

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 18, No. 15

April 13th, 1957

Threepence

A DEFENCE WHITE PAPER TO TELL US

THERE'S NO H-BOMB DEFENCE

THE government's "sweeping changes" in military policy, announced last week, only make sense to such cynical observers of the political and economic scene as ourselves; goodness knows what the gullible public makes of it all! For it is only by relating military policy to the economic problems of a nation or group of nations that one can see any meaning in the government's sudden *volte face* in its "Defence programme". Or to put it another way, military policy is determined more by economics than by considerations of so-called "aggression". War, in the words of Clausewitz, is the continuation of diplomacy by other means. But diplomacy which is a polite way of referring to politics, is not a struggle for power for its own sake, but is directly or indirectly rooted in economics. Since 1945, "prosperity" and full-employment in the industrial nations has been maintained by a war-economy. To our minds that war economy has very little to do with threats of aggression from the Iron Curtain countries, but a great deal to do with capitalist economics and the extraordinary expansion of industrial production techniques.

TWENTIETH century politicians differ from their nineteenth century counterparts only in that they are more hypocritical. They are wolves in sheep's clothing; realists who pose as idealists. Whereas their ancestors had no scruples in revealing themselves as the pirates they were, contemporary politicians would have us see them as saviours, defenders of all that is good in society; political missionaries bringing light to the dark corners of the globe! Perhaps literacy and the growth of mass communications have made it more difficult for their policies to be acceptable without the disguise and the deception, but the fact remains, as we pointed out just

two years ago, when once again the H-bomb was being discussed in the House of Commons: "Power politics is as much the vice of democracy as of the totalitarian régimes and is at the very foundations of the class society".

Power politics is as old as government, and to-day there is no means of distinguishing aggressor from aggressed since these terms have become purely subjective. As to the divisions in the world being *ideological*, as the politicians on both sides of the curtain would have us believe, well, one needs to be very green to swallow that one!

IF they were ideological then one would expect to find a determination and unity of purpose on both sides of the ideological curtain which would ensure maximum co-operation in at least military matters not

*Freedom Selections, Vol. 5, 1955.
"Vested Interests & the Bomb", p.57.

to mention foreign policy. Instead of which the post-war years have been marked by revolt and defection East of the curtain and secrecy and rivalry on this side. It is perhaps worthwhile to refresh our memories—in view of the recent debate on the Macmillan government's new military programme—by reference to the H-Bomb debate in the House of Commons two years ago (in which, incidentally Bevan was made the scapegoat by the Press just as Mr. Brown's utterances have now been used to distract attention from the real issues). Then, Sir Winston Churchill justified Britain's development of the bomb firstly on the grounds that "owing to the breakdown in the exchange of information between us and the United States since 1946 we have had to start again independently on our own", and secondly because

"personally I cannot feel we should have much influence over their [the United States] policy or actions, wise or unwise, while we are largely dependent

upon their protection. We too must possess substantial deterrent power of our own".

Two years later, in the White Paper in which the government explains its new military policy we are told that "No country can any longer protect itself in isolation. The defence of Britain is possible only as part of the collective defence of the free world". And this now justifies the government's policy of reliance on American missiles and the consequent abandonment of independent research on, and development of, these weapons here! We are not complaining; we are simply illustrating a point.

Are we to understand that the differences between this country and the United States have disappeared in the past two years . . . or rather in the past few months since after all on the Middle East issue, for instance, the United States voted with Russia against Britain in the United Nations Assembly, clearly

"If the people refuse to render military service, if they decline to pay taxes to support that instrument of violence, an army, the present system of government cannot stand . . . Let them go to prison. The Government cannot put the whole population in prison, and if it could it would still be without material for an army and without money for its support." —LEO TOLSTOY.

an indication that until quite recently there was no unanimity between the two Western Powers!

TO our minds the government's new (military) look has little to do with defence against some unnamed aggressor but a lot to do with future economic policy. (Without a blush they are adopting Bevan's line of a few years back). On the one hand they declare that they cannot afford the present expenditure on the military forces, on the other, they have to do something to counteract the growing encroachments on their foreign markets by countries such as Germany and Japan. Thus in the White Paper they justify drawing in their horns militarily on the grounds that

Britain's influence in the world depends first and foremost on the health of her internal economy and the success of her export trade. Without these military power cannot in the long run be supported.

Suddenly the Russian menace has taken second place. Success in world markets comes first. Macmillan's "sweeping changes" represent only a saving of some £70 millions this year, but in terms of manpower, thousand of scientists and skilled workers will be released for industry. This new outlook on Defence policy, is matched by the government's attitude to the European free market, from which it has remained aloof for years but to which it is now committed. Suddenly, too, the Channel Tunnel has come back into the news and we shall not be surprised to hear that the government is prepared to override its military advisers and sponsor its construction!

WE do not know how many millions have been spent on the Defence of these islands in the past ten years. The Macmillan government has at last come to share the conclusions of millions of nit-wit laymen that in a nuclear war there is no defence:

It must be frankly recognised that there is at present no means of providing adequate protection for the people of this country against the consequences of an attack with nuclear weapons. Though in the event of war, the fighter aircraft of the R.A.F. would unquestionably be able to take a heavy toll of enemy bombers, a proportion would inevitably get through. Even if it were only a dozen,

Continued on p. 3

Cyprus an Unsinkable Missile Ship

IT is now nearly two years since the British Government made clear its intention never to allow Cyprus to retire from the role for which its geographical position ordained it.

Following the withdrawal from the Suez Canal Zone in 1955, British Forces made their main East Mediterranean base in Cyprus, and the British Colonial Secretary, in words afterwards echoed by Sir Anthony Eden, categorically stated that Britain *must* keep its grip on the island in order to be ready to defend British interests in the Middle East.

The usefulness of Cyprus for this purpose was demonstrated last October when both the British and French forces massed and took off from there for the attack on Egypt.

Eighteen months ago (FREEDOM 17/9/55) we pointed out just what this meant for the Cypriot people. In the event of a major war Cyprus would be a base for atom bombers, we said, and would thus become a target for the atom bombs of the enemy. This, in our opinion, was one of the reasons which—quite justifiably—made the Cypriots hopping mad at the British intransigence over self-determination.

A Sitting Target

It's bad enough to be denied the right to choose their own form of government, but when that denial implies their becoming a sitting target in the event of war it is not surprising that the Cypriots refused to take it lying down. To the best of our knowledge this aspect of the Cyprus question has not been presented in the Press—for obvious reasons.

Steady progress has been made in fitting out the island for its splendid purpose. In December 1955 (FREEDOM 24/12/55) the then Secretary for Air, Lord De l'Isle and Dudley visited Cyprus and inspected the airfields, and on his return proudly spoke of its use as a base for nuclear bombers and said 'The location of Cyprus is exceedingly important in the whole strategy of that area, and I am delighted to see the progress we are making, particularly at Akrotiri.'

At the same time the American General, James Van Fleet told a Greek newspaper in Athens that the British establishment in Cyprus, to be of any strategic value, must have friendship and loyal support among its inhabitants—'otherwise it is nothing more than a prison in a hostile country.'

Now we—who do not pretend to be military experts—have pointed out often enough that the reason for the withdrawal from Suez was not because of any respect on the part of the British Government for the national aspirations of the Egyptians (and we think that has been amply demonstrated since!) but simply that a base established in a hostile country, surrounded by a population prepared to use terror as a means

of protest, is a very insecure one and of doubtful value in time of need. Unprepared on Cyprus

How much has this applied to Cyprus? Those who are supposed to know and be concerned about such things have strongly criticised the performance put up by the combined British forces in the Suez adventure of last autumn. The whole operation by land, air and sea, according to some experts, mishandled in a most 'shocking' manner. How much of this (assuming it to be true) was due to the fact that over the last eighteen months the garrisons on Cyprus have been unable to concentrate on the function of preparing the island for war, but have been bullying the population and hunting the terrorists of EOKA?

It now becomes clear that the real reason for the release of Archbishop Makarios from the Seychelles and his return to Athens is that President Eisenhower told Macmillan pretty bluntly that he'd better clear up the mess in Cyprus if he wanted American co-operation in Middle East defence. Probably repeating what his fellow general, Van Fleet, said sixteen months ago, Ike's line was most likely that the USA would not supply Britain with guided missiles (Macmillan's proud bargain) unless Cyprus was a stable base from which to use them.

For, such is the rapid progress in defence that all the best civilized countries are now making, that it is not only atomic bombers that are to be based on Cyprus, but guided missiles as well.

Ideally Situated

It was announced last Monday that Mr. Duncan Sandys, Minister of Defence and author of the Government's grand new defence White Paper, is to visit Cyprus during the Easter recess. A *Daily Telegraph* report said:

It has long been recognised that for one military purpose and one only Cyprus is ideally situated. It is a perfect base for the intermediate range ballistic missile or IRBM.

In other respects Cyprus lacks most of the attributes of a base of operations. The ostensible purpose of Cyprus

Continued on p. 4

HUNGARIAN MINERS

WHILE we can understand the economic fears which makes workers refuse to accept foreign labour in their midst, we have to disagree with the shortsighted policy of the British miners, many of whom are opposed to the employment of Hungarian refugees training to become miners in this country; only seven out of the 140 collieries in South Wales have agreed to accept Hungarian refugees.

As we see it the problem is twofold; practical and moral. Our views on the latter are well enough known to readers of FREEDOM. We regard it as the duty of everyone to take some responsibility for those people who are in need wherever this is possible, and a social endeavour like finding work for refugees is made easier where a collective organisation is available. It can be argued with some truth that the Government made arrangements to take refugees and the Coal Board has accepted them as trainees, therefore, these two outfits are responsible for them. But we are interested in the attitude of the miners themselves, and we always hope that they will display a sense of solidarity, not only among themselves, but towards foreign workers—a spirit which is necessary before any change in social relationships can be brought about. If, however, the economic consideration were removed we wonder just how much prejudice would remain. But, even assuming that the only objection the miners have is the fear that there may be a shortage of work as a result

of too much labour, the test of a man's social conscience is when he extends help to others even at the risk of reducing his own economic standards.

It does not seem to have occurred to any of the miner's leaders (or the miners themselves as far as we know) that the more men there are working in the mines the greater the chance of reducing the hours of work. They could safeguard themselves from wage cuts and redundancy in the mines by making conditions to the Government and the Coal Board. They could come to an agreement with the Hungarian miners whereby they all stuck together if the Coal Board tried to reduce their numbers. In other words take on the Hungarians at the same rate of pay and if a group of men are threatened with the sack when conditions change then all withdraw their labour unless the Government guarantees to keep them until such a time as more jobs are available. The Coal Board is in fact at the moment paying Hungarians £8 a week while they are in training, which may be the reason for some of the resentment on the part of the miners.

The problem will remain as long as human relationships are soured by monetary considerations. But the deep-rooted prejudices against people who are in some way different from the group have to be tackled on another level, and the first step towards this is by different nationalities working together and participating in their social pleasures. In this way it will be discovered that there are few differences between human beings.

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 13

Deficit on Freedom	£280
Contributions received	£248
DEFICIT	£32

March 29 to April 4

Cleveland: T.H. £1/9/0; London: D.R.* 10/-; Welwyn: Joxer* 10/-; London: A.F. 2/6; Hamilton: D.N. 2/6; London: A.W. 1/-; Sheffield: G.P.* 5/-; London: W.W. 1/-; Shepton Mallet: E.H.S. 5/-; Charlton: J.B. 1/3; London: J.S.* 3/-; London: S.B. 2/6; Smethwick: E.W. 2/-; Blackburn: P.H. 1/-; Lakewood: S.M. £1/15/0; London: E.P. 10/-; Ilford: C.S. 5/-.
--

Total	6 5 9
Previously acknowledged	242 9 7

1957 TOTAL TO DATE	£248 15 4
--------------------	-----------

GIFT OF BOOKS: London: S.E.P.

Freedom Press Fire Fund

Manchester: V.M. £1/7/0; Charlton: J.B. 10/-; London: J.L. 2/6; London: L.F. £1; London: G.O. £1; London: Anon. £1; Preston: W.A. Le M. 15/-; Newcastle-on-Tyne: H.R.R. 6d.; Greenford: B.M.E. 5/-; London: H.C. 2/6; London: Anon. £20; Nazeing: M.W. £2; Headcorn: H.K.H. £1
--

Total	£29 2 6
-------	---------

"Our American Guests. Hints: Stress should be placed on the common language and the partnership in efforts to preserve world freedom."

—SPEECHES AND TOASTS FOR ALL OCCASIONS.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

(Open 10 a.m.—6.30 p.m., 5 p.m. Sats.)

New Books . . .

Religion without Revelation
(Revised) Julian Huxley 21/-
The Direction of Human
Development
M. F. Ashley Montagu 25/-
The Unconscious Motives of War
A. Strachey 25/-

Cheap Editions . . .

The Peasant War in Germany
Frederick Engels 4/6
The Golden Bough (abridged)
James Frazer (2 vols.) each 6/-
Far from the Madding Crowd
Thomas Hardy 4/-
Tess of the D'Urbervilles
Thomas Hardy 4/-
Three Plays
Sean O'Casey 3/-

Second-Hand . . .

Theory and Practice of Socialism
John Strachey 3/6
Poverty B. Seebohm Rowntree 2/-
A Connecticut Yankee at King
Arthur's Court (Play)
Twain & Fuller 1/6
Garden Cities of To-morrow
Ebenezer Howard 3/-
The Radical Tradition 1763-1914
(ed.) S. MacCoby 6/-
Essays in Freethinking (1st Series)
Chapman Cohen 3/-
Essays in Freethinking (2nd Series)
Chapman Cohen 2/6
The Secret Treaties (1917)
F. Seymour Cocks 2/6
The Best Plays of Massinger
(Mermaid Edn.) 5/-
The Stolen White Elephant
Mark Twain 2/6
Lost Property Paul Derrick 3/-
Haeckel's Critics Answered
Joseph McCabe 2/6
Let Freedom Ring
Arthur Garfield Hays (signed) 4/-
The Totalitarian Enemy
Franz Borkenau 4/6
The Catholic Church Against the
Twentieth Century
Avro Manhattan 5/-
The Marx Brothers Kyle Crichton 6/-
A Short Biography of William
Lloyd Garrison
introd. by Tolstoy 3/6

Periodicals . . .

University Librarian
No. 2, Winter 1957 10d.

N.B.—An order to the bookshop is a gift to the Press Fund.

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

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

PEOPLE AND IDEAS

RIGHT ABOUT DWIGHT?

called *Politics*. Of the American periodicals of the left that came our way, it was more racial and less literary than the *Partisan Review*, less intransigently anarchist and pacifist than *Why?* (later *Resistance*), and *Retort*. The advantages that *Politics* had over its specifically anarchist contemporaries were greater financial resources, much more journalistic expertise, and the services of a number of first-rate writers. The owner, publisher, editor, proof reader, layout man and principal contributor of this magazine was Dwight Macdonald, a professional journalist who for years had been employed on Henry Luce's glossy businessman's monthly *Fortune*. He had evolved from being a "tepid Communist sympathiser" to membership of one of those warring Trotskyist sects that it is now difficult to believe ever existed. In 1937 he assisted at the rebirth of *Partisan Review* and remained one of the editors until 1943 when his colleagues "had come to feel it was their war and their country, while I had remained disaffected", and in the following year he began *Politics* which rapidly moved from a dissident Marxism to a searching for "a new kind of radical approach—individualistic, decentralised, essentially anarchist".

After five years of life Dwight Macdonald's magazine staggered (its quality unimpaired) to an end, like many of its contemporaries at that time on both sides of the Atlantic. "This has been a one-man magazine," he explained, "and the man has of late been feeling stale, tired, disheartened," and his bank balance had gone down impressively. (The yearly deficit varied between \$2,000 and \$6,000). So Dwight went back to writing for his and his children's living, and, he writes, "In recent years I have devoted most of my time to *The New Yorker*, where I have been able to write the kind of social-cultural reportage and analysis that now interests me more than political writing". At present he is spending a year in this country writing for *Encounter*.

We had a meeting with him a couple of months ago, firing questions at him in a slightly hilarious atmosphere. He turned out to be a big grey-bearded corduroy-jacketed man in his fifties, rather less coherent as an impromptu talker than as a writer. As he spoke of his political evolution we got the feeling that, like so many of the American radicals of the nineteen-thirties and forties, Dwight had become a representative of the "new American right". The quotation from Burke, the affirmation of the need to preserve the plural society, the insistence that ugly phenomena like McCarthyism are not right-wing manifestations but the result of democratic populism, the stress on the value of the checks and balances provided by the Supreme Court—the tone and emphasis placed him

in our minds as a member of that familiar species, the American-intellectual-who-once-was-radical. True his strictures on the incipient totalitarianism of the closed systems of the left, applied more to the various Marxist mythologies that he had waded through in his youth, than to anarchism; true when we badgered him for a label for his present political attitude, he described himself as a "conservative anarchist"; but the feeling we got was that here was an amiable and amusing, but defeated man, who had lost more than he had gained by getting Outside Macdonald.

THERE was something rather smug and self-righteous about our attitude—after all what do we do but churn out our thoughts or regurgitate other peoples, in a paper with an infinitesimal circulation? But allowing for that, were we right about Dwight? What set me wondering were his reminiscences of "Politics Past" in the March and April issues of *Encounter*. These are largely devoted to the strange private world of American Trotskyism, but some marginal remarks show that if Dwight Macdonald is to be regarded as among the ex-anarchists, he is not to be numbered among the anti-anarchists. In his first article he remarks that, "I think anarchism makes more sense to-day than any other radical philosophy," and in the second he says:

"The revolutionary alternative to the status quo to-day is not collectivised property administered by a 'workers' state' whatever that means, but some kind of anarchist decentralisation that will break up mass society into small communities where individuals can live together as variegated human beings instead of as impersonal units in the mass sum. The shallowness of the New Deal and the British Labour Party's post-war régime is shown by their failure to improve any of the important things in people's lives—the actual relationships on the job, the way they spend their leisure, and child-rearing and sex and art. It is mass living that vitiates all these to-day and the State that holds together the status quo. Marxism glorifies 'the masses' and endorses the State. Anarchism leads back to the individual and the community, which is 'impractical' but necessary—that is to say, it is revolutionary."

Now here Dwight is speaking our language, and it makes one wish that he would expand these thoughts in an evaluation of the contemporary relevance of anarchist ideas. But that is not what the *New Yorker* or *Encounter* want of him. They may want sophisticated and knowing reportage on the British Press or the Streets of Cairo or Colin Wilson—perceptive observation of the current scene, but not the kind of writing envisaged in the first issue of *Politics*: "The assumption will be that its readers and contributors are critical of existing insti-

tutions and feel the need for radical change". One might think that the impact of a radical writer like the Dwight Macdonald of ten years ago, in the well-established magazines would be all the greater by reason of their much larger circulations, but in fact this is not so, partly because of the surrounding sea of triviality, and partly for a reason which he himself has discovered:

"While I was editing *Politics*, I often felt isolated, comparing my few thousand readers with the millions and millions of non-readers—such is the power of the modern obsession with quantity, also of Marxism with its sentimentalisation of the masses". But in the last eight years I have run across so many nostalgic old readers in so many unexpected quarters that I have the impression I'm better known for *Politics* than for my articles in *The New Yorker*, whose circulation is roughly seventy times greater. This is curious but should not be surprising. A 'little magazine' is often more intensively read (and circulated) than the big commercial magazines, being a more individual expression and so appealing with special force to other individuals of like minds."

NO-ONE can blame Dwight Macdonald for writing in those periodicals which will provide his bread and butter. He is, after all, a professional writer, and a very gifted one. But again, it surely isn't enough to say, "I now think no one has a duty to interest himself in politics except a politician". For the most mem-

FREEDOM

orable of his articles in *Politics*, for example 'The Responsibility of Peoples' and 'The Root is Man' were not about politics at all, but about the big moral issues which will obviously always be important both for Dwight and for us. Surely the struggling radical papers in America, and our own paper for that matter, have also a place which he could fill (wouldn't he be happier as a sceptical anarchist than as a reluctant conservative?), and which in a way one is entitled to ask him to fill.

Dwight, like a lot of other unpolitical people, feels that anarchism 'makes sense'. What probably makes our activities seem remote to him is the lack of constructive anarchist thinking and writing in the context of the second half of this century—people are always asking rhetorically where are the Kropotkins and Malatestas of to-day? (One of the questions he asked when we met was how many new contributions to anarchist thought we had published in the last five years). Original thinkers and accomplished writers are rare, and one could make a list of a number of people who have made a contribution to anarchist thought but are now apparently lost to the anarchist press. It is their loss since, as they no longer think of the minority press as an outlet and incentive for their radical thoughts, they drift out of the habit of thinking radically, and it is ours since they could make our press so much more valuable and effective. Propagating anarchism may quite conceivably be flogging a dead horse, but since we are not the slaves of history, since we don't believe that because no road leads to Utopia, no road leads anywhere, since we don't want to be tacit victims of 'the new failure of nerve' we ought at least to have the nerve to face failure.

C.W.

FREEDOM PRESS

VOLINE :

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

E. A. GUTKIND :

The Expanding Environment 8s. 6d.

V. RICHARDS :

Lessons of the Spanish Revolution 6s.

RUDOLF ROCKER :

Nationalism and Culture cloth 21s.

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.

ERRICO MALATESTA :

Anarchy 6d.
Vote—What For? 1d.

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.

PHILIP SANSON :

Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step 1s.

★ Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial

Committee publications :

Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949:

A Tribute cloth 5s.

Journey Through Utopia cloth 16s. (U.S.A. \$2.50)

★ K. J. KENAFICK :

Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx paper 6s.

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

Some Factors Affecting Emotional Development in Children—9

(Continued from previous issue)

One meets the occasional sexual anesthetic adult who, having been conditioned to frigidity or psychological impotence by a restrictive up-bringing, is unwilling to admit the need for sexual activity in others. Sex, such people assert, can be sublimated. Possibly it can, up to a point, but not without serious psychological results, and it would be a sad outlook for humanity if it was sublimated. A society based on anti-sexual tradition may make technical progress, for a time, but in doing so becomes sterile and inhuman.

As with infantile sexual behaviour, mutual masturbation is a frequent occurrence among adolescents. It may be heterosexual as occurs in "petting", or it may be homosexual. In neither case is there cause for censure or alarm. Dangers only arise when such activities are undertaken by the sexually unlightened. It might be mentioned, in passing, that there is no justification for keeping adolescents ignorant of contraceptive techniques. Indeed, a knowledge of such techniques would have prevented many unfortunate incidents.

Adolescent homosexuality is a normal stage of development, most adolescents of both sexes pass through such a phase. However, to ensure ultimate complete orientation it is essential that all educational establishments be co-educational so that the growing child has constant contact with the opposite sex. The reputation which England has gained abroad for homosexuality is largely due to the peculiar and unnatural traditional sex segregation in its schools. (Where, of course, homosexuality is due to genetic factors there is little that can be done other than to express toleration and sympathy for the unfortunate individual who all too often, particularly in this country with the law as it stands, is condemned to a life of loneliness. It is very noticeable that quite frequently the greatest aversion to homosexuality is expressed by those who are themselves latent homosexuals. Much of the emotional antagonism towards homosexuality is due to the belief that such unfortunate individuals are a menace to children. This is, of course, nonsense and a con-

fusion of two different deviations. The irrationality of the attitude towards male homosexuality is shown by the acceptance of female homosexual practices as being not only within the law but not even particularly condemned socially.)³⁶

Realization of many of the factors involved in the process of development and a greater sympathy towards the sexual problems of the adolescent would go a long way to prevent many of the gross injustices which too frequently occur when children are dragged before juvenile courts and punished for so-called offences which are no more than normal behaviour. It takes little to imagine the bewilderment which such action must cause in the minds of the children concerned and the deleterious effect on their future happiness which depends so much on correct sexual orientation. A particularly lamentable case occurred in a certain city in England in 1954 when some boys in an institution were brought before a Juvenile Court and convicted for having indulged in activities quite normal for boys of their age—activities which would probably have incurred a considerably lesser censure (in spite of the restrictive nature of our society) had the youngsters concerned belonged to a higher level in the social strata. They should not, of course, have been punished at all.

When circumstances ultimately permit normal sexual intercourse, masturbation is usually—but not always—abandoned. Where circumstances do not permit normal sexual intercourse, masturbation generally survives as a substitute throughout adult life—although, of course, it is a poor substitute since there is lacking the physical contact and the sharing of the experience which are so essential for the complete enjoyment of the sexual act.

Although there is still a long way to go in educating the conventional adult to the view that childhood and adolescent sexual activities are natural and harmless much progress is being made, particularly amongst the better educated section of the community. Attitudes towards sexual behaviour vary considerably according to social background. For

example, the lower income groups are very likely to take an extremely restrictive attitude towards masturbation. The college educated groups generally tend to take a permissive attitude to the activity. It is this difference in attitude which can lead at times to the many injustices which occur, as mentioned above, when young people (or even adults) are being dealt with in the courts. A magistrate may be particularly severe with a certain type of offence which is regarded with disfavour by his social group but which may be a form of behaviour condoned by the social group of the accused.

More children are being assisted towards a happy adult life than was the case only a few years ago. But there are still too many who are not. In England each year the NSPCC has to investigate cases of cruelty involving some 100,000 children.^{37 38}

The cases brought to the notice of the NSPCC are probably only a fraction of those which take place. But these are mostly cases of physical cruelty (not necessarily brutality—more often to-day neglect or cases of environmental conditions dangerous to the child) because it is such occurrences which the outsider observes and, if socially conscious and a child lover, reports. (Unfortunately it sometimes happens that individuals do not intervene when they observe or suspect cases of cruelty. Occasionally they knowingly let

³⁶ For an understanding of the problems of homosexuality the reader is recommended: West: "Homosexuality"; Westwood: "Society and the Homosexual"; Cory: "The Homosexual Outlook". For an insight into the treatment of homosexuals by the law-enforcing authorities see: Wildeblood: "Against the Law". Sane recommendations for changes in the laws relating to homosexuals are contained in the Memorandum presented to the Home Office Committee on Homosexuality and Prostitution by the Progressive League. This also summarizes the position in other countries.

³⁷ See: Housden: "The Prevention of Cruelty to Children".

³⁸ Many of the text-books on sexual perversions contain case histories outlining examples of cruelty to children, frequently singularly revolting. For example, see: Hirschfeld: "Sexual Anomalies and Perversions".

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 18, No. 15. April 13, 1957

There's No H-Bomb Defence

Continued from p. 1

they could with megaton bombs inflict widespread devastation.

Why, just now, does the government wish to "frankly recognise" what was made quite clear to the world some years ago by such eminent scientists as Einstein and Bertrand Russell—indeed, not only that there was no defence but that nuclear warfare would wipe out the whole human race—if not that to do so serves the government's present economic policy?

Rightly or wrongly—and we think wrongly—the government hopes to solve the economic crisis by switching a part of its industrial potential from military to consumer production. It assumes that there is an expanding market, whereas in fact there is every indication that world production and productivity is outstripping world demand (not to be confused of course with *needs*!). Already Australia has announced a reduction in its military programme, and Western Germany not only has cut down the original size of its military personnel, but following Britain's initiative, now sees itself as a "nuclear" power even before it has started pouring money down the drain providing itself with out-dated tanks and ante-diluvian bazookas! Other nations will follow Britain's lead.

★

ONLY the United States is horrified and worried by such home truths about there being no defence against nuclear attack (apart from anything else it makes all their civil defence exercises look rather silly!) and the prospect of automated warfare. For economic reasons, the United States will be the last bulwark to aggression, real or imaginary. The United States cannot afford to see peace on the horizon! And in the last few days she has made a terrible discovery: for the first time in her history (as well as in the history of the world):

"the number of people employed in the production of goods was fewer than the number employed in everything else—government, trade, services, finances, utilities, transportation.

The significance of this is explained in a *New York Times* editorial with the equally significant title "A New American Revolution":

It means, in the first place, that we do not need as many workers as we did in proportion to population to produce a given quantity of goods. Between the middle of 1947 and the middle of 1956 the production of *things* in this country went up about 45 per cent. During the same period the number of workers producing *things* went up a little less than 3 per cent. Each average worker produced more, not because he worked harder or longer—he worked less, in fact, with the shortened workday and work week—but because the machinery he used and the methods he followed were better.

During this period the population went up about 24 million. By old theories—even by some modern theories—the result should have been an increase in unemployment. There was no such increase. Workers displaced or not needed in the goods-producing enterprises found places in the service-rendering enterprises. The number of retail shop clerks and others employed in trade rose by 21 per cent.; the number of bank tellers, stockbrokers, insurance salesmen and others employed in financing by 38 per cent.; the number of automobile mechanics, laundry workers, barbers, bellboys and other earning pay for a multitude of services by 26 per cent.; even that seemingly scarce individual, the domestic servant, added 40 per cent. to his number.

Governments—federal, state and local—needed more help, too; the number of persons earning pay for rendering service to them rose by 31 per cent. or about 1,700,000 individuals. The taxpayer may find this fact a sad one, but in spite of the multiplication of public servants the national product did not diminish: it went up.

What would happen if America were to cut her armed forces by a half is difficult to imagine. Certainly there appears to be no room for more men in industry. Better for everybody concerned that they should kick their heels in the Armed Forces than that they should join the dole queues, for at least in the Army they keep yet another army of civilians busily employed and that pays good dividends to some industrialists.

Just as it is in America's immediate economic interests and stability to maintain the Cold War at its present so is it in Britain's interests to play it down. But there is no reason why at some later date the respective roles might be reversed. The cold war economy is the safety valve of new-look capitalism. It bears little relation to threats of aggression by foreign powers or political crises. "Military crises" to-day are a warning that the economic ship needs trimming, nothing more revolutionary or "sweeping" than that.

THE SUN RISES IN THE EAST

THE division of the world into East and West, into this and the other side of the Iron and the Bamboo Curtains, is most deplorable and not unintentionally exaggerated, but it is also a political fact which cannot be dismissed as irrelevant to the immediate future of humanity. The argument that political leaders of different countries have something in common to defend against the aspirations of the classes which they severally oppress, is no longer so convincing as it was before the first or even the second world war. Not only the methods of modern warfare force these leaders to consider danger and ignominy as far more probable than fun and glory, but also, while once the conviction prevailed amongst them that the division of the world into a fair number of strong and independent States was the best guarantee of the continuation of their rule, they see now the unification of the world under a single system of control as the surest, if not the only, way to free themselves of all anxiety and fully to enjoy the gratifications of power. The same applies to those classes and cliques that support political leaders and draw most benefits from the way they rule.

Now, of the two systems or blocks into which most of the world is divided, the Eastern is commonly regarded (or so it was till not so long ago) as the probable victor. That the Communist system is more advanced, that the Communists are riding the wave-crest of history, and that there is a fatality in human events leading to their ultimate triumph, has become almost a commonplace among people thinking, or trying to think, on historical lines. The Communists have skilfully fostered this opinion, and have been quick and loud in seizing upon any sign that could be interpreted as proving them right. Of course there is no fatality in human events, or, if there is, no man and no party is privileged to know it, as it is shown; without looking for philosophical reasons, by the fact that Communist leaders keep on discovering and punishing their own mistakes.

What gives the impression that history is on their side is simply that they hold the initiative, and that they hold the initiative because the countries which they rule are, for the moment at least, economically poorer. Since the Americans are better off than any other people, that is presented as a patent injustice crying for redress, and the Americans themselves cannot help developing a bad conscience about it. Having enough, and more than enough, they are more inclined peacefully to enjoy what they have than to attempt to get more, since this attempt may easily mean losing what they have. American imperialism is not an empty word, but it has long ceased to tally with the Marxist-Leninist analysis. It is an imperialism politically, more than economically motivated. America has accumulated so much gold

that she does not know what to do with it, and there is comparatively very little that she does not produce herself, while most of the countries under her influence need both her products and her gold with which to buy them.* The returns of American investments abroad are not assessed therefore so much in terms of dividends as they are in political and military advantages providing support for the continuation of her social status quo, and strengthening her position in case of attack.

It is Russia who, economically weaker than America, is more imperialistic in the old sense of the word, grabbing other people's resources in the most ruthless and brazen way whenever she has a chance. With the projection mechanisms and hypocrisy peculiar to political propaganda, she accuses America of aiming at the economic domination of the world, while America, politically weaker than Russia because lacking her repressive apparatus, accuses Russia of wanting to bring the whole world under her political leadership. Russia is making gigantic efforts to catch up with America's industrial development and organization, while America does nothing equally so gigantic to catch up with Russia's system of enslavement and control. Thence the appearance that time is against America and the West in general; thence also the Russian fear of a sudden nuclear attack because, obviously, solely upon these considerations and insofar as anybody has any interest in war, America's interest is to start it before her chances to win it dwindle further. Upon the same considerations, Russia's interest is to wait, but it is not quite true, as some Communists believe, that without a war Communism can only wax stronger and capitalism do nothing but decay. There are inner contradictions in the Communist system as there are in the capitalist. In fact, the inner contradictions in the two systems are not very different. The economic development of Russia breeds precisely those contradictions which beset the economically more developed United States of America, and insofar as the United States develop their apparatus of repression and control they meet the same difficulties with which Russia is ridden.

★

THE present differences between the two systems are still greater than a dislike for both usually permits to see. Yet, as time goes on, and there is no military showdown, the two tend to grow more and more alike, and may find in their growing likeness little ground for mutual fear. A similarity between two political structures develops a similarity of outlook. As the words "communism" and "capitalism" will no longer correspond to a radically different social and economic reality, political leaders will eventually realize that they may conveniently dispense with these words, and with the ideologies and feelings which

they express. One or the other will be chosen to remain, or perhaps a neutral third, and, although there will be some struggle within the block which will first take the step because it will look like a resounding victory for the ideology of the other block, leaders will not be lacking to effect change of name which will strengthen their rule and guarantee it in the future.

This is the development to which the hopes of those who want peace above all are most safely pinned. Under the threat of war, well kept alive by the leaders of both blocks, the masses are ready to submit to all sorts of sacrifices, including a number that must obviously increase the danger of war, would make it more terrible, and more difficult to bring to an end if it were to break out. But there is the comforting fact, wherever it occurs, that the higher the standard of living rises, the greater is the pressure for more freedom to enjoy it, and people are less prepared to believe that war is the only way to maintain or improve their condition.

Yet peace above everything and at all costs, with limited interest in the kind of system under which it is achieved, is a negative ideal, unappealing to most of the young who cannot visualize the horrors of war, and to the old who are beginning to forget them. Also, above a certain level, and in an atmosphere of relative security, a rising standard of living is generally detrimental to the fondness and cultivation of ideals. Those which still linger as an heritage from the past show themselves ill-adapted to modern conditions. They are a kind of private property and luxury of mind which is easily put aside when personal advantage, applause or material advantages are at stake. Men of to-day are not intrinsically of a lower moral fibre or less ready to give of themselves than were men of past generations, but generosity of self and moral integrity are no

Continued on p. 4

Paris: A Jolly Occasion with Batons

THE crowds surged through the police ranks. Men clambered on to roofs, hung from lamp-posts. Girls crying "Philip—Philip—Philip" danced on the roofs of parked cars. One caved in under the weight of 20 people...

The Queen appeared on the balcony a second time. Then a third.

Shortly before midnight, so dense was the throng that repeated baton charges had to be made by the police to give the Presidential car room to drive up...

The evening newspaper *Paris-Press* summed up the popular mood of the day: "Welcome, Madam. To bring about the unity of France, there is nothing better than a Queen of England."

News Chronicle, 9/4/57.

(continued from page 2)

the treatment of the child continue for some time before making any move to intervene. Such people do not apparently realize that by their non-intervention they may be contributing towards the ruination not only of the child's future life but of that of his or her children in turn. The effects of the child's experience may have repercussions on children of the future generation. But mental cruelty can be more disastrous to the child than physical cruelty. A youngster may quickly recover from the effects of a physical assault (though he or she will not forget it)—it may take years to mend a mental injury. We cannot do anything about this hidden cruelty, which can arise from misguided attitudes on the part of the parents towards childhood behaviour, unless the child breaks down or exhibits behaviour difficulties, except by educating the parents. Can it be done? Breaking down taboos, particularly sexual taboos, is a laborious process.

January, 1957.

A.C.F.C.

RECOMMENDED BOOKS

ALLEN: The Sexual Perversions and Abnormalities (Oxford).
ALLENDY & LOBSTEIN: Sex Problems in School (Staples).
AMMAR: Growing Up in An Egyptian Village (Routledge).
Annals of the Orgone Institute, 1 (Orgone Institute Press).
BAILEY (ed.): Sexual Offenders and Social Punishment (Church Information Board).
BEIGEL: Encyclopedia of Sex Education (Owen).
BETTELHEIM: Symbolic Wounds: Puberty Rites and the Envious Male (Thames & Hudson).
BIBBY: Sex Education (Macmillan).
BONAPARTE: Female Sexuality (Imago).
BOSS: The Meaning and Content of Sexual Perversions (Grune & Stratton).
BOWLBY: Child Care and the Growth of Love (Penguin).
BRIFAULT: The Mothers (Allen & Unwin).
BURNS: Maladjusted Children (Hollis & Carter).
CALVERTON & SCHMALHAUSEN (ed.): The New Generation (Allen & Unwin).
CAPLAN (ed.): Emotional Problems of Early Childhood (Tavistock).
CARMICHAEL (ed.): Manual of Child Psychology (Wiley).
CHESSER: Cruelty to Children (Gollancz).
COMFORT: Barbarism and Sexual Freedom (Freedom Press).

COMFORT: Sexual Behaviour in Society (Duckworth).
CORY: The Homosexual Outlook (Nevill).
Cruelty and Neglect of Children (BMA).
CUTNER: A Short History of Sex Worship (Watts).

DANIELSSON: Love in the South Seas (Allen & Unwin).
DE BEAUVOIR: The Second Sex (Cape).
DICKINSON: Atlas of Human Sex Anatomy (Bailliere).
DINGWALL: Racial Pride and Prejudice (Watts).

EAST: Sexual Offenders (Delisle).
EDELSTON: Problems of Adolescents (Pitman).
ELLIS, A.: Sex, Belief and Custom (Nevill).
ELLIS, A. & BRANCALE: The Psychology of Sex Offenders (Thomas).
ELLIS, H.: Studies in the Psychology of Sex (Heinemann).
ELLIS, R. W. B. (ed.): Child Health and Development (Churchill).
ELWIN: The Muria and their Ghotal (Oxford).

FLEMING: Adolescence (Routledge).
FORD, D.: The Deprived Child and the Community (Constable).
FORD & BEACH: Patterns of Sexual Behaviour (The Practitioner).
FREUD: Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality (Imago).

GARDNER (ed.): Case Studies in Childhood Emotional Disabilities (American Orthopsychiatric Association, Inc.).
GLOVER: The Social and Legal Aspects of Sexual Abnormality (Institute for the Study & Treatment of Delinquency).

GORER: Exploring English Character (Cresset).
GORER: Himalayan Village (Joseph).
GUYON: Sexual Freedom (Bodley Head).
GUYON: Sex Life and Sex Ethics (Bodley Head).

HAIRE (ed.): Journal of Sex Education.
HAIRE (ed.): Sexual Reform Congress (Kegan Paul).
HENRY: Sex Variants (Cassell).
HEWETSON: Sexual Freedom for the Young (Freedom Press).
HJMES: Medical History of Contraception (Allen & Unwin).
HOCH & ZUBIN (ed.): Psychopathology of Childhood (Grune & Stratton).

HOLMAN: Bedwetting (Delisle).
HOUSDEN: The Prevention of Cruelty to Children (Cape).
HURLUCK: Child Growth and Development (McGraw-Hill).
ILG & AMES: Child Behaviour (Hamilton).

International Journal of Sex-Economy and Orgone Research (Orgone Institute Press).
International Journal of Sexology.
ISAACS: Intellectual Growth in Young Children (Routledge).
ISAACS: Troubles of Parents and Children (Methuen).
JOLLY: Sexual Precocity (Blackwell).

KARDNER: Sex and Morality (Routledge).
KARPMAN: The Sexual Offender and his Offences (Julian Press).
KINSEY et al.: Sexual Behaviour in the Human Female (Saunders).
KINSEY et al.: Sexual Behaviour in the Human Male (Saunders).

LAUBSCHER: Sex, Custom and Psychopathology (Routledge).

LEWIS: Deprived Children (Oxford).

MALINOWSKI: The Sexual Life of Savages (Routledge).

MANNIN: Commonsense and the Child (Jarrolds).

MCINTOSH & HARE (ed.): Neurology and Psychiatry in Childhood (Williams & Wilkins).

MEAD: Coming of Age in Samoa (Penguin).

MEAD: Growing Up in New Guinea (Penguin).

MEAD: Male and Female (Gollancz).

MEAD: Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies (Routledge).
MEAD & WOLFENSTEIN (ed.): Childhood in Contemporary Cultures (University of Chicago Press).

Memorandum Presented to the Home Office Committee on Homosexuality and Prostitution (Progressive League).

MENZIES: Autoerotic Phenomena in Adolescence (Lewis).

MORDY: The Child Wants a Home (Harrap).

NEILL: The Free Child (Jenkins).

NUMBERG: Problems of Bisexuality as Reflected in Circumcision (Imago).

OLIVEN: Sexual Hygiene and Pathology (Lippincott).

PARMALEE: Nudism in Modern Life (The Bodley Head).

PEARSON: Emotional Disorders of Children (Allen & Unwin).

RAWSON: The Werkplaats Adventure (Stuart).

REICH: The Sexual Revolution (Orgone Institute Press).

Report of the Committee on Maladjusted Children (Ministry of Education—HMSO).

RITTER & RITTER: Self Regulation (Ritter Press).

SCOTT: Phallic Worship (Privately Printed).

SODDY (ed.): Mental Health and Infant Development (Routledge).

SPOCK: Baby and Child Care (Bodley Head).

STEKEL: Autoerotism (Nevill).

STOPES: Contraception (Putnam).

SWYER: Reproduction and Sex (Routledge).

TANNER: Growth at Adolescence (Blackwell).

TAYLOR: Sex in History (Thames & Hudson).

The Sex Hormones (CIBA).

VALENTINE: The Normal Child (Penguin).

WALKER: The Physiology of Sex (Penguin).

WALL: Education and Mental Health (UNESCO).

WEST: Homosexuality (Duckworth).

WESTWOOD: Society and the Homosexual (Gollancz).

WILDEBLOOD: Against the Law (Weidenfeld & Nicolson).

WILLIAMS: The Psychology of Childhood to Maturity (Heinemann).

WILLIAMSON: Morality Fair (Watts).

WOLF & SZASZ: Helping Your Child's Emotional Growth (Doubleday).

(Many of these titles are available through Freedom Bookshop)

PRACTICAL NOT MORAL SAYS

Dr. FISHER

ORGANISED religion has entered the H-bomb controversy, and the British Council of Churches has passed a resolution "deploring the decision of Her Majesty's Government to carry out a number of nuclear test explosions in the megaton range in the new future".

The resolution calls for the prohibition of all weapons of mass destruction and urges the Disarmament Sub-committee now sitting in London to reach an agreement on the drastic reduction of all other armaments and to make provision for international inspection and control—such as would safeguard the security of all nations.

One might ask why it has taken the Churches so long to make resolutions on weapons of mass destruction, and why they have not outlawed war before now as a method which is contrary to the Christian ethic? Perhaps the observation of the Bishop of Chichester, who proposed the resolution, helps us to understand why it has become so urgent. He said: "the attitude of millions of Asiatic peoples towards Christian peoples may be profoundly affected" by the stand taken by the Churches.

The Archbishop of Canterbury was more worried about the fact that the world would witness the division of the Churches on this issue than about the H-bomb itself. Perhaps at his age this is understandable! Before voting took place on the resolution the Archbishop made the

fantastic comment that the matter was not a moral one, but a practical one which depended on scientific knowledge which none of them possessed. He said:

"I could not conceivably vote for a motion which contains the words 'in the megaton range' when I have not the slightest idea what the 'megaton range' is. There are so many technical things behind here that are unknown to me, and to most people, that to call this a moral issue seems to be a great mistake. It is a practical issue which must depend on scientific knowledge, if you are going to have the bomb at all, which I think none of us hold."

Is one to conclude that Dr. Fisher is so stupid that he cannot follow the reasoning and simple facts available to all which have been published by many responsible scientists on the effects of radiation? Or is it really that he is anxious to defend the actions of the Government whether these are contrary to the teachings of Christ or not? Commenting on an observation made by a layman at the meeting, the Archbishop indicated quite clearly which side he was on: "Really," he interrupted the speaker, "I must ask you not to speak of our Government's efforts in such a disparaging way."

Thirty-nine members supported the resolution opposing the Government's decision to test H-bombs; thirty-two opposed with five abstentions, which, we suppose, is quite a step forward for the Council of Churches.

Cyprus: Unsinkable Missile Ship

Continued from p. 1

hitherto has been to provide us in the Middle East with an assembly area from which we could fulfil our treaty obligations to Jordan or protect our Middle East oil interests if need be. Those roles for Cyprus are obviously out-dated.

If we are again to use Cyprus operationally we are likely to use it either for N.A.T.O. purposes or else in conjunction with the Eisenhower doctrine and the Baghdad Pact.

In either of these roles Cyprus would prove an unsinkable missile ship. With its 1,500 mile range the IRBM based on Cyprus could cover and protect the whole area of the Baghdad Pact other than Pakistan. There can be little doubt that Mr. Sandys plans to replace his land bombers in Cyprus by IRBMs at the earliest possible moment.

Last week's White Paper made it known that British forces in the Middle East area would in future include bomber squadrons based in Cyprus capable of delivering nuclear weapons.

The fact that British forces are being withdrawn from Jordan and are to be progressively reduced in Libya gives added importance to Cyprus as the foundation of Britain's defence system in the Middle East.

Well, there it is. Some time ago a Government spokesman described the British attitude as not merely wanting a base in Cyprus, but to make a base of Cyprus. The charming concept is now taken a step further.

Cyprus is not merely to be a base; it is now regarded as 'an unsinkable missile ship'.

And the range of the missiles is such that not only can they cover

the whole area of the Baghdad Pact—but also extend well into Russian territory. A not unimportant consideration, one feels!

Who Cares?

We must confess, as we read more and more of this kind of development, to a sick and sinking feeling in our stomachs. How easy it is to succumb to despair when faced with this steady development of insanity. For where is the protest? Where are the signs that anybody outside the militants give a damn for Cyprus?

The people of Britain, nominally responsible for the actions of the British Government, apparently do not see (or do not care about) the connection between Cyprus and this country. If Cyprus comes into use as an IRBM base, it can only be in the event of a major war. In which case Britain itself will be involved at the same time.

Britain has also, in its time, been referred to as 'an unsinkable aircraft carrier'. It all depends, we suppose, on how you define the words 'unsinkable' and 'Britain'. If Britain means the people who live upon this North Atlantic island, then we are eminently sinkable in the event of guided missiles flying around. The rock, the chalk and clay may remain, in some battered shape or other, but the White Paper already referred to has admitted that there is no effective defence against the modern weapons of full-scale war for the population of this island. If Cyprus get it, therefore, we get it also.

★

So now a 'solution' will be found to the Cyprus 'problem'. Perhaps even, in a few months' time, Makarios will be allowed to return and some measure of self-government in trivial matters will be allowed.

Meanwhile the technicians and scientists of NATO's modern army will be crawling over the sun-drenched island, boring their tunnels, stockpiling their missiles in the mountains but lately sheltering the 'terrorists', making the island a sure target for the stockpiled missiles of the other side.

And the people of Cyprus? Oh, hell—who cares about them?

'Death Stands at Attention'

IN our naïve way we have for some time clung to the illusion that perhaps nuclear weapons would not be used to destroy the human race should a war occur, and that a kind of limited war in which only conventional weapons would be used, because both sides feared the ruinous effects of H-bombs and atomic missiles, would be the worst we might expect.

This illusion lost some ground when Field Marshal Montgomery made a speech some months ago stating that he personally would certainly let fly with nuclear weapons right at the beginning of any hostilities. Now it appears that the Montgomery theory is widely shared amongst those whose responsibility it is to drop bombs on behalf of the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.

In February, U.S. Air Force Secretary Donald Quarles made the following statement:

"To deter not only total war, but limited war as well, I believe we must make clear to all potential aggressors that we will resist aggression with our quality weapons from the outset. Any lesser posture of deterrence is an open invitation to aggression, and is less than our best effort to avert war."

This seems to us an extraordinary statement, for it does not really make sense—or perhaps it is not intended that it should. If the only way to avert war is to say that in the event one will drop H-bombs, then it either assumes there will be a war in which case they are dropped (with dire results), or that there will not be a war, in which case it is unnecessary to make the threat for it is merely provocative.

However, a few days ago, Marshal Georgy Zhukov, a realist if ever there was one, replied for the U.S.S.R. He said:

"In the event of a major armed clash atomic weapons will inevitably

be used as the principal means of offence . . . At present there is no corner in the world where an aggressor might seek cover. The Soviet air force is capable of delivering crushing blows against any adversary wherever he might be or hide."

The end of another illusion . . .

Voting Reform in U.N.?

THE United States has produced many politicians who, on retirement, have taken up their pens and with varying degrees of acumen and accuracy, given an account of their exciting and significant role in world affairs. Mr. John Foster Dulles, who is not generally regarded as a particularly original man, has reversed the procedure. He wrote a book in 1950 before he became a prominent politician, and called it *War or Peace*. (A title which lacks in some degree originality).

This book has just recently come out in a new edition, complete with a preface by the now distinguished author, in which he brings attention to a view he held in 1950, relating to voting in the United Nations, which he considers has now been confirmed as necessary after several years of practice.

It is suggested by the Secretary of State for the U.S. that a system of "weighted" voting should be introduced. By which he means that the present [theoretical] principle of national sovereignty would be replaced by the principle that the nations with the greatest power and responsibility in world affairs must also have special rights at the United Nations. In particular, the increase in U.N. membership emphasised "the inadequacy of the voting methods, both in the Assembly and the Security Council."

We are informed that the significant point about Dulles' recommendation is that it brings him into agreement with the latest thinking

of the British Government on the need for voting reform in the U.N.

Here is the thin end of the wedge so far as the democratic majority is right, principle is concerned. Anarchists are of course not in favour of the majority vote, for it always brings in its train unfortunate results for the out-voted minority, who may in fact be right, or at any rate no more wrong than the majority!

But to adopt a principle by which the strongest and supposedly more responsible members should have greater voting power, is to beg the democratic question. It is of course a first principle in the law of dictatorship, and a method by which the powerful few may become more powerful at the expense of those who are weak.

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.

★ 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

DON'T FORGET THE FPFF★!

★Freedom Press Fire Fund

NEW YORK

MAY DAY MEETING
will be held at
THE LIBERTARIAN CENTRE
813 Broadway (between 11th & 12th Sts.)
WEDNESDAY, MAY 1st at 8 p.m.

Speakers:
CONRAD LYNN
SAM WEINER

Refreshments will be served following the meeting.

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

NO ORDINARY WIFE

A REMARKABLE attitude was the summing up of Mr. Commissioner Flowers in the divorce court this week when he granted a decree to Mrs. Barbara Sears.

She offered to adopt the baby expected by another woman and told her husband she "would never cast it in his teeth", and agreed to wait in their home for six months in case he decided to come back. The night he left she packed his bag with clean clothes.

The husband lost his petition, accusing his wife of adultery!

The Sun Rises in the East

Continued from p. 2

longer as socially rooted as they used to be.

HOW do we stand for ideals in the West? The masses are doped and bureaucratized, and lack an élite which, born out of them and still at one with them, could articulate their feelings and aspirations. The best minds, besides, are lured or directed from an early age, with decreasing discrimination of classes, into specialized pursuits, mostly scientific, and are thus immunized, or at least inhibited, against wider human interests. Those looking for expression in the literary field find themselves at the mercy of a few commercial agencies or fail convincingly to strike any note unless it be of frustration, nihilism and disillusion. Finally, the few who take and stick to politics are soon left with no ideal, except of leadership, and even this soon ceases to operate as an ideal, and is swamped in the sordidness of the "political" class, fundamentally indifferent to principles and programmes, and only concerned with the mechanisms and privileges of ruling.

Is it the same in the East? The freedom of thought and expression allowed in the West is partly cause and partly effect of the disillusionment, inefficacy and powerlessness of the intellectuals. They give the impression of not knowing what to do with freedom, or of striving to persuade themselves and others that nothing worth doing can be done with it anyway. Not only as an ideal, but also as a reality, freedom appears to be a luxury to be put aside in exchange for other luxuries or whenever it is convenient to remember that there are "necessities" and that they have to come first. In the East, on the other hand, freedom is not a gift, but has to be conquered. It takes courage to make use of the littlest bit of it or to claim a little bit more. Freedom in the East is weighed against imprisonment, bereavement and loss of life, and the balance is often tipped on its side. A typical Western present-day philosopher may simply say that if people in the East are more excitable by ideals it is because they still believe in the magic of certain words. My explanation is, instead, that there is in the East a deeper feeling of brotherhood than there is in

the West, be it because the profit motive there is ostracized, and nobody is allowed openly to be selfish, be it because the spiritual loneliness forced upon everyone by terror and stultification has brought the need of communication to an explosive pitch, and shown it to be at once the driving force and justification of freedom. Freedom in the West means freedom to be oneself or, simply, to be selfish; in the East it means freedom to be brothers.

He who in the West speculates upon the immediate future of humanity, not academically, but because he cares about it, and feels that he would not be fully human if he didn't care about it, usually fails to see beyond the triumph of communism or some other form of totalitarianism, beyond an increase in the power of the State, beyond a mummification of institutions, a sterilization of affections and a mechanization of all aspects of human intercourse. But in the East the State is not the last word. It may be a more powerful god than it is in the West, but it is a god that is clearly hostile to society as well as to the individual. There is a faith in society there, as distinct from the State, which is lacking in the West. He who in the East speculates upon the future of humanity, does it hopefully, and in a spirit of active participation. Indeed, it is this spirit of hopefulness and active participation that makes him dare speculate, and the very ideology of dialectical materialism in which he has been brought up, strengthens him in the thought that the tyranny which is weighing upon him and his people is bound to disintegrate or be overthrown to be replaced by a dispensation characterized by the absence of the state, in fact, by an anarchist dispensation.

GIOVANNI BALDELLI.

[*Apart from finding grounds for disagreement with comrade Baldelli in almost every paragraph of the present article, we particularly disagree with his view that American capitalism is independent of the world both for its goods and as an outlet for investment, and that therefore American Imperialism is political rather than economic. We suggest that the facts are against Baldelli. Some of the facts can be found in the "Freedom" editorial on "Dollar Imperialism" in the January 12th issue.—EDITORS.]