to are recorded in print for the first time. So I'm afraid the doctor's address is not very original. And you may find him tedious, but read on because he has got hold of a good idea.

In keeping with good reporting I have not, in shortening his speech, altered its content, and I have not attempted to conceal the lack of objectivity in what he says. Complete objectivity is not humanly attainable anyway. So you must excuse the doctor's little joke in his opening paragraph and bear with his sacrilege. Probably he thought a joke would help to allay the anxiety he anticipated when the audience read the title of his paper, "A Method of Universal Non-Manipulative Contraception".

I have omitted much of the more technical aspects of his paper since the elucidation of recondite phrases of protein metabolism is not likely to mean much to many readers of FREEDOM. The Editor said, keep it simple, so I have. But by getting a friend to read up on the doctor's references I have been satisfied that the facts of the matter cannot be disputed.

WHEN we speak of birth-control we should think of people exercising control over their own lives, an exercise of freedom if you like, and we should not be vaguely disturbed, as many well-wishers are, by the feeling that we are somehow reducing the mystery and therefore the value of birth. Every group of mankind has a festival of nativity to celebrate. We have just celebrated Christmas, and rightly so. In a general sense that is. Naturally some of the details don't stand up so well nowadays. I mean it is difficult to believe, after half a century's work on statistics, that Jesus' birth

followed an immaculate conception, which has a statistical probability far lower than that his birth followed, like many other people's, an inaccurate contraception.

Contraception has throughout the ages been practised though at a primitive level, and the technological advances of the last century have made birth-control only a little less imperfect. The various spermicidal creams which are intended to inhibit motility of the sperm have also not added much and the claims of the manufacturing companies are certainly not accurate.

A method of universal non-manipulative contraception is now clearly possible. Let me explain that by non-manipulative I mean without the use of mechanical barriers either by the male or by the female during sexual intercourse. These are unsatisfactory on account of flaws in manufacturing and difficulties inherent in their use and do not fulfil the two most important criteria of the perfect contraceptive, namely that conception be 100% prevented and that sexual intercourse not be modified for the sake of contraception. To be universal a method must also be cheap and uncomplicated.

Five years ago the question was raised, whether it would not be possible to prevent fertilisation of the ovum by interfering with the hyaluronidase mechanism by which the sperm penetrates the ovum. Although this is a possibility, it means that the woman is obliged to keep taking tablets for many days before intercourse and in practice therefore the method is of limited value. Both partners are likely to experience a reduction of pleasure as a result of anxiety and an uncertainty whether or not sufficient tablets have been taken over a sufficient number of days for a physiological effect to have been reached.

However, this was the first non-manipulative method to be suggested. I now propose to examine the value of a quite different method of approach. Since the end of the war there has been an enormous advance in our understanding of many of the malignant processes grouped under the term "cancer". So far this know-

ledge is still at a fundamental stage. We know a great deal more about the changes that take place within cells than we used to but practical therapeutics is still at a limited stage. There have been some results though. In 1948 the effects were demonstrated of certain drugs in the treatment of childhood leukaemia. Of these the most interesting was 4-Aminopterylglutamic acid, an analogue of folic acid. Folic acid is a vitamin which is necessary for the growth of many types of cells in the body, and the more rapidly growing the cell is, the more the need of folic acid is. By giving a molecule slightly different from folic acid it is possible to produce a state of mild deficiency of folic acid, a deficiency great enough to inhibit the growth of rapidly dividing cells but not great enough to harm the development of normal cells. The application to certain forms of cancer was obvious.

During the next few years it was realised that folic acid antagonists if taken by a pregnant woman frequently caused an abortion, and that if the foetus was delivered at full term there was a likelihood of it being deformed. Recently a definitive study on the pregnant rat confirmed the impression that embryonic tissue, because of rapid growth, was susceptible to chemical interference with folic acid antagonists. Unfortunately these drugs are too dangerous for their widespread use to be encouraged.

The great impetus given to cancer research since 1948 has led to the study of other synthetically produced compounds. It is one of these

compounds, o-diezoacetyl-l-serine, that at present would seem to be the most encouraging drug for birth-control. The action of this drug appears to be specific. It prevents a certain stage in the building up of essential protein by acting as an analogue of serine, and since serine is an essential part of the protein molecule the molecule will be defective. The drug is effective in inhibiting growth in the early stages of development of the embryo. A very small dose given to the pregnant rat will cause reabsorption and disappearance of the foetuses and deformities in the ones that survive. A slightly larger dose causes uniform reabsorption, so that no evidence of pregnancy remains.

I want to emphasize the safety of this drug. When taken by mouth it naturally reaches all areas of the body in the blood-stream. Normally growing cells including those of the ovary are not affected, but once the ovum has been fertilized and there is a great increase in the rate of division of its cells, the cells are sensitive to a minute quantity of the drug and cannot survive in its presence. One tablet of the drug taken once a month will cause an abortion without the woman knowing that she is pregnant, for at the most only one

"I entered parliament with what I thought to be the lowest possible opinion of the average member. I came out with one still lower."

—JOHN STUART MILL.

menstrual period would be missed, and if, as would usually be recommended, the tablet be taken between periods, no pregnancy would last more than a few days.

This method is definitely a pregnancy preventive. Once the embryo is more than a few weeks old the rate of all division has slowed sufficiently for the drug to be no longer effective. The result of taking one tablet a month is temporary sterility for as long as the dose is kept up, with no effect on the woman's ovaries but a direct effect only on the fertilized ovum. The duration of the effect is probably about 12 hours after which the drug is completely removed from the body, yet that 12 hours is all that is needed to produce abortion.

It is my proposal that we encourage the use of this drug in work outside the field of cancer research to which it is at present confined. Let us publicize this use it can be put to and end the secrecy that surrounds its effects. Within a few years a great instrument for freedom and happiness could be put at the disposal of women everywhere.

At the moment the drug mentioned above is on a list termed, "For investigational use only", and is obtainable only by certain scientific workers in the U.S.A. The Editors of FREEDOM will be informed when it becomes in more general supply.

New York, Jan. 1. J.B.

[Editorial Comment, p.3]

## A S. AFRICAN BUS BOYCOTT

WE have often expressed the hope that the Africans under Strydom's domination would follow the example of the Southern Negroes in

the United States in their determination to claim equal rights with the white man. One of the methods used to abolish segregation on buses, for example, has been the boycott of public transport. The Negroes have shown how effective such methods can be when people with a common aim are prepared to hang together however uncomfortable the consequences might be.

We are glad to record that at the time of writing some eighteen thousand Africans are following the example by boycotting the bus transport system between the African township of Alexandria and Johannesburg, nine miles away. The Africans have chosen to walk rather than pay the extra penny rise in fares, and have pointed out that if the State compels them to live so far away from their work the State should take the responsibility for rising costs.

The Johannesburg City Council and Chamber of Commerce sent a joint deputation to the Government expressing concern about the fatigue and absenteeism (not the economic reasons for the concern), as a result of the boycott, and were told by the Minister of Transport, Ben Schoeman, that the Government saw no reason to take any action but:

"the boycott must first cease and (in the meantime) whites who gave lifts to Africans would be prosecuted."

Coming on top of the recent arrests and the vicious behaviour of the police (who opened fire on demonstrators outside the court on the first day of the trials) does this further expression of African indignation mean that black South Africa is beginning to stir. If so, Strydom and his white supporters are in an unenviable position.

## Last Sunday's Polish Elections

### GOD BLESS GOMULKA

WLADISLAW GOMULKA, Communist leader of the new Poland, has won his vote of confidence—with the help of the Catholic Church.

In a mammoth poll—so large that it almost embarrassed the government, being so similar to forced-vote elections—the National Unity Front got well over 90 per cent. of the votes. Gomulka himself was awarded 99.44 per cent. votes in his district of Warsaw. The only difference between that and any other Communist type election was that close behind Gomulka, with 98.05 per cent., was a non-party candidate, while in another Warsaw district, another non-party man gained 98.68 per cent.

It seems then, that Gomulka has nothing to worry about, and that his fears (discussed in FREEDOM last week) should now be calmed. In the week before the election, however, Gomulka had worked hard to present the harsh facts of the Polish position to the people, showing them that their only chance of retaining such independence from Russia as they have already won was not to push it too far.

The most effective pre-election move, however, was the intervention on Gomulka's behalf of the Catholic Church. Obviously instructed from above, on the Sunday before the election, every priest in Poland was urging his flock to vote for the National Front candidates. The Church gladly chose the lesser evil, since a

## GUESS WHO?

### The Newspapers & Our Latest Crisis

THE resignation of Sir Anthony Eden received the full treatment in our newspapers for January 10.

Here—oh joy—was another crisis, and in the leader columns it was treated with that due regard for the proprietor's opinions, the editor's opinions, and the readers' alleged opinions with which we have become so familiar.

The presentation on the news pages largely depended on whether you paid 2d., 3d., or 4d. for your newspaper. For 2d. you could be fairly sure of "sensation, surprise, and shock" at Eden's move, for 3d. you had the *Manchester Guardian*, and for 4d. (*The Times*, *Financial Times*) you had sobriety.

Most papers agreed that Eden's ill-health was genuine and that he was not resigning for purely political reasons, though the *Guardian* suggested that his policies and his health might be cause and effect. The *Worker* was the only paper to dispute the claim of ill-health.

But what engaged all the papers (with one exception) was the delightful guessing game of whose turn for £10,000 a year now? The exception was the *Telegraph*, who with its customary ability

for being unnecessarily pompous, said that it would be "improper, in advance of the Queen's summons, to discuss the qualifications of the more obvious candidates". Other papers agreed that the choice lay between Butler and Macmillan but every paper that hazarded a guess was wrong. The *Worker* tipped Selwyn Lloyd, the others tipped R. A. Butler. No one tipped Macmillan.

The *Times* said that although Macmillan had "shown a wise and firm hand at the Exchequer" Butler was the more likely choice; contrariwise the *Mail* said that Macmillan "had not been a resounding success at the Treasury" and therefore Mr. Butler must be the choice. It all depends how you look at it.

The "crisis" afforded our papers yet another occasion for titillation ("High Drama at No. 10"—*Daily Sketch*) or for manufacturing grave situations and for attaching the highest importance to the game of political chairs. Someone suggested that Butler did not succeed because the headline "Queen Summons Butler" would have looked too domestic. I wouldn't be surprised, at that.

M.G.W.

## PEOPLE AND IDEAS

# MAESTRO TOSCANINI

THE story is told of a young art editor of the now defunct *Sunday Chronicle* who when he was offered a magnificent set of close-ups of Toscanini taken, during an actual concert, by that pioneer of candid photography, Dr. Salomon, asked: "Whoever is Toscanini? I've never heard of him. Why not bring us some football pictures?" The date of that story was some time in 1932 when the Maestro was at the height of his powers and of an age (66) when most men are thinking of their retirement. By 1932 Toscanini had conducted, and won, some of his fiercest battles against slovenly music-making, noisy audiences and the domination of operatic performances by the "stars". It was as long ago as 1903 that his best-known encounter took place, at the Metropolitan in New York. A "well beloved prima donna" who normally took considerable liberties with rhythms and tempo resented the way Toscanini brought her up sharply. "Maestro," she told him loftily, "you must conduct as I sing, for I am a star." Toscanini looked at her coldly and replied: "Signorina, the stars are in heaven. Here we are all artists, good or bad, and you are a bad artist." And when Caruso during a performance held a particularly successfully-landed high note as long as his breath lasted, Toscanini waited for him to finish and then shouted at him so that the whole audience could hear: "Have you finished, Caruso?"

The many Toscanini anecdotes—many of them against himself—are the material for the creation of the Toscanini legend. One can well imagine that that young Art editor of the *Sunday Chronicle*, if he is still alive, no longer asks "whoever is Toscanini" even though to this day he may never have listened to, or been present at, a performance by the Maestro. For the stories have got around. And just as until Albert Schweitzer received the Nobel prize at the end of a long life of service to a small, ostracized section of the human race, the general public

ignored Schweitzer (and the same could be said of Gandhi or Einstein or Freud to name only three of the outstanding men of our time) so also with Toscanini. Yet Toscanini's contribution to mankind are not the anecdotes but his integrity as an artist and as a man (or should one say his integrity as an artist because of his integrity as a man?). To those of us whose musical education has been so largely influenced by his performances, the anecdotes besides being amusing and often very moving, give us an insight into what kind of man he was who could give freshness and a new vitality to works hackneyed by pedestrian conductors and cautious impresarios.

TOSCANINI was neither the autocrat nor the exhibitionist that the anecdotes, taken out of their context, might lead one to believe him to be. His objection to the "star" system that rules in opera houses to this day (it is happening even in Covent Garden without "stars") was not motivated by his own desire to shine, but by an artistic approach which viewed an opera or a concerto as an integrated whole, in which every part, every instrument contributed to the musical sound and theatrical effects that were in the mind of the composer.

Clearly the rôle of the conductor is on the one hand to seek to understand what is in the mind of the composer, on the other to convey this meaning to a 100 or more instrumentalists whose different parts, taken alone, may have very

little meaning, but which, in a balanced blend, produce the incomparable music of a Beethoven or a Mozart. For Toscanini it was inconceivable that because a singer had the melody all else was of minor importance, any more than because the violins in a symphony had the melodic line the remaining instruments of the orchestra should be relegated to a grey background of muffled accompaniment. Everything the composer wrote—markings as well as notes, were meant to be observed, and the conductor who ignored them was failing in his duty.

In his pursuit of musical truth Toscanini spared himself neither on or off the platform. We are always reminded by the journalists (it's all part of the sensationalism which makes an item newsworthy: dog bites man isn't, man bites dog is... the conductor who uses a score isn't, the one who conducts from memory is!) that Toscanini never used a score. What they should have also said was that he had studied the score of the music he was to conduct so thoroughly beforehand that he did not need it at performances. These journalists should have also quoted his remarks to a young conductor seeking his advice: "I shall tell you my secret; all my life I have been studying scores". To another young colleague he said, "You must not conduct a piece of music until the notes have marched off the paper and come alive in your head and heart." A man who felt music in this way could no more be an autocrat and achieve the results he did, than an anarchist could hope to achieve the free society by imposing freedom.

Toscanini achieved his ends by example and integrity.

### Example:

Toscanini may slash out at the musicians who work with him, but he is most demanding of himself. "Look at me," he shouts in rehearsal, "look at the old man." And he punches himself on the chest. "I give everything—all of myself." And this is no idle boast. He holds nothing back on the podium—not concentration of mind, nor temper, nor energy. Music absorbs all of him and he cannot abide collaborators who do not give in the same way. For those who do he has unlimited affection. He pointed to a man in his orchestra and said proudly: "Look at him, he sweats more than me."

### Integrity:

The drive for perfection is relentless, and it does not matter whether he himself or anybody else gets hurt *en route*. On three different occasions he attempted to record Debussy's *La Mer* with the N.B.C. Symphony, and each time he rejected the final product. He had spent his own time and energy without compensation, and the cost to the recording company was about \$6,000 a session. But Debussy had not been sufficiently well served, and there was nothing more to be said. In 1950 he undertook to try again. A friend said: "I'm sure it will go well this time," but Toscanini replied softly and humbly: "I hope".

SUCH humility—which also made him declare that the adjective "great" was not applicable to conductors but only to

\*Toscanini, by Howard Taubman (Odhams 15/-) a warm, informative book by one who spent twenty years collecting material for his biography. It conveys a picture of the unbounding energy of Toscanini, even in his eighties, of his integrity and his simplicity as a man. Many of the anecdotes reveal Toscanini's strong sense of humour, others, we hope, will by their deep humanity draw a tear.

composers such as Beethoven and Mozart—is not the stuff of autocrats. And certainly we have never heard of an autocrat bringing out the best in those who are subjected to his will! Yet when Herva Nelli, who had sung the part of Desdemona in a performance of *Otello*, listened two years later to a recording of it she exclaimed: "How did I do it? He must have hypnotised me" And it was not only the "stars" but the rank and file of the orchestras to whom Toscanini "did something". Samuel Antek, a violinist in the N.B.C. Orchestra put it in these terms in an article in the *Saturday Review of Literature*:

Playing with him makes you particularly proud of being a musician; it brings a special dignity and nobility to your work. You are not only a skilful violinist, flutist or trumpeter. You feel yourself an artist, an integral part of the performance. It is this uncanny ability, the talent he, Toscanini, has for making musicians unlock the secret door of their personal emotions, the hidden reservoirs of their resourcefulness and ability, that is, in my experience, one of his exceptional characteristics. There is no question that every musician who plays with Toscanini gives up some special part of himself only to the Old Man.

Equally for Toscanini it was not the applause—which on the whole he disliked though, like his friend Verdi, he respected the public's judgment—that moved him. Each performance was a new experience, a striving after that perfection which he felt he and his orchestras would never quite achieve. Speaking of *Otello*, he once observed to a friend:

"The soprano goes one way" the long square index finger pointed to the right, "the tenor goes that," the finger waved to the left, "the orchestra goes there," an upward sweep and a sigh. "I am only the conductor. I cannot keep them all

Continued on p. 4

## Story of a "Surplus" and a "National Debt"

# BUDGET ON A SHOE-STRING

AT about this time last year in these columns we offered some "Reflections" on the problems of "Voluntary Initiatives" (FREEDOM, Jan. 14, 1956) and expressed ourselves at some considerable length. In examining *Freedom Press*'s problems in connection with last year's activities we should have to repeat all the things we wrote last year about 1955! But we do not propose to weary our readers by repeating ourselves, and any new reader who is interested in having a fuller picture of our activities and the attendant problems will be sent a copy of that issue of FREEDOM on request.

ON the other hand we do not propose to remain silent about our financial situation. We believe that any encouraging signs should be stressed for the benefit of those of our friends and comrades who might feel pessimistic about our ability to carry on in a world where the small voice—and not even "small voices" if one is to judge from the disappearance of at least three provincial dailies in the past few months—is being swamped by the mouthpieces of mass-communications. And so far as our activities are concerned there were some encouraging signs last year!

At the beginning of 1956 we were forced to raise the target of our Deficit Fund from £15 to £20 a week since income from the sales and subscriptions in 1955 had not reached the figure we had hoped for. The response to this additional appeal was that readers contributed £923 last year as against £667 in 1955, an increase of £258. As if this were not enough, income from sales and subscriptions exceeded our estimates by just under £200, with the result that though we missed our Deficit Fund target by £117, in fact, we were able to record a surplus of £76 for the year.

Sales of *Freedom Press* literature covered the cost of production of two *F.P.* books, "Freedom Selections, Vol. 5" and Voline's "Unknown Revolution", with £7 to spare, and in spite of increased running overheads (£402 against £336 in 1955) the surplus from *Freedom Bookshop* and our mail order book enough to cover (£387 in 1955 to £479 last year), these added commitments.

The following table shows how our various departments have fared.

	Loss	Surplus
	£	£
(1) FREEDOM. Excess of Expenditure over income from Sales and subscriptions	£847	
Contributions received to Deficit Fund	923	
(2) FREEDOM PRESS LITERATURE		76
(3) FREEDOM BOOKSHOP & BOOK SERVICE		7
(4) FREEDOM PRESS Running Overheads, Rent, Rates, Gas, Light, Stationery, Postage & Sundries	402	
	402	562
Excess of Income over Expenditure 1956	160	
	£562	£562

It will be seen that for once in a while our income from all sources exceeded expenditure by £160 (in 1955 it was the other way round to the tune of £212). But let us not forget one very important point: *Freedom Press*' "National Debt" at the beginning of 1956 was £725. Last year's surplus therefore is not available for any rash schemes since it has already been swallowed up in reducing the "National Debt" which on January 1st, 1957 stands at £565.

PERHAPS we would be pushing our optimism, born of last year's promise, too far if we were to suggest that this year's target should be to cover the current deficit on FREEDOM as well as to wipe out the accumulated debts with which we started 1957. Yet we really need to do this. Two years ago our debts were secured by loans totalling £400. During the ensuing period we have paid off the loans but we still owe as much to trade creditors as in 1954 when it was felt necessary to raise a loan to relieve the pressure being exerted on us by them, but with this difference, that now we have no loans in sight. Unless, therefore, money reaches us during the coming months fast enough to cover current commitments as well as to allow us to make some kind of token payment to our creditors we shall experience considerable difficulty in carrying on.

1. There are many ways in which our readers can help. The "passive" supporters can at least order all their books through *Freedom Bookshop*. Every pound's worth of books they order benefits *Freedom Press* by five shillings approximately. Can we not step-up

our mail order service by £1,000 this year? Those readers who already deal with the bookshop know what good service they get. Listen to two American "testimonials". From Franklin Grove, Illinois one "satisfied customer" writes:

Many thanks for your prompt, efficient service. The four packages came through the mail in good shape... Again, many thanks for your excellent service. It sure is a pleasure to do business with you fellows.

Another in Goleta, Cal. writes: Thanks in advance for your kind consideration and prompt reply to my request—something I have learned to take too much for granted because of your past performance.

2. Then there is our "Deficit Fund" which in spite of the record total reached last year could be much larger if a majority of our friends and comrades did not rely on the faithful few who never fail to respond to our appeals.

We have, as a matter of interest, analysed last year's contributions and find that of the £923 received no less than £521 came from the United States, £323 from the British Isles and £76 from the rest of the world! Even more interesting, so far as our American readers are concerned is to note that of that £521 (\$1,500) £421 (\$1,200) came from groups and that no less than £353 (\$1,000) of the £421 was contributed by the groups in San Francisco and Los Angeles! In other words all the other groups, throughout the U.S. contributed \$200 between them! We draw attention to this fact as it is clear that there are a number of groups who receive bundles of FREEDOM for which they neither pay nor send contributions to the Deficit Fund. Individual contributors in the U.S. sent £100 (\$280) last year, and represented only a small propor-

tion of our American readers. Contributions from the British Isles showed an improvement on previous years, but in view of the fact that more than 60% of FREEDOM's circulation is in this country must we conclude that very few of our readers care very much whether FREEDOM survives or not?

3. And of course there is the question of finding new readers for the paper. We all know how this can be done but too few of us take the trouble to see to it that copies of FREEDOM reach all our politically conscious friends and acquaintances. Yet many of our present readers were, we are sure, introduced to the paper by someone. To encourage readers to pass the paper around we shall be introducing a special scheme in next week's FREEDOM, though by then many subscribers will have received intimation of the scheme with their renewal forms (due to be dispatched this week) and we hope for a good response.

NEWSPAPERS and magazines are folding-up all over the country in spite of circulations which would make anarchist editors dizzy. FREEDOM doesn't need their budgets to keep going. We have no wages to pay to editors and contributors, and no shareholders clamouring for their rake-off. But we need the means to print the paper, to pay the rent, the light and the gas bills, and to meet an ever-growing postage bill (it was £457 last year!). We cannot expect all readers to feel sympathetic to our appeal, since many are probably not (yet) in sympathy with our cause. But of the remainder are there really so few willing to lend a hand as would appear from this survey of 1956?

## No Surplus Here!

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!	
WEEK 3	
Deficit on <i>Freedom</i>	£60
Contributions received	£23
DEFICIT	£37
January 11 to January 17	
Graz: G.A. 6/-; New York: N.M. £1/15/0;	
London: Anon. 9d.; London: H.M.* 5/3;	
London: J.S.* 3/-; London: Anon. 2/6;	
5ydney: H.M. 3/4; Los Angeles: M.B. £1;	
Copenhagen: Anon. 16/3; Edinburgh: A.S.L.R. £1/1/0.	
Total ...	5 13 1
Previously acknowledged ...	18 1 8
1957 TOTAL TO DATE ...	£23 14 9

## FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

### OPEN DAILY

All your books sent post free, so get your birthday presents, etc. from us. Book tokens exchanged... 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!

N.B. for U.S. readers:  
\$1=7/-; 50c.=3/6d.

### New Books . . .

Soviet Youth: Some Achievements and Problems Dorothea L. Meek 28/-  
Sexual Behaviour in the Human Female A. C. Kinsey 56/-  
Kruschev of the Ukraine V. Alexandrov 15/-  
Fabian International Essays (ed.) McKitterick & Younger 18/-  
Look Back in Anger John Osborne 10/6

### Reprints & Penguins . . .

Trial D. M. Mankiewicz 2/6  
Art and Society Herbert Read 25/-  
Good Handwriting J. C. Torr 2/-  
Darkness at Noon Arthur Koestler 10/6  
Pelican Book of English Prose:  
Vol. 1. Elizabethan and Jacobean Prose 3/6  
Vol. 2. Seventeenth Century Prose 3/6  
Vol. 3. Eighteenth Century Prose 3/6  
Vol. 4. Prose of the Romantic Period 3/6  
Vol. 5. Victorian Prose 3/6  
(The set), special price 15/-  
Women in Antiquity Charles Seltman 2/6

### Second-Hand . . .

The Secret Agent Joseph Conrad 3/-  
Science of Wealth J. A. Hobson 2/-  
The Plumed Serpent D. H. Lawrence 4/-  
The Danger of Being a Gentleman H. J. Laski 3/6  
Christ Stopped at Eboli Carlo Levi 3/-  
Handbook of Marxism (ed.) Emile Burns 15/-  
To Beg I am Ashamed Sheila Cousins 3/6  
Living Thoughts of Rousseau (ed.) Romain Rolland 2/6  
The Seed Beneath the Snow Ignazio Silone 2/6

### Periodicals . . .

The University Libertarian Winter 1957 10d.  
Africa South, Jan.-March 1957 4/-

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

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

## SCIENCE FOR HUMAN HAPPINESS

FOR a good many years people have been wondering whether science is proving a blessing or a curse, and since the development of the atomic bomb, the answer for most of us has not been in much doubt. During the first world war Norman Douglas suggested that the way to stop the war was to shoot every newspaper editor in Europe, and many people would not now raise much opposition to a proposal to shoot the scientists.

FREEDOM, however, is a fair-minded journal and taking an objective standpoint would probably regard Norman Douglas' solution as conferring more benefits (despite obvious personal drawbacks) on mankind than the massacre of the men of science. For science can clearly benefit mankind as well as threaten to exterminate it. Kropotkin believed that scientific progress held the key to the achievement of a free world and that it provided the great hope of the revolution. It was however to the advance of science, and not to the scientists, that he looked for the solution of problems which could make the social revolution possible.

The fact is that science, particular science as encouraged (by financial aid and other incentives) by governments, is to-day directed to mainly destructive ends, while the constructive sciences which hold out hope for human happiness and human advancement have to get on as best they may. And, strangely enough, despite the publicity which atomic menaces have received, the extent to which destructive expenditure outruns constructive activities, is not fully realized even now.

Everybody knows what a formidable amount of money the Health Services cost. There are legions of hospitals costing enormous amounts to run, staff, and equip. There is the cost of the everyday maladies treated in clinics and in surgeries in every district of the country. And there is the huge cost of medicines which the government is always going on about.

Yet all this vast expenditure which few of us would say is entirely wasted or useless, amounts to only 3½ per cent. of the total budget.

School buildings and the existence of the State school apparatus is something which is brought home to all of us, schools being a familiar landmark in our lives; yet education also cost only a small percentage of the total government expenditure.

The bulk of this expenditure, wrung out of us by income tax, pay-as-you-earn, tax on beer, cigarettes, petrol, and almost every conceivable article subject to purchase tax, the huge bulk of it is spent in ways which we hardly see at all, for it is spent on "defence", i.e. on armaments and maintaining the armed forces.

### Science for Human Happiness

Science is also used for humanly constructive ends, of course. But it is on a tiny scale (compared with defence projects). And it is, so to speak, defensively used. Thus some money is forthcoming to meet serious problems of public health, but very seldom indeed for questions where human happiness as such is concerned without being tied to "the public interest" or some tangibly useful service.

In this issue of FREEDOM we print an article from a correspondent in New York which points to this gap in the orientation of science. For some time it has been known that

a substance with the extravagant name of o-diazoacetyl-l-serine has effects on rats which could have a remarkable effect on undesired human fertility. Yet we are still waiting to hear what steps are being taken to utilize the full potentialities of this knowledge.

Obviously we shall go on waiting because it is quite plain that governments are not interested—even when they are not actively hostile—to that kind of research. But it is not only governments who are orientated away from constructive use of science for human happiness. The majority of scientists are "practical" men, i.e. they are interested in whatever society and its means of expression—government bulletins and newspapers—are chiefly concerned with. Nor is the general public much better. We may be fairly confident that FREEDOM readers will be more interested in o-diazoacetyl-l-serine and its potentialities than the readers of most journals. Many newspaper readers will actually be hostile to such possibilities. Yet the effect on women of having in their own hands the power to decide whether they get pregnant or not could be immense.

Nor will it really do to complain that this is a special case involving special shyness and inhibitions. Important as these are with regard to sexual matters, it is also generally true that people are singularly inert in matters affecting their happiness, being content to rub along in the old grooves and fearful of breaking new ground.

### Folic Acid Antagonists and the Law

The folic acid antagonists of which o-diazo-etc. is a derivative are likely to run into legal difficulties if their obvious potentialities for human happiness are explored and put to practical use. Our New York correspondent does not mince matters. It is quite plain that these substances do not prevent conception, they prevent an early pregnancy from continuing. This means in plain terms that they work by producing an abortion. However they cannot be used in the usual way of abortifacients to terminate a known and established pregnancy, for their effect is only on the earliest and more actively growing stage of the embryo. Hence if you take them you will never know if you get pregnant or not because they will terminate the pregnancy at a stage too early to detect by the existing tests or clinical methods. Clearly *Baby Doll* is not the only headache which Cardinal Spellman may have to face!

A more serious problem is whether the attempt to advance this method of pregnancy control will not straightaway run into legal difficulties, making its advocates (and those who employ it) open to prosecution under the laws against abortion.

And this brings us back to our starting point—that established institutions whether governmental, or legal, or the conservative habit of mind, all alike militate against the use of science constructively for human happiness. Progressive people are continually in conflict with governments and legal systems, and no doubt such conflicts will only end with the extinction of government. But the conservative habit of mind is something which is found in ourselves and in our fellows, and hence is more accessible to the possibility of change by persuasion instead of conflict. But it requires considerable exercise of imagination and also imaginative courage.

**We need many more NEW READERS and your help to reach them!**

## What Kind of Revolution in the Russian Empire?

"Marx is an authoritarian and centralising communist. He wants what we want, the complete triumph of economic and social equality; but he wants it in the State and through the State power, through the dictatorship of a very strong and, so to say, despotic provisional government, that is, by the negation of liberty. His economic ideal is the State as sole owner of the land and of all kinds of capital, cultivating the land under the management of state engineers, and controlling all industrial and commercial associations with State capital."

"We want the same triumph of economic and social equality through the abolition of the State, and of all that passes by the name of law (which, in our view, is the permanent negation of human rights). We want the reconstruction of society and the unification of mankind to be achieved, not from above downwards by any sort of authority, nor by socialist officials, engineers, and other accredited men of learning—but from below upwards, by the free federation of all kinds of workers' associations liberated from the yoke of the State."

—MICHAEL BAKUNIN, 28 Jan. 1872.  
(Letter to the Internationalists of the Romagna).

★

IN the present ferment of ideas in the Russian empire it is possible to discern, beyond the demands for the most elementary human rights, social and economic aspirations which are neither for the 'free enterprise' peddled by ageing exiled politicians on Radio Liberation and Radio Free Europe, nor for the 'back to Lenin' cult fostered by one wing of the Russian bureaucracy. One of the latest observers of these tendencies was Mr. Peter Wiles, the Oxford economist who was in Poznan at the time of the riots and who went to Hungary in the period when the Austrian frontier was open. In the January issue of *Encounter* he writes:

"... on the whole both preserved an astonishing moral purity. Poland had less chance to show this than Hungary, where for weeks there was no authority. In a frenzy of anarchist self-discipline the people, including the criminals, stole nothing, beat no Jews, and never got drunk. They went so far as to lynch only security policemen (AVH) leaving other Communists untouched... The moral achievement is perhaps unparalleled in revolutionary history... It was indeed intellectuals of some sort that began both movements, with the industrial workers following them. The peasants had of course never ceased to resist since 1945, but from the nature of things in a dispersed and passive manner. Peasants stop things, they don't start them. Their sole initiative was the astonishing and deeply moving despatch of free food to Budapest after the first Soviet attack had been beaten."

This account is amplified in a broadcast by Mr. Andrew Révai (*The Listener* 10/1/57), who said, describing the days from October 23rd to 29th:

"The factories were taken over by the workers' councils. The administration was taken over by the revolutionary councils, consisting of delegates of workers, peasants, soldiers, and the young people. Each council worked out a programme defining political, economic, and administrative aims. They were all variations of the demands first promulgated by the intellectuals, differing only in emphasis and gaining in sharpness as the days went by."

and he continued:

"In the fourth stage of the revolution, which began on November 11 and is still going on now, the industrial workers, though abandoning the use of arms, retained the real power vested in their councils. For weeks Kadar tried to win these over by negotiations, by promises, and by threats. But whenever threats were followed by punitive action, the councils replied by calling strikes. Neither concessions nor punitive action have succeeded in abolishing the council's authority. They have shown a remarkable elasticity in swinging between assent and resistance according to the respective needs of the people and the State; they have agreed to production if it serves the needs of the people, but have stopped it when it could help the reconstruction of the State."

★

OBSERVERS have been drawing parallels with the situation in Russia in 1917. Mr. Révai for instance remarks that "In order to overthrow this very State set up by Russian Communism, the Hungarian people reverted to Lenin's method and vested the local and factory councils with the same power as Lenin demanded for the soviets in 1917". But the difference is that the Bolsheviks, whose whole mode of thought and action was centralist were simply exploiting the

popular revolutionary slogan 'All Power to the Soviets' in order to ride into power, and the indications are that the Hungarian workers to-day do not intend that their soviets should be subordinated to a political party. As Ignazio Silone wrote last month in *L'Express*, "In reality Soviets disappeared from Russia in 1920 and the only Soviets that exist today on the whole face of the earth are precisely the revolutionary committees in Hungary and that in the exact sense of the word—open, elementary formations improvised by the power of the people".

In discussing the kind of economic demands which are being made, Mr. Wiles declares that:

"... it was incredible how similar have been the ideas of the Poles and Hungarians for the future economic structure of their countries. Industry is to remain in public ownership, but to be radically decentralised. The independent socialist firms thus created are to decide their own outputs and possibly prices on a free market. Workers' councils are to have considerable powers. In agriculture, there is to be a free peasantry which may voluntarily co-operate for certain purposes. Compulsory collective farms are to be abolished, and the crop sold on a free market without compulsory deliveries to the State."

This description reminds us a little of the 'managerial' opposition in Russia itself, the so-called *Malenkovtsy* with their demand for a kind of 'socialist market economy', but more, of the radical opposition in Russia described in the *Observer* (24/6/56) by two returned prisoners from Vorkuta:

"The more radical elements, like the students and younger party members as well as the survivors of old oppositions, approve the demands for economic decentralisation and rationalisation, but go beyond them in two vital respects. First, they believe that the kolkhoz in its present form cannot be saved, but should be replaced by voluntary co-operatives of individual peasants, with co-operative ownership of the machines which are now owned by the State. Second, they attack the principle of totalitarian party control by urging that democratic trade unions and peasant organisations, independent of the party, should play a major rôle in deciding economic policy and administering production."

★

MR. WILES makes a comparison between the kind of policies which are being forced upon Gomulka, and those of Tito in Yugoslavia.

"Be he never so left-wing, Tito had to dissolve his collective farms and abolish compulsory deliveries—a typical Gomulkaite policy. In industry, Tito pressed on towards his own conception of 'full Communism': the State 'withered away' as planning was decentralised, price and output decisions were left to the free market, and—above all—workers' councils took more and more managerial power. This anarcho-syndicalist fits more easily into left-wing Communist ideas (a right-winger would prefer State capitalism counterbalanced by normal trade unions); yet Gomulka is imitating it. What else can he do? It is what his workers want."

And the point about this, is that Tito, for all his so-called syndicalism remains the totalitarian boss of a monolithic State. If the changes in the Russian empire are in the direction of Titoism (*form without content*), they will be as

limited in effect as those of Yugoslavia. But in reality, Gomulka in Poland and Kadar (or Nagy in his brief hour) in Hungary are floating on the surface of events, trying to keep their heads above water. (The simplicism of the Western press in making Nagy a hero and Kadar a traitor ignores this). And they are all trying to appropriate the institutions thrown up by popular discontent, for their own political purposes, just as the Bolsheviks did in 1917, or just as the German communists did in the Munich Council-Republic in 1919.

When Lenin introduced the New Economic Policy in 1921, after crushing the Kronstadt Revolt and the Makhnovists in the Ukraine, he did so, as the alternative to yielding to demands for local autonomy, and with the intention of 'starting all over again' when political conditions permitted. And when the régime was sufficiently consolidated, his successor did start all over again with the enforced collectivisations and the first Five Year Plan.

If the "silent pressures from below" in Russia and its empire, are seen in the minds of their initiators as part of the Lenin revival, a study of the actual, as opposed to the official history of the Soviet Union should convince them that Lenin versus Stalin is a false antithesis. The difference was one of timing and not of ideology. A much more basic antithesis is the one which has been creeping into the reports of students of Soviet affairs, that of Bakunin versus Marx. For the disputes between Marx and Bakunin in the First International in 1871-2 have acquired a new topicality in post-Stalinist Russia. An article in the Russian émigré paper *Socialist Courier*, commenting under the title "The Spectre of Bakunin Reappears in Russia", on the testimony of repatriated prisoners, says about references to 'a certain renewed interest in anarchism and anarcho-syndicalism in Russia' that:

"It is true to say that even without this information it would be possible to predict precisely the development of these ideas in Russia. The all-pervading power of the State, suppressing all free thought among the people, the negation of all human rights by the State and the fierce economic exploitation could lead to nothing else but a change in the mind of the worker, peasant or intellectual, to the point of view that only the struggle against the State would enable them to win their rights and security. The Russian workers and peasants are tired of decades of bolshevik propaganda telling them that the Soviet State is their protector, and that exploitation has been abolished... Thus the idea of a struggle against the State is coming to replace the idea of the class struggle, and this is leading to the spread of anarchist and anarcho-syndicalist ideas."

★

THIS interpretation adds interest to Mr. Révai's remark on the Hungarian workers councils' differentiation between the needs of the people and those of the State, for if, as has been said, the East European peoples have telescoped into twelve years the experiences of the Russian people in forty, they must reject not only Leninism, Stalinism and Titoism, but the Marxist assumptions on which all these allegedly varying versions of

Continued on p. 4

## FREEDOM PRESS

### HERBERT READ :

*Art and the Evolution of Man* 4s.  
*Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism* 3s. 6d.  
*Poetry and Anarchism* cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d.  
*The Philosophy of Anarchism* boards 2s. 6d., paper 1s.  
*The Education of Free Men* 1s.

### GEORGE WOODCOCK :

*New Life to the Land* 6d.  
*Homes orhovels?* 6d.  
*Railways and Society* 3d.  
*What is Anarchism?* 1d.  
*The Basis of Communal Living* 1s.

### MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI :

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

### PETER KROPOTKIN :

*The State: Its Historic Rôle* 1s.  
*The Wage System* 3d.  
*Revolutionary Government* 3d.  
*Organised Vengeance Called Justice* 2d.

### TONY GIBSON :

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

### 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.

### E. A. GUTKIND :

*The Expanding Environment* 8s. 6d.

### V. RICHARDS :

*Lessons of the Spanish Revolution* 6s.

### RUDOLF ROCKER :

*Nationalism and Culture* cloth 21s.

### ALEX COMFORT :

*Delinquency* 6d.  
*Barbarism & Sexual Freedom* boards 3s. 6d.

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

## PROJECTS

## A Town Community?

THE idea of forming communities, for working or living together, is one which is constantly cropping up among anarchists and libertarians generally.

A country community run by anarchists has existed for two years now at 'Communitas', near Cirencester in Gloucestershire, and many comrades from London and other parts of the country have enjoyed visits there. So far however, there has been little evidence of a real desire to create a similar community in town.

But now we have been asked by a reader to advertise her willingness to discuss seriously the creation of a group in London for the purpose of setting up a libertarian community.

We are pleased to publish her appeal and to point out that this is an initiative coming from her and her friends and that any readers contacting her may do so direct and on their own responsibility.

The announcement is as follows:  
Woman reader and three friends (male and female) want to join or form a group for the purpose of living (and learning) together on a libertarian basis. Own jobs and a room of one's own—and a common-room. Experience shows that ultimately each would probably have to pay about £100 to buy a house in London, with a repayment of £1 per room per week until mortgage is paid off. House would probably take six months to find. Beryl Paul, 12 Nassington Road, N.W.3. Hampstead 5116 (Out between 1.0 and 8 p.m.).

★

## International Anarchist Centre for London?

THE need for a better contact between individual Anarchists (and groups of

Anarchists) of all countries is now more important than ever.

A small group of comrades has therefore undertaken the forming of an INTERNATIONAL ANARCHIST CENTRE.

We seek contact with all friends, wherever they may live, for the exchange of information and opinion. This to be a first attempt of organising an International Information Service and altogether a more militant approach to Anarchism.

If you like to help please write to:—  
I.A.C. c/o Freedom Press,  
27 Red Lion Street, London, W.C.1.

THE Movement for Colonial Freedom in its January issue of *Prod* reveals that there are over 30,000 Africans still held without charge in Kenya's detention camps.

"There have been accusations of inhuman treatment. Because of this the Red Cross in Geneva asked to send observers to these camps. But the Kenya government refused them admission. At least, the Red Cross says so.

Similarly in Hungary the other imperial power concerned refused to admit the Red Cross for weeks. Then, anxious to demonstrate its masters' magnanimity *The Daily Worker* reported on 12th November "Red Cross admitted" and that a convoy of 15 vehicles was on its way to Budapest.

There is not a peck of difference between one imperialism and another. Speed the day of their evanishment!

P.

## A WORLD PROBLEM — OUR PROBLEM

## The World's Refugees

"Refugees are the backwash of political events, of wars, coups, pogroms. As long as these events are interesting, the refugees are interesting too; and Governments are easily persuaded to support large and expensive relief operations while there is some political kudos attached. But all too soon the interest wanes and the official purse-strings tighten."

John Davy in *The Observer*,  
20th Jan., 1957.

"The rate at which these refugees can be released must not be determined by considerations of money. If the programme can be speeded up then no fellow-being should be expected to remain in these camps a moment longer than is imposed by the problems of rehabilitation. Insist that a government—preferably one's own—advance the £6 million required and then a world-wide campaign should be launched to raise every penny. Not to repay the government—after all it's our money!—but in order to emphasise that the problem of the refugees is our problem!"

FREEDOM, 20th Oct., 1956.

WHAT are the feelings of the hundreds of thousands of refugees who spend their lives stagnating in the hopeless and inadequate refugee camps of the world, when they hear of the immediate immigra-

tion granted to Hungarian refugees into countries which they have been trying to enter for years? What must they think when they hear that over £2 million has been raised in Britain in two months for the Hungarians, when it took the United Nations Association's campaign a year to raise only £250,000?

As *The Observer* has said, it is those refugees who catch the public imagination "as a spectacle at once tragic, dramatic and romantic" who become the objects of much sympathy, and the recipients of considerable financial aid. There are no exceptions to the rule, for the public memory is short, and Governments never act as charitable institutions.

The vast numbers of refugees who occupy camps in Germany, Austria, Italy, Greece, Turkey, South Korea, Vietnam, Indonesia and Pakistan—all these homeless and destitute people are the responsibility of various organisations which could function speedily and well if they had sufficient resources; these resources should be forthcoming from the governments of the world who

are asked to contribute in proportion to their U.N. contribution. But, for example in 1955 only 52 per cent. of the target was met, and much of that figure was provided by voluntary campaigns in a few small countries like Holland, Sweden and Belgium.

When one considers the relatively small amount which would be required to settle all the refugees of the world—insignificant by comparison with the thousands of millions of pounds and dollars which are spent by the Western governments on armaments for "the defence of human rights"—one can hardly avoid wondering why the rights of human refugees should not be defended by governments here and now.

But the responsibility for refugees everywhere rests with all of us—all just causes should be supported, not only the ones in the headlines, or those which will yield a profit in propaganda.

It rests with all of us to demand that help should be given—not only to the seemingly romantic refugees from current Communist tyranny, but also to the thousands upon thousands of human beings who have been and are the victims of tyranny and oppression from both East and West all over the world.

## Revolution in the Russian Empire

Continued from p. 3

Communism are based, and so must the Russians themselves. Bakunin declared in 1870:

"You can see quite well that behind all the democratic and socialistic phrases and promises of Marx's programme, there is to be found in his State all that constitutes the true despotic and brutal nature of all States, whatever may be the form of their government and that in the final reckoning, the People's State so strongly commended by Marx, and the aristocratic-monarchic State, maintained with as much cleverness as power by Bismarck, are completely identical by the nature of their objective at home as well as in foreign affairs. In foreign affairs it is the same deployment of military force, that is to say, conquest; and in home affairs it is the same employment of this armed force, the last argument of all threatened political powers against the masses, who, tired of believing, hoping, submitting and obeying always, rise in revolt."

This was said nearly ninety years ago, and nearly fifty years before any Marxist party came to power, and it all came true. Bakunin was right, not because he was endowed with the gift of prophesy, but because he understood the nature of the State and the vital distinction between society and the State. And that is why the real issues in Eastern Europe and in Russia itself are not the choice between Malenkov and Khrushchev, between Tito and the ghost of Stalin, between Nagy and Kadar, nor between Gomulka and the Natolin Group in Poland's rigged elections, but between a socialism which is based on the coercive power of the State and the party, and one which is based on the free federation of autonomous associations of producers.

C.W.

\*See "Libertarian Manifestations in Russia" (FREEDOM 17/12/55).

Howard Taubman in his much referred to book tells a story which we hope will move our readers as deeply as it moved us. In New Orleans during Toscanini's tour of the American continent (when he was over 80!) a shy Italian, one Gino Alessandri, who had played the cello with him at La Scala more than forty years before, waited for the Maestro outside his hotel shortly before he was due to leave to conduct a concert.

Toscanini emerged from a lift and with his mind on the music to be played shortly he walked towards the street, looking neither left nor right. Alessandri called out: "Maestro!" There was an annoyed look on Toscanini's face as he stopped and turned round. Then a broad smile broke out. "Alessandri," he said. "What are you doing here?" When Alessandri told him that he was in town to play some concerts in the local orchestra's pop season, the maestro said: "You will come to hear the concert to-night." Alessandri was embarrassed. "I'm not rich these days," he murmured. Toscanini took him by the arm and led him to his car. As they rode to the hall, Toscanini recalled the old days of music-making together. In the hall, just before he went out to conduct, Toscanini led Alessandri to a place in the wings and told him to stay there through the concert. That evening Toscanini conducted not only with his usual concentration but with a rare ebullience. One of the players said to him: "Maestro you are happy to-night." Toscanini smiled gently. "Yes," he said, "I have an old friend here to-night."

★

"BLESSED be simplicity" was a phrase often used by Toscanini but one which also influenced his life. He resisted publicity (hating flash-light press-photographers in particular!), consistently refused the honorary doctorates that were offered him by all the American universities and gently but firmly refused a life membership of the Senate offered him by the President of Italy. But where his conscience dictated that he should take a stand against some injustice then he was as unafraid of publicity in politics as he was where musical integrity was concerned. One feels his attitude was the same whether he was fighting the dictatorial management of La Scala or the Metropolitan or protesting against the dictatorship of Hitler or Mussolini.

In spite of early sympathies for Mussolini he soon realised his mistake and became an implacable enemy of the régime (that he should ever have hoped for Italy's salvation through the socialist renegade Mussolini, would indicate that Toscanini had little understanding of the real political situation in Italy after the first war. Indeed, later, he conceded without hesitation that he erred in his early estimate of Mussolini, by confusing his political ambitions with a love for Italy). But he made no mistake where Hitler was concerned and broke with the Salzburg Festival even before the

date of the Anschluss in Austria in 1938.

For Toscanini people were not important according to their wealth or status. It was just as easy for him to refuse to break his lifelong rule of not seeing anyone in his dressing room during the interval, for a king as for a layman (at the 1939 B.B.C. concerts he declined an invitation to visit the royal box; some years earlier he had declined two requests to visit him backstage by King Ferdinand of Bulgaria). On the other hand one can imagine with what pleasure he came to the rescue of those two Negro chambermaids at his Hotel in New Orleans when they told him that there were no more \$3 tickets, the most they could afford, for his concert. Toscanini arranged for them to be his guests backstage!

★

NOW the "Old Man" is gone. His life was one of fulfilment. To lovers of music everywhere he has left a heritage of musical performance which will serve as standards of reference for perhaps generations to come. Above all he was the symbol of a human integrity and dignity to which all should aspire but which no one, we think, will emulate!

V.R.

## MAESTRO TOSCANINI

Continued from p. 2

in the centre of the road, where they belong. Soon there is no Verdi. I like *Otello* best in my study when I read the score. Then it is perfect.\*

But conducting was also a joy, a deep physical experience in itself. There could be no better proof of this than the kind of words Toscanini would use to conjure from the orchestra the sounds and phrasing that he sought to achieve: He would say "Be happy", "Understand", "Enjoy", "Realise this sorrow, this anxiety, this fever". To the B.B.C. orchestra in a passage from the *Meistersinger* Prelude, he said:

"First violins, play sotto voce, but with intense feeling, as if you said, and here his voice became a hoarse whisper: 'I love you, I love you—but whispered under your breath'."

And how better could one express what music meant to him than in this exchange with a friend to whom he asked—following a performance of the "Eroica" in which the audience made him take bow after bow—"What did they want me to do?" and to the answer which was in fact a question: "What did you do when you were moved by a performance?" Toscanini replied: "At nineteen I heard Lohengrin, and I was moved, but I didn't applaud; I cried."

How many of our British "star" conductors, we wonder, could confess to such reactions. Very few if we are to judge by the standard of their own performance!

★

WHAT is it that makes us unreservedly refer to Toscanini as one of the great men of our time, perhaps even as one of those rare exceptions that prove the rule. He was a man who could combine an awareness of his worth as a musician with humility before the creations of the composers whose works he sought to interpret. He recognised that his great musical gift was of no value unless combined with integrity as a musician and as a man. (Did he not say to Richard Strauss—whose equivocal position vis a vis the Hitler régime is notorious—"I take my hat off to you as a composer," but with a disgusted gesture added, "I put back ten hats as a man.")

He commanded high fees, and must have died a wealthy man (and one suspects that the "business side was largely handled by his manager-son, Walter) but his wealth, we are convinced was incidental, for apart from the fact that his life was too rich to need the artificial and expensive distractions that keep the idle-rich from death by boredom, it is clear that financial gain never influenced his actions. The demands Toscanini made on impresarios or the recording companies were of the kind that would above all ensure performances of the highest order: adequate rehearsals, and the release of recordings only if the

Maestro was satisfied with the performance. Not the kinds of demand made by conductors concerned with commercialising their art! We have already referred to what these demands cost the gramophone companies, as well as Toscanini, in the case of Debussy's *La Mer*. But we cannot refrain from another example. Toscanini's recording of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony was made in 1952, when he was 85, fifty years after his first public performance of that work. On four previous occasions RCA Victor had recorded a Toscanini performance of the symphony. But each recording was rejected by the Maestro as falling short of the mark ("The Ninth is difficult. Sometimes the chorus is not good. The soloists are seldom good. Sometimes the orchestra is not good. Sometimes I am no good. You know, I still don't understand the first movement"). Of this performance however he said, after listening to the playbacks of the recording: "After fifty years of studying and performing it, this is the closest I can get to Beethoven's Ninth. I'm almost satisfied this time."

★

NOT only have we, and our children, thanks also to science, a performance of the Ninth which "almost satisfied" Toscanini but the New York Infirmary too benefited by \$55,000 for its building fund!

Again, Toscanini, contrary to the general rule, became ever more generous as his wealth increased. When in 1945 the Italian Committee of Liberation sent him an appeal to return to Italy to help in the reconstruction of La Scala in Milan (severely damaged by Allied bombers), he sent a message to the people of Milan in which he told them how "deeply" their message had moved him, that he would be "happy to return among you as a citizen of a free Italy and not as a subject of the degenerate kings and princes of the House of Savoy". He did not, in fact return until Victor Emanuel was on his way to exile in Alexandria, Egypt, but in the meantime he responded to the appeal by sending a million lire (in 1945 at least £1,000) "for the reconstruction of my beloved theatre, La Scala. I hope to do more in the future". And his "unauthorised" biographer\* adds that:

In 1945 he conducted a special Carnegie Hall performance with part of the proceeds going to Italian war-orphan. In 1947 he heard that the Casa Verdi di Riposo for aged musicians lacked heat and he quietly underwrote the bill for this service for that and succeeding years. In January, 1949, on the anniversary of Verdi's death, he sent \$6,000 for distribution among needy musicians of Milan.

Yes, we know the rich can afford to be generous with their money. But the fact is that generally they are not! Not only was Toscanini generous with his money, he was also unaffected by it.

## 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.

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.

## ★ Malatesta Club ★

SWARAJ HOUSE,  
32 PERCY STREET,  
TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD, LONDON, W.1.  
(Tel.: MUSeum 7277).

## ACTIVITIES

Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.  
London Anarchist Group Meetings  
(see Announcements Column)

Every Wednesday at 8 p.m.  
BONAR THOMPSON Speaks.

Every Friday and Saturday:  
SOCIAL EVENINGS

## AFRICAN FORUM

Tuesday, January 29th, at 7.30 p.m.  
CANON COLLINS ON  
SOUTH AFRICA & THE  
PROTECTORATES  
Followed by Social

## 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  
/c Payee, and addressed to the publishers

FREEDOM PRESS  
27 Red Lion Street  
London, W.C.1. England  
Tel.: Chancery 8364