"I have remarked over and over again that a democracy cannot govern an empire. Empire is a despotism."

—THUCYDIDES.

Vol. 18, No. 16

April 20th, 1957

Threepence

PEOPLE - AND THE WORLD - HAVE BEEN WARNED THE GERMAN

# NUCLEAR SCIENTISTS REFUSE!

THE statement by 18 German scientists opposing West German participation in the nuclear important first step in awakening human consciences throughout the world against the suicidal policies of the political leaders on both sides in the present power political struggle.

The German scientists, who include in their number four Nobel prize winners, have warned against all plans for the arming of the forces of the Federal Republic with nuclear weapons. They consider that

a small country like Germany can make its best contribution to European stability and world peace by expressly renouncing the use of nuclear weapons of all kinds. This renunciation should apply to so-called "tactical" nuclear weapons as well as to a major weapon like the hydrogen bomb.

They declare that an atomic grenade or shell would have the same destructive effect as the bomb dropped on Hiroshima in 1945, while the dropping of a single hydrogen bomb could make all the Ruhr uninhabitable. The annihilation of the population of the whole of Western Germany might be possible by the systematic use of this weapon. For these reasons the 18 scientists declare their refusal to take any part in the manufacture, testing or destructive use of nuclear weapons. They are, on the other hand, prepared to develop the peaceful application of nuclear science in all possible ways.

### A PARTIAL VICTORY FOR AFRICANS

THE boycott by South African workers of the Johannesburg buses which carries them into the city from the locations is over with a partial victory for the Negroes.

The Government-subsidized bus company are not the losers since employers, worried about their overtired staff, have raised a fund to pay the extra penny in fares demanded by the company—a considerable sum for underpaid workers.

The real gain of the boycott has been the display of unity exercised by 145,000 Africans over the weeks which has echoed the determination of the Negroes in the Southern States of Africa over segregated public transport.

One should not be over critical of the African workers for the compromise they have made because many of them were left poorly equipped for the long daily trek to their jobs.

The lessons of the boycott are valuable for the future struggles, the Africans have shown their ability to sustain an organised protest. This would be a good time for them to commit themselves to support for the anti-segregation groups now organised against the Government proposal to segregate the universities, reported elsewhere in this issue.

The Nationalist Government is in an unenviable position; it cannot go on for ever holding the people down. Unfortunately when the balloon goes up white South Africans who are in sympathy with the black population are likely to suffer the same fate.

One primary reason for their declaration is that in their estimation

the population of the Federal Repubarms race is welcome news and an lic has been insufficiently informed as to the deplorable consequences of nuclear warfare. They do not claim to be able to think as politicians but only to act in a spirit of responsibility for the possible consequences of their work.

> Within hours of this statement being made public, Dr. Adenauer replied in a speech that

> if the scientists had intended a ban on atomic weapons valid for all countries "it would completely coincide with the views of the Government. If, however, they meant to say that a small country like the Federal Republic should renounce such weapons, then I must say that has nothing-to do with physical science. It is a purely foreign policy matter."

> The logic of these remarks is somewhat difficult to follow. Adenauer would have approved of the scientists' statement if it were directed to all countries since "it would completely coincide with the views of the government". But because it does not coincide with these views, the statement has nothing to do "with physical science" and since the problem is "purely a foreign policy matter" scientists have no

right to express themselves! As if the declaration had it been directed to all countries, rather than simply to the people of W. Germany, would have had anything to do with "physical science" anyway.

But Audenauer, who apparently believes that "physical science" and "politics" are two distinct departments each with its specialists, nevertheless attacks the scientists even on scientific matters when it suits his convenience! To their statement that there is no "known protection against the H-bomb where great masses of population are concerned" he replied in his speech

it would appear that the scientists did not know the results of tests made in the United States for the protection of civilians and soldiers. The German people would learn from a Parliamentary debate on atomic matters, to be held after Easter, that the Government was doing everything possible to protect them from the consequences of atomic

It is not enough to say that "the Government is doing everything possible" to protect the people from the consequences of atomic war. In Britain millions of pounds have been spent on this "protection"

during the past ten years only for us to be told at the end of it, in the recent Defence White Paper, that:

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.

DROTECTION against nuclear attacks is a matter of scientific fact, not of political demagogy. The H-bomb is not only more than two thousand times more powerful than the atom bomb, which in turn was say a thousand times more destructive than the largest "conventional" bomb—and therefore something more substantial than a quaint Anderson shelter of recent memory is clearly required to protect the population from the immediate consequences of the explosion!—but unlike the conventional bomb, the nuclear weapon produces secondary results, the full effects of which are not known in detail by science, but enough is known to have provoked a statement addressed not to this or that small nation, but to the World by nine scientists of international eminence nearly two years ago. The scientific content of this statementalas forgotten by the people, and pigeon-holed by the politicians—was as follows:

We now know, especially since the Bikini test, that nuclear bombs can gradually spread destruction over a very much wider area than had been supposed.

It is stated on very good authority that a bomb can now be manufactured which will be 2,500 times as powerful as that which destroyed Hiroshima. Such a bomb, if exploded near the ground or under water, sends radio-active particles into the upper air. They sink gradually and reach the surface of the earth in the form of a deadly dust or rain. It was this dust which infected the Japanese fishermen and their catch of fish.

No one knows how widely such lethal radio-active particles might be diffused, but the best authorities are unanimous in saying that a war with H-bombs might quite possibly put an end to the human race. It is feared that if many H-bombs are used there will be universal deathsudden only for a minority, but for the majority a slow torture of disease and disintegration.

In the light of this statement we challenge the politicians—the Adenauers and the Eisenhowers-who dare to deny that there is no protec-Continued on p. 3

### THE BRITISH H-TEST

DEAR SIR.

Harold and Sheila Steel, Reginald Reynolds, and other volunteers from this country have expressed their intention, if possible, of going to the Pacific in order to challenge the right of the British Government to carry out the proposed tests with nuclear weapons.

At this late stage an Emergency Committee for Direct Action Against Nuclear War has been established in order to raise funds for this purpose, to co-operate with Japanese and, we hope, American organisations sharing the same general purposes, and to provide the basis for further direct action in future so long as it may be necessary.

The Emergency Committee wishes to hand over its responsibility to a larger and more representative body as soon as this can be done.

In the meantime funds are urgently needed and donations can be sent to J. Allen Skinner, Hon. Secretary, at the address below.

Signed:

Alex Comfort Laurence Housman Bertrand Russell Ruth Fry Spike Milligan Horace Alexander

Peggy Rushton. John Hoyland Arlo Tatum Hugh Brock J. Allen Skinner.

79 Lordship Park, London, N.16.

## THE BRIGGS ENQUIRY REPORT The Importance of Stewards

OUR contention that the Court of Inquiry held under Lord Cameron into the recent series of disputes in the Ford factories at Dagenham was, from the point of view of the workers there, a waste of time, has been amply justified.

Published last week, the Court's findings have come down nearly 100 per cent. on the side of the management, and the utterings of Lord Cameron have shown more class bias than objectivity.

True, he has said that 'both sides are to blame' for the record of bad relations at Dagenham, but 'substantially the greater measure of responsibility' for the continued bad relations 'rests on the side of the workpeople.'

Especially does Lord Cameron blame the shop stewards. Now in our report on the Inquiry in progress 'Anarchy' at Dagenham 10/3/57) we pointed out that the Shop Stewards had asked through counsel that they should be allowed to take part in the proceedings 'as a party'. That is, that they be able to call witnesses, cross-examine and make representations in the same way as the employers and the top trade union officials. They were refused.

Counsel had asked for these rights on behalf of both John McLoughlin, the steward whose bell-ringing started the rumpus, and the Joint Shop Stewards' Committee. For reasons not stated, Lord Cameron decided not to allow them, and yet now, when the Court's rulings were published, we find the learned judge has devoted a considerable proportion of his report to criticism of the shop stewards' organisation and of McLoughlin.

In other words, he is castigating those whom he considers important parties to the disputes at Dagenham, but whom he refused representation as parties at the Inquiry. He is

strongly criticising and condemning people who were not allowed to put their case before the Court.

We hardly think that this kind of procedure will endear such Courts to the workers at Dagenham or anywhere else.

#### The Stewards' Function

It is not as though Lord Cameron was at any time unaware of the importance of the shop stewards. Of them, he writes in his report:

At Briggs, as elsewhere the day-to-day duties of a shop steward are responsible and important, often thankless, and the financial reward is negligible . . . The importance of the function of the shop stewards as a channel of communication, as representatives of the workers, and as a necessary and vital element in the chain of trade union organisation is well recognised, and when fairly and properly discharged is of the highest value.

It does not seem to occur to the noble Lord that there may be a difference of opinion between himself and the workers at Briggs and elsewhere, as to what is implied in the fair and proper discharge of the shop stewards' function.

We pointed out at the time of the dispute that agreements had been reached at 'top' level, between the unions and the management, and had been handed down to the workers in the factories. The unions see the shop stewards as a means of funneling their decisions and agreements down to factory level. But for the workers themselves the shop

stewards are far more significant. At shop steward level the workers can see their organisation. It is not something amorphous, going on at TU headquarters while they keep their noses to the grindstone-for the workers the shop stewards are their direct representatives and by and large they do a far better job than the highly-paid permanent officials at head office.

But Lord Cameron can't or

won't—see this. Quite naturally, since he is a judge, he is a firm believer in authority, and showing through his Report is his conception of the workers thoroughly subjugated to constitution duties. Anything which appears to him to step outside the bounds of this legality threatens the proper relationship between master and man.

For instance, he complains:

'The shop stewards' organisation as operated at Briggs, by itself and in association with other organisations, undertakes functions and exercises powers, including the raising and disbursement of substantial funds, which appear to lie outside the scope or requirements of its constitutional duties and in respect of which it is not subject to any effective control by the respective unions . . . The continued existence of such an uncontrolled organisation at Briggs is undesirable in the interests of the unions, the company, and the work-people employed there alike, and is a potential obstacle to the creation or continuance of harmonious labour relations there.'

#### Accept Subservience

For Lord Cameron, for the Government, for the Ford's management, the worker's function is to do as he is told, conform to institutions sanctioned by law and adhere to agreements arranged above his head. And, one may say, this is the attitude of the official trade unions as well.

There is no-one who really speaks for the worker to-day. And there is no influence at work which holds out for him any alternative to the wage slavery against which he unconsciously rebels. All known and established organisations—managements and unions, political partiesaccept, and thus get the worker to accept, his subservient position.

Through his shop stewards the worker can express some direct responsibility for his own conditions. He can see what goes on and can control his stewards in a way he can never control the national officials.

Lord Cameron's attack on the stewards is a good indication that he considers their organisation a menace to his interests and those of his class. The workers at Briggs should take courage from this. They have clearly created an organisation which could be of value.

We should like to utter just one comment to the workers of Dagenham. There is quite clearly some communist influence in the Shop Stewards' Committee. As long as the Commies work hard in the dayto-day interests of the workers they are bound to get on the committees.

But the workers should not be blinded to the fact that the Communists, like Catholics, TU officials and all authoritarians, owe their first loyalty to the authority they serve the Party, the Church, the State.

If it came to a conflict of loyalties, it is the workers' interests which would come second. The rank and file therefore should always be sure that they know where they stand as far as their stewards are concerned. and that they are men whose interest is first and always identical with the men at the bench.

# PEOPLE AND IDEAS

"It is unforunate that popular knowledge about water vapour stopped short at James Watt's discovery about his kettle and did not include what happened to his mother's decorations. As a St. Pancras tenant wrote to the Mayor, 'Whatever the Housing Manager calls it, wet is-wet!"

-E. COLLYER, Condensation in Council Dwellings.

NE of the London evening papers came out a few weeks ago with a front-page headline in two-inch high letters 'The Shame of London',-the kind of title to win anybody's tuppence. This time it related to none of the usual newspaper 'revelations', prostitution, teenagers or traffic jams, nor to any of the things we might get worked up about, road accidents, the housing of 'problem families', the state of prisons and mental hospitals, or of doctors' waiting rooms, the overcrowding in schools, the whole mess and muddle of our urban surroundings. It was in fact about dampness in flats at the LCC's prize-winning Ackroydon Estate at Putney.

My first reaction was to regard this as a newspaper sensation, though one closer to reality than most. Tons of water are used in putting up a building-in the mortar, in the concrete and in the plaster, and really it should be dried out before occupation. But if these flats had been left to dry for six months before occupation, there would have been headlines about the LCC allowing flats to stand empty while thousands are homeless, while if the Council had heated them there would have been more screaming headlines about the waste of fuel in warming empty flats. If houses or flats are decorated and occupied immediately they are completed, you may be sure that the decorations will be damp-stained and that the tenants will hold out mouldy pairs of shoes or rashers of bacon to the visiting architect as a reproachful comment on the usefulness of his builtin cupboards. He will advise them to keep their rooms as warm and wellventilated as possible, assuring them hopefully that these troubles are temporary and will disappear when the building has had time to dry, when since the structure itself will be less saturated with water, it will be able to absorb more of the water vapour from the air inside, And quite often it comes true.

Often, on the other hand, it doesn't. Partly as Mr. Collyer of St. Pancras says, because of the unpredictable ways of the

#### FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

(Open 10 a.m.-6.30 p.m., 5 p.m. Sats:) New Books . . . The Bridge at Andau

J. A. Michener 15/-G. Piroue 15/-Proust's Way Being and Nothingness: an Essay On Phenomological Ontology

Jean-Paul Sartre 50/-Votes for Women Roger Fulford 25/-Second-Hand . . .

The Face of a Nation Thomas Wolfe 4/-Human History G. Elliot Smith 7/6 Men, Medicine and Myself

S. Vere Pearson 3/-The Russian Storm-Cloud Stepniak 6/-The Kon-ticki Expendition

Thor Heyerdahl 4/-The World is Mine William Blake 3/6 The City of the Red Plague George Popoff 3/-

The Film Sense Serge M. Eisenstein 3/6 The Gospel of Superman

(The Philosophy of Nietzche) J. M. Kennedy 8/-The Abbess of Castro, etc. Stendhal 2/6

T. F. Powys 3/-The Left Leg Ape and Essence Aldous Huxley 3/-Studies in Revolution E. H. Carr 4/6 Faith and Works in Fleet Street J. W. Robertson Scott 2/6

General from the Jungle B. Traven 3/6 The Case for African Freedom Joyce Cary 2/6

The Romance of Trade H. R. Fox Bourne 3/-

Jim Crow Anton Fairbank 2/-Pamphlet . . . Death Stands at Attention Harold Davies 6d.

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!

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from 27. RED LION STREET. LONDON, W.C.I

occupiers. "Some tenants never open windows, some never close them, some live on stews and take in washing-others just go out". And partly because although modern buildings are actually more prone to condensation troubles than old ones, we don't take enough precautions against it. Think of an old house. The surfaces are absorbent, it is built of soft bricks in lime mortar, lined with soft plaster, the floors are of wood and the ceilings of lath and plaster. There is a fireplace in every room, and however inefficient the open fire is, the flue is a highly efficient ventilator. Think of a new flat. The surfaces are much less able to absorb moisture from the air, the walls are of dense brick in cement mortar, lined with hard plaster, the ceilings are of hard plaster on concrete, the floors are of plastic tiles or sheet laid on concrete. The only flue, if there is one, is in the living room; any permanent ventilation is from one of those little grilles that gets stuffed with old socks against the draught.

IN the actual instance that hit the headlines, it seems, from the remedial measures that the Council is taking, that the walls or roofs have inadequate thermal insulation, which means, quite apart from the loss of heat from the room, that in cold weather the inside surface of the outside walls is so much colder than the air in the room itself that drops of water are bound to form on them.

The London County Council is always a good butt for newspaper attacks. In fact, since the internal upheavals of six or seven years ago, it has built some of the best housing in the country. But what instances like this do show, is the strangely amateur and hit-and miss attitude to house-building-one of the very oldest human activities after all-which architects, not to mention speculative builders, still have. Perhaps it is the nagging question of cost-an unwillingness to spend enough of a limited budget on insulation or on appropriate but ex-

## STICKS AND STONES

"The State calls the violence of the individual 'crime'; its own violence it calls 'law'."

-MAX STIRNER.

DEJORATIVES, or depreciatory words, have a useful linguistic function to perform. When, for instance, a literary critic mentions "W. McGonagall, the noted poetaster", it is a useful short way of saying "W. McGonagall, the noted poet-or rather one who thinks he is a poet, but who in the opinion of all whose opinion I respect is nothing but . . . etc., etc. Words like "hypocrite", "ba-

pensive materials, perhaps it is the teething troubles of experimental techniques -trying to break away from bricks and mortar where the height of a building makes the use of larger units more sensible, perhaps it is, as with plumbing and heating, a lack of realism in accepting what our climate is actually like, perhaps it is the antiquated nature of the whole building industry.

A ND why is it antiquated? Because it has little war potential. Think of those industries which are essential to the military trade-engineering, aircraft, electronics, computors, nuclear physics, and compare their development and the efficiency of their products with the building trade, its haphazard processes of design and execution. We gape with bemused admiration at the Viscount, our ears flap with wonder at Hi-Fi, we learn with open mouths of computors that can read the printed page, and we talk knowingly about atomic ships, while the pipes freeze, the neighbour's voices boom through the walls, and the condensation drips off the window-ledge.

Years ago Lethaby declared that "we have to aim at a standard of ordinary good quality; damp, cracked and leaky architecture must give way to houses as efficient as a bicycle". Quite a modest demand in the age of cybernetics and automation. But how long is it going to take us to realise it? C.W.

loney", "contemptible" and "wrong", and metaphors like "ostrich" applied to a man and "drivel" applied to a newspaper article, are all useful items of vocabulary. Indeed, the English language would be a more efficient means of communication if a few more pejoratives, like say the Lation "philosophaster" and the German "stinkfaul", were incorporated into it.

But one of the most common fallacies of reasoning is that pejoratives, and their opposites the melioratives or words expressing approval, are misused. It is too often forgotten that pejoratives and melioratives are neither facts nor arguments, but in themselves expressions of opinion, and therefore quite useless in arguing or explaining an opinion.

Thus a patriotic Tory among my workmates, last November: "The British action in Egypt is not an attack; it's a police action." Now if "police action" has any objective meaning at all, it means the action of a sovereign body against a subject body, and in this particular case the body acted against was admitted to be a sovereign state. So the term "police action" must here be a meliorative meaning "an attack of which I approve" (your patriotic Tory approves of police action in the objective sense, unless they are undertaken by Britain's enemies in which case he calls them something else), and the term "attack" a pejorative meaning "an attack of which I do not approve".

So my colleague's argument may be restated: "The British action in Egypt is not an attack of which I do not approve; it's an attack of which I approve," which is clear enough as a statement of opinion but no argument at all!

It would take a full-length dictionary to enumerate all the words expressing opinions, which are used as facts and arguments by the supporters of statesmen. (There are no supporters of politicians; politicians are always in the other party). We support a particular statesman over a particular issue because, by gad Sir, he's in the right. The Fascist insurrectionaries (or, if you prefer, counter-revolutionaries), who are occasionally executed by the forces of law and order in the

territories under our protection, are different in every respect from the fighters for freedom, who are murdered by armed thugs in the nations labouring under Fascist tyranny. "Fascist", which once meant the holder of certain political opinions, is now such a pejorative that a Fascist would sue you for slander if you called him one; and "Socialist", which once meant the holder of opinions roughly contrary to those of the Fascist, has become such a meliorative that even the Fascist applies it to himself.

The people who accept such words as facts and arguments, while not necessarily moronic, are obviously not given to pondering the meanings of words; but this cannot always be said of those who originate such argumentasters. Josef Goebbels, doctor of literature, wrote in his private diaries how proud he was to use his considerable linguistic skill in the service of the Führer. We have no access to the private diaries of the ingenious Russian who, in 1917, first used the words "communism" and "soviet" to mean support for the totalitarian Social Democratic Party; but surely only a clever word-manipulator could think of a stunt like that,

The men who write the Colonial Office news bulletins, in which the deaths in battle of nationalist troops are listed as "armed men killed" and the deaths in battle of British troops are listed as "murders", must know what they are doing. And whoever dreamed up the idea of calling the Anglo-French invasion of Egypt a police action probably spent the whole night working out his story, and found "police action" in a dictionary of melioratives at about four in the morning.

It does not follow, however, that everyone who invents such an argument is a cold-blooded twister. Proudhon, for instance, was undoubtedly an honest and simple-hearted man; but, as his contemporary Stirner pointed out, his famous sentence "Property is theft" is not the condemnation of property that Proudhon thought it was, but simply an expression of dislike for property in the form of a

Continued on p. 4

## COMPARISON

#### Goldman Emma

(This contribution by Emma Goldman in 1932 to "Americans Abroad" published in Holland has relevance to-day in view of America's leading role in world affairs).

HAVE been asked to write about the "good points" of America as seen by me through my European experience. Surely the United States must appear "better" to me now-I am told-than when I was in that country.

It may be true that those who have grasped the remote may be better equipped to understand the near; and if that be so, my twelve years' travel through foreign lands ought to enable me to see both the good and the evil of America in much sharper outline than before.

In my childhood I was taught that people are imbued with two conflicting impulses; one which makes for good, the other for evil, and that he who is strong enough to overcome "evil" is good. In that conception the saints and holy men were good, for which they were rewarded -if not on earth then surely in heaven. The others were bad and would suffer dire punishment.

In later years I realized that the impulses that move the individual as well as the masses are not quite so simple and easily defined as I had been led to believe United States. Neither are the rich as arbitrary and by my well-intentioned parents and teachers. I found that there is no straight and clearly-marked line between between the classes and the masses is more distinct in good and evil. Both are interwoven and overlap each other. Surely neither good or evil can be chosen by one's Europe is not the poor man's son of yesterday. As a mere "free will". I have found that good and evil are general rule, wealth has been handed down from generaterms for human actions conditioned by various forces tion to generation. Not having personally experienced outside of man. Their meaning and content are subject the struggle for wealth, the rich man of Europe is less to modifications and development in accordance with prone to flaunt it in the face of his victims, or to use the changes constantly going on in the social and ethical values at various periods of human life.

The most important lesson, however, that life has taught me is the relativity of things. Every institution, be it ever so evil, may yet become worse. On the other hand, the best in man and society can become better. That is the law of evolution and growth without which life would decay and society become extinct. In this sense every saint was also a sinner, and the greatest sinner has the making of a saint in him.

Now, I cheerfully admit that America is a very great sinner indeed. For this very reason I find much in the United States that has "saintly" qualities. My faith and greater individual rights in monarchical Sweden, in the fine potentialities of the country has not been dimmed or lessened by my European vantage ground. On the contrary, it has been strengthened. But similarly has also grown my realization of the evil things in America, and the need of speaking out frankly and fearlessly against them.

I think I can best characterize both sides of the American make-up by contrasting that country with Europe. Since the "generous" treatment accorded me by my erstwhile adopted land I had occasion to pitch my tent in various countries in Europe, including Russia, Lettland, Sweden, Germany, Holland, England, and now also France. In some of those countries I lived long enough to make a thorough study of the forces that ment of politicals in Europe and America. In Europe have made for the mental and spiritual quality of their people, the structure of their social, political and ideals or of the class struggle. The accused often economic struggles of the masses. Everywhere I found

that the fundamental difference between them and America is mostly a difference of age. The difference between juvenility and maturity, with all the special traits and characteristics that represent the two stages of human and social development.

Most of the European countries I found not only mature but well nigh ancient in their life and civilization. Overcautious, conservative, set and not easily moved. But centuries of struggle for political and economic freedom, for ethical ideals, for cultural and artistic values have created there certain traditions more binding than any man-made laws. Among those traditions the most potent is the realization that "man does not live by bread alone". In consequence the achievements of Europe are much more of the spirit than of the flesh This, more than any other factor, has established certain values that even the great war has not been able to destroy altogether.

To illustrate. The rich of Europe, even as their American brothers, have gotten their wealth at the expense of their fellow-men. Yet the exploitation of the masses is nowhere in Europe quite so intensive as in the brazen as with us. To be sure, the line of demarcation Europe, the barriers more definite. The millionaire of it to bribe, corrupt and prostitute the sources that aid him in increasing and keeping his fortune.

The political rights established through age-long struggle have solidified into traditions which the plutocracy of Europe cannot so easily and brutally set aside for its convenience and benefit as is done in the United States. To be sure, most democratic liberties are mere makeshifts, a cloak the better to blindfold the explointed masses, a whip to keep them in check. Strange as it may seem this is even much more true of European democracies and republics than some monarchies. have found more freedom of speech, press and assembly, Holland and England than in France or the newer republics of Lettland, Esthonia and Germany. Still it must not be forgotten that the German revolution (1918) superficial though it was, has established certain liberties far beyond anything known under the Wilhelm régime.

However, every government grants only as much liberty and opportunity in social, economic and cultural fields as it considers "good" for the soul of the masses. Yet irrespective of the wishes of the powers that be, the political traditions of Europe have given the social idealist and the political protestant a certain status, which the enemy is willy-nilly bound to recognize. That explains, for instance, the difference in the treatthey are looked upon as the spokesmen of new social becomes the accuser, and the Court is compelled to

listen to his social indictment. Nowhere in Europe, except in England, are the politicals considered criminals or treated as such. They enjoy certain rights and privileges in prison, and their protests, in the form of hunger strikes and obstruction tactics, are formidable weapons in the fight for improvement in the prison régime and treatment, and even for political amnesty.

All this is entirely lacking in America because the revolutionary and political traditions are lacking there. In the United States the political and labour prisoners are considered fools and impractical dreamers, even worse than criminals.

But tradition, like everything else, may work for good as well as for evil. While the traditions I have referred to are the very backbone of what is worth while in Europe, it is also tradition that serves to support the conservative, stationary and enslaving tendencies. Such tradition is the paralyzilng hand of the dead upon the living. Mature countries, like mature people, are prone to walk in the accustomed groove. Having passed their Sturm und Drang period, they resent the adventurous spirit of youth. Having had their "fling", the mature generally cling to respectability. Having lost faith in the commong better day, they dwell in the past. Their lives and their thoughts crystalize into hard moulds.

Still, new forces are ever at work, particularly among the young generation, which the old in mind and spirit lament and resent as immoral and disintegrating. Yet in them is the sole hope of Europe if it is not to die of decay. But for the present most European countries are still ruled by old moralists, old statesmen, old habits, and old traditions.

In comparison with Europe America is unpleasantly young. Indeed, it is almost infantile, with all the good and the evil, the generous impulses and the crude, savage outbursts of extreme youth. The best proof of America's juvenility is its resentment of criticism. Youth is arrogant, self-centred, cocksure and impatient to censure. It is blind in its hate as in its love. It lacks the capacity to understand that love with open eyes is infinitely difficult and more enduring. Or that blind hate is ferocious and never settles anything. Time and growth are necessary to comprehend the "human, all-too-human". Youthful countries, like young people, are not troubled by time: they have no yesterday, they live only in to-day. That alone enables them to plunge forward, head foremost, without regard to consequences to themselves or to others. Yet it is well that this is so, for it is youth and not old age that is the harbinger of new ideas and fundamental changes.

That which is evil in America is due not only to its adolescent crudity and heartlessness. It is due also to the fact that as a pioneer country it was and still is concerned more with material values than with the achievements of the spirit. Of America it can be justly said that it lives by bread alone, and hence its worship of material things, its love of quantity, of bulk, its adoration of the golden calf. In quest of things of the body, America has rushed on at a terrific speed, sweeping everything in its way.

(To be concluded)

Vol. 18, No. 16.

April 20, 1957

## German Nuclear Scientists Refuse

Continued from p. 1

tion against nuclear warfare to produce evidence that (a) they have built shelters which in the event of nuclear warfare would be something more positive than mass tombs for those who seek refuge in them and (b) that they have discovered the antidote to the secondary effects of H-bomb explosions, to those "radioactive particles" which for nine eminent scientists, at least, would "quite possibly" put an end to the human race . . . " through "a slow torture of disease and disintegration".

TT is a pity that the German scientists' declaration will become, according to the Manchester Guardian's Bonn correspondent (15.4.57), a "major issue in the coming election campaign, and will be used by all Dr. Adenauer's political opponents in their efforts to end his régime". For the significance of the scientists' statement, from the point of view of mankind and the future, will be lost in the party political struggle. Already Dr. Adenauer has referred to it as a "political ruse" which can severely damage his party's chances in the elections, and even the M.G.'s correspondent writes of "the broadside against the Government", though he does not deny the factual accuracy of the scientists' statement. Indeed in an earlier report (13/4/57) he points out that:

German nuclear scientists, including members of this same group, issued a similar warning two years ago at their meeting on the island of Mainau in Lake Constance. Then, as now, those in favour of banning all nuclear weapons in Germany included the outstanding scientists of the Federal Republic.

Thus the present "broadside" is not "a political ruse" but a second warning at an opportune moment if "democracy"\* is more than simply a much abused word. The executive power of a government in a "democracy" is justified on the grounds that government has been elected (actually it is the individual candidate who is elected, but we will not complicate an already complicated "justification" with such details!) by a majority of the people. The switchover to nuclear weapons by Western Germany is surely a matter of considerable interest to all Germans. It so happens that Dr. Adenauer expressed himself on this subject for the first time just prior to a general election. What is more natural than that these scientists should reply by repeating what they said two years ago? Why is Dr. Adenauer "incensed" by their "unrealism" and their "emotional appeal" and regards it as a "political ruse". Is it not a case of the kettle calling the pot black? It seems to us that the scientists are on the one hand presenting the facts (the realities) so far as their knowledge goes and, on the other, stating their position as responsible individuals, who besides being eminent scientists are also members of the community. Dr. Adenauer who knows more about the art of vote-catching than about nuclear physics is a "realist" only where scientific truth furthers his political ends.

Even assuming that the timing of the German scientists' statement was political, in that it was intended to influence the results of the forthcoming elections, the question which remains, irrespective of the party struggle is: are the facts true? Does nuclear warfare condemn mankind a priori to annihilation?

As much as we are allergic to this age of "experts" (a racket, a vested

\*And we are here using the arguments of democrats" with which of course we do not wish to be identified!

interest which deserves to be exposed no less than the industrial monopolies) it is a fact that no group of scientists has come forward so far to contradict either the Russell-Einstein statement of two yetrs ago or the forebodings of the 18 scientists in Germany last week. We have only the assurance of politicians that the effects from testing nuclear weapons so far is no more harmful than is the luminous paint on our wrist watches, or that America is rapidly finding means of defence against nuclear attack. But even the politicians are not agreed since we now have the British government's "frank recognition" that there is no defence!

If, then, we understood the Russell-Einstein et alia statement correctly, the hydrogen bomb is a kind of boomerang; that death overtakes the conquerors as surely as it has the conquered. It is only a question of hours, weeks or months—possibly a generation if the nuclear war is settled by the launching of a handful of bombs. Either we are ruled by raving lunatics (which is Alex Comfort's view) or politicians, the rank and file as well as the hierarchy, just cannot see the wood for the trees; they cannot see that Clausewitz's dictum that "war is the continuation of politics by other means" is now superseded. It is no longer a question of who can launch the first H-bomb.

For one side to destroy the offensive potential of the other will require the dropping of many such bombs (since we ignore Russia's "defensive" set-up we will limit ourserves to the assumption of a Russian attack on the West). The West has in the past ten years established a series of H-bomb launching airfields, a defensive-offensive perimeter, against which Russia would have to launch not one H-bomber but hundreds. Whether the bombers strike the target area or not is of relative importance. It even matters little whether they prevent the "enemy" bombers from setting out on their retaliatory mission since all that counts from the point of view of humanity, is that they have taken-off with their bombs set for an explosion. That fact has determined the future—or more exactly, on the basis of our knowledge to-day, the annihilation—of man-

THAT such awareness—assuming the public realises that in a nuclear war the element of chance of survival, has no meaning—should be accompanied by apathy and indifference is more than disappointing. We do not wish to foster anxiety; it is as negative as apathy. But we would wish to see a healthy resistance to the governmental steam-roller; a resistance so uncompromising that governments are suddenly made aware of their own weakness, and the people of their basic strength. Eighteen scientists in Germany by a few uncompromising remarks have sparked off a political storm; a few thousand determined, intelligent men and women, willing to defy authority, tradition and petty self interest, might well set in motion a social revolution which could ignite the imagination of the world. The strength of a people is not measured in numbers or armament but by its spirit of resistance to authority and the social integrity of its individual components. Any effort, however

†We say this in all humility, that is within the limits of human knowledge to-day. Science may well find the answer to the "deadly rain" of radioactive particles eventually just as it exploded the Churchillian prognosis that the development of the modern bombing plane would eliminate war since both sides would possess the means of wiping each other out. The difference between nuclear war and the long range bombing plane is that the latter whilst it could, admittedly, wreak havoc on both sides did not possess the secondary boomerang effect of the nuclear weapon. Nuclear warfare should be compared not to the "conventional bomb" but to bacteriological warfare. And for the same reasons, and more so it is a prob-Iematical weapon. The former is problematical because of the variability of the wind; the latter because there is any wind at all!

# The Same Old Struggle for Power Khrushchev's Conversion to Decentralisation

SO many Communists have their favourite arguments shattered by utterances from the horse's mouth of their own leaders that it is a wonder they are still prepared even to pretend that there are arguments for their belief. Why not just believe and leave it at that?

We have always been assured by Communists-and many another variety of 'Socialist' as well—that State control, centralised planning, was the answer to the chaos, the anarchy, of capitalism. In order to plan efficiently a modern industrial society and prevent the wasteful duplication of a competitive free-for-all -and incidentally to ensure fair shares for all—it was necessary to have central planning.

Left to themselves, people would selfishly squabble about priorities. Only state planners, with power to allocate according to the public need and the common good, can organise production and distribution so that everything is where it is wanted when it is wanted. Only thus can a social alternative to the capitalist jungle ensure a smooth operation of the complex machinery of a modern state.

So runs the argument, and Russia was the grand example. The ever-rising production-demonstrated by statistics; the constantly improving standard of living of the people-proved by figures, showed the superiority of a state-planned economy. And in spite of his several 'mistakes', Comrade Stalin had made tremendous and unforgettable contributions to the establishment of socialism in the USSR by being the prime planner and genius of organisation of the great Soviet industrial revolution.

Faithfully the comrades reiterated their beliefs. Even when shaken to the core by Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin last year, still they clung to their faith in the essential rightness of the type of planned economy the old dictator has established.

#### Khrushchev's 'Thesis'

But now the same Khrushchev has come forward and denounced with equal vigour this whole industrial pattern. In a 'thesis' which he is to present to the Supreme Soviet on May 7, Khrushchev brings forward plans which envisage the complete re-organisation of Soviet industry from top to bottom on a vast scale. Thousands of persons will be dislodged from sinecures and entire Ministries may be swept away in a gigantic reshuffle.

Why? First let us take Khrushchev's reasons. He maintains that the thirty or more Ministries concerned with industrial and construction planning do not cooperate sensibly together, but in fact compete. They compete for scarce labour and for materials and are always trying to build up their own industrial empires at the expense of others. This results in duplication and the most appalling waste of manpower.

Khrushchev quotes the example of the Kiev factory 'Red Excavator'. This factory belongs to the Ministry of Machinebuilding for Road and Construction Works, but there are also seven other Ministries building machines—a Ministry of Machine-building proper and one Ministry each for General, Heavy, Medium, Agricultural, and Transport Machinebuilding.

Besides manufacturing machines for road-making and construction, the "Red Excavator" plant makes castings which it sends from Kiev to the same Ministry's engineering factories in towns such as Leningrad, which has more than it needs, to Sverdlovsk in the Urals, Tashkent in Central Asia, Tyumen in Siberia, and to many others.

At the same time other Ministries,

modest and so long as it remains outside the clutches of party machines, which aims at awakening the human social consciousness, is in the right direction and worthwhile.

This is the message of the 18 German scientists, and of the letter of the "Emergency Committee for Direct Action against Nuclear War" in this country which we publish elsewhere in this issue of FREEDOM. But these gestures of the few are wasted and lost if they are not taken up by the many. They are incitements, calls to action, which must grow to live. For ultimately each man must be the representative and defender of his conscience. Assuming of course that he doesn't "leave it to others" until it is too late. No one can say we have not been warned!

which make castings in these very same towns, send them to their own factories in other parts of the Soviet Union. Castings are thus transported over distances of more than two thousand miles, adding 20 per cent. to their original cost in the process.

#### Defective Planning

Leningrad, says Khrushchev, produces annually 360,000 tons of iron and steel castings, of which only 250,000 tons is consumed by local factories. Yet at the same time the city "imports" from other areas 40,000 tons, while "exporting" 110,000 tons of castings. - As if this were not wasteful enough, some Leningrad organisations insist on expanding casting capacity at a time when other organisations next door are producing far more than they need for themselves.

How can industry be organised so uneconomically in a centrally planned industrial system? Khrushchev's explanation is that the planning itself is defective.

He says:

'Such shortcomings, and there are not a few of them elsewhere, arise because the production plans, and the plans for the construction of new sections and plants, are evolved in each Ministry without regard to what is being done by other Ministries, without taking local conditions into consideration, and without the participation of local officials."

What Khrushchev omits to state is the reason behind this senseless duplication and competition between a multitude of

Ministries.

The real reason is the 'Gosplan'—the government plan which tells each Ministry what it has to produce. Ministers who fail to hit their targets lose their jobs, if not their heads. All the way down the industrial hierarchy fear of the consequences of not fulfilling The Plan drive the officials on to greater stupidities. All the way down, that is, until the bottom level, the workers, who, having nothing to lose, are not driven by the same anxieties.

The theory goes that the Gosplan really begins in the factories, which tell the departments, which tell the Minister, who tells the Gosplan what each was going to produce, and that the final figures were arrived at through a process of discussion. In fact, such discussion used to be confined to protestations by the Ministries that the Gosplan figures were too high, and then the department would protest to the Ministry and the factory to the department. Centralisation is so efficient!

#### Territorial Organisation

Khrushchev's plans for remedying this state of affairs are drastic. He is going to abolish all the Ministries, which have their headquarters in Moscow and control between them more than 200,000 industrial establishments and at least 100,000 construction sites throughout the USSR. Khrushchev is going to decentralise and to set-up National Economic Councils based on territorial organisation.

Now this sounds all right. This sounds like the anarcho-syndicalist pattern of regional councils of labour, in which all the industries of an area are represented and whose task is to co-ordinate productive capacity in acordance with the needs of society as expressed through communal organisations.

But Khrushchev's plan is not quite like that. To begin with there is no talk in his thesis of abolishing the Gosplan. Still the overall grand plan will be handed down from above and the only difference will be that the party will come into greater control through its grip on the National Economic Councils.

For there is plenty of reason to think that one of the prime reasons (if not the reason) for Khrushchev's plan is to counter the growing power of the economic Ministers and the industrial bureaucracy in general. Some of these Ministers control industrial empires comparable with General Motors or I.C.I. They do in fact wield tremendous power and although they are centralised in themselves they work against the contralisation of government control.

Aiming at becoming self-sufficient, even to such absurdities as the motor-car factories which clutter up the smooth flow of production by turning out their own nuts and bolts, their own oil-canseven their own bicycles to supply their own workers, the Ministries controlling these factories become States within the State. They breed the tycoon, monopolist mentality in their officials, who become powerful.

#### The Struggle for Power

Now in a Communist State there must be only one source of power-the Party. Over the years the managers have developed into careerists concerned only with their jobs and the technical problems involved. They are party members for career reasons only and are unconcerned with ideologies. They are capitalists in all but name and but for privately owning the factories they control. They are therefore unreliable from a Party point of view and represent an alternative source of power in Soviet society. As such they must be curbed.

As Edward Crankshaw says in The Observer (14/7/57): 'what is happening, with this stupendous reshuffle, is a decentralisation of managerial power and a reassertion of centralised party control. For the party, of course, is as centralised as ever.'

Towards the end of his 'Thesis' Khrushchev lets the cat out of the bag. He writes:

'The reorganisation of the management of the economy on the territorial principle will increase immeasurably the responsibility of the party organs of the Republics, the krais and oblasts, and of all party organisations for the development of production and the state of construction in each economic administrative агеа. . . .

'Under the existing forms of management, when the plans are drawn up and implemented through the specialised Ministries and Directorates, the local party organisations have, in a number of cases, been deprived of the possibility of exercising more active influence . . .

It becomes clear then that the real reason for Comrade Khrushchev's grand plan is not to iron out the absurd and wasteful anomalies in what was supposed to be the prefectly planned system. It is to retain the grip of the Party on a society which, as it becomes more industrialised and technical, relies more for its stability upon the industrial bureaucrats and the technicians than upon the Party bosses.

Khrushchev is promising the workers more participation in management. Why don't we welcome that? Because it is as phoney as his will to decentralise. Khrushchev demonstrated in Hungary just how much he cared for decentralisation and workers' councils.

There is one key to everything that happens in the Soviet Union-power. Every zig and every zag of the Party line, every adjustment, every new interpretation of the ideology, must be observed as serving one main underlying purpose: that which serves the power of the men in the Kremlin. More particularly, the men on top of the men in the Kremlin.

VOLINE :

Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed) cloth 12s. 6d. The Unknown Revolution (Kronstandt 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. ERRICO MALATESTA: Anarchy Vote-What For? M. BAKUNIN: Marxism, Freedom and the State.

GEORGE WOODCOCK : New Life to the Land Homes or Hovels? Railways and Society What is Anarchism? The Basis of Communal Living PHILIP SANSOM: Syndicalism-The Workers' Next Step

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.I.

# Speed and Responsibility

twentieth century reasonably be regarded as the era in which the abstract phenomena of speed and mass (in their widest senses) have reached such proportions that man's ability to control them has been outstripped. Speed in a variety of things: the tempo of everyday life, the production rate of modern machinery, the rapid changes which take place upon the surface of society, and even the speed attained by contemporary means of transport. Mass in such things as states and political parties, newspaper circulations and other communications, bomb explosions, defence programmes and wars, advertising and mass production.

Certainly part of the answer may be traced to the nineteenth century with the birth of the industrial revolution and the introduction of highspeed machines intended for mass production and therefore mass consumption. This in turn leading to advertising on a large scale with its consequent effects upon newspapers, which became what is now the popular press and bore doubtful fruit in the form of commercial radio and television. We can see only too clearly the relationship between production and consumption, in which the two perform an everwidening spiral with the one chasing the other until saturation point is reached and the balloon bursts with a resounding slump.

This confirms the proposition that men are not able to control the machine they have created, and suggests a reason for the rapid acceleration in the growth and development of the phenomena under discussion. The only method discovered under the present system for the avoidance of a slump, has been the alternative, but apparently preferable, retrograde step-war. Unquestionably the advent of two world wars has accelerated the desire to Man seems powerless to halt the produce more speedily and more efficiently. Advances in technical skill and knowledge were made in the war years out of all proportion to those in peacetime.

The most important of these advances was the concentration upon armaments. In this field we may look back and see the see-saw de-

velopment of one weapon after another, and coming close behind the consequent counter-weapon or defensive instrument. Finally the dénouement—the production of a weapon, the nuclear bomb, capable of infinite destruction but with no feasible counter. All the presumed protagonists possess it, none can defend themselves against it or even accurately foretell what it might do in a given circumstance. Man, in fact, has lost control.

What of the tempo of living itself? To re-state the melancholy fact that we live in a neurosis-ridden world is not original but is true nevertheless. A society which is torn asunder by a capitalist system, of which the watchword is production at the cheapest cost and greatest speed, spells insecurity in an atmosphere of cut-throat competition, both for employer and employee; but since effciency is required this is a further addition to the insecurity of employees. This can hardly be said to be an environment in which human beings may remain free from anxiety.

Life clatters on at a speed determined by a false set of values, everyone must earn as much money as possible, and time is money. Every available means of transport is made to go faster so that no unnecessary time shall be lost; everything must run to schedule and man has become slave to the clock. A nervous, anxious slave, fearful that the great, complex system which he has built shall leave him behind.

And as the twentieth century grinds forward through its sixth decade, the power of the super-state increases to enormous proportions. The smaller states are forced to choose one side or the other, either for political or economic reasons, and the effective size of the group, East or West, grows ever larger. process, for it has already developed out of his control.

At the same time the individual, whilst he supports the state, becomes increasingly dominated by it, and in doing so he supports his own slavery and the power of the superstate. He is blinded by the apparently fast-moving changes in society

and believes that change is progress, that the supposed emphasis to the Left will somehow bring about a better world. He forfeits his strength either voluntarily or because he thinks he has no option, to a system in which he may or may not believe, but over which in any event he now has no control.

Anarchists argue that no process

should be premitted to exist which is beyond man's ability to direct or is not in his own best interests. They insist that the only real power lies with men, since it is men who do all the work in society, produce all the goods, fly all the areoplanes, grow all the food, drop all the bombs . . If men were to fully understand this and take upon themselves full and reasonable responsibility for their own actions, they could come into control of their whole environment.

Economic freedom is still a necessary step

before we can even approximate the

That is not to say that workers'

"chains" are only economic, but it is

important that they understand the divi-

sion between employer and employee as

well as the wider issues involved in a

concept of freedom. Many do under-

stand the relationship but have no wish

to alter it. It is therefore the task of the

comrades who are involved in the same

work to give them the anarchist alterna-

In short, wherever there are people

and whatever their occupation, with the

exception of those who have a vested

interest in the privileged and heirarchical

nature of this society, there is material

(admittedly very raw sometimes) with

Perhaps the suggestions made by G.

D. H. Cole and commented on by G.O.

(Freedom 6/4/57) might serve to en-

courage a sense of dignity among work-

ers vis-a-vis their work and a realisation

of their strength and importance to the

community as a start towards the final

Certainly children are of equal impor-

tance because they are the workers of

to-morrow and the more wisdom exer-

cised in educating them the less likely

they are to make the mistakes of their

fathers. At the same time the louder we

are in our condemnation of stupidity

now the easier will be the task for those

It sounds easy, but of course it isn't.

The progress we make compared to poli-

ticians and priests is slow and damned

frustrating. But all our words don't fall

on barren ground, and it is "easier to

live with oneself" if one protests against

injustice wherever it occurs. We like to

think that this is not the primary aim of

the propagandist, but it is an important

by-product of what has been described

by our opponents and soured ex-anar-

chists as 'useless propaganda'.

which the anarchist can work.

aim—the equalitarian society.

who come after us.

# MEETINGS AND

A pipe dream? Perhaps the only

way for continued existence in a

world which is so disordered that

the system runs the people instead

of the other way about. If the world

is upside down only a complete

change can put it to rights. A revo-

lution of the mind at the very least.

LONDON ANARCHIST

LECTURE-DISCUSSIONS

Every Sunday at 7.30 at THE MALATESTA CLUB, 32 Percy Street, Tottenham Court Road, W.1.

Sundays at 7.30

APRIL 28—Philip Sansom on ANARCHISM—A SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY

MAY 5—Arthur Uloth on

MAY 19—ANARCHIST BRAINS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP MEETINGS

IN DEFENCE OF PHILOSOPHY

JUNE 2—John Smith on WHY I AM AN ANARCHIST JUNE 9-Max Patrick on JUNE 16—John Bishop on

JUNE 23-Donald Rooum on

all free.

Weather Permitting HYDE PARK Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

# Anarchist Propaganda

DLOUGHING through the week's newspapers, FREEDOM writers have little difficulty in finding material which free society. underlines the defects in our society; crisis follows crisis almost daily. Without going as far afield as Cyprus or Suez, we could fill FREEDOM with constructive suggestions for improving conditions in Britain. But, at the moment, in this country, events seem of minor importance compared to the daily struggle of people in other countries. The tragedy is, as was pointed out editorially in FREEDOM (6/4/57), these crises are manifestations of power politics and class-divided nations. What happens in other countries to-day was our crisis yesterday and will no doubt be ours again to-morrow, but their problems are bound up with ours, and the difficulty that faces anarchist propagandists is trying to pursuade

people of this basic truth. In the same article quoted above the comment is made:

'Most people suffer from Angst at the thought of the uncharted spaces of the free society but go on accepting insecurity from the womb to the tomb in this power-ridden, class-dominated money society of to-day with hardly a protest, this is a subject which should engage all the attention of anarchists and progressive educationists. If we are to make headway it is not the workers we must seek to "free from their chains" but their children, if possible with their parents' co-operation, but if necessary in spite of them!'

The practical problem is then posed: As propagandists how do we go about this task?

For those of us who do not work in the field of education, that is, without direct contact with groups of young people, the only alternative is to propagate anarchism to the adults who have. This is one of the functions of FREEDOM. Although one assumes that the majority of Freedom readers are in sympathy with our intentions (since a newspaper like ours is not sought for 'hot news' or football results), they are not all anarchists. But in their discussions with their friends and colleagues they will be able to present anarchism in a more accurate way than the uninformed nonanarchist commentators who generally equate anarchy with chaos. This is therefore one way of spreading ideas.

Included in the readership of FREEDOM are railwaymen, miners and bus drivers, and it is this section of enlightened manual workers that we hope will help to "free the workers from their chains".

Deficit on Freedom

DEFICIT

Contributions received

£300

### South African Students Rally Against Segregation Bill

FOR many years, in fact since the Nationalists came into power, segregation at Witwatersrand University has been threatened by the Government. 'Wits' is the most liberal-thinking of the Universities but unfortunately is dependent on the government for a large grant.

Now that the threat of segregation is becoming a reality the students are trying to use what power they have to arouse public feeling against it. A student at 'Wits' writes that those opposed to segregation have formed an Academic Freedom Society, Members of the society, regardless of creed or colour, parade in the main centres of Johannesburg with placards. This form of protest needs courage, especially for the Indian and African students who are thus inviting interference from rowdy Afrikaans youth whose only method of retaliation is brute force.

A meeting was held at the University by the Society one evening recently where copies of the University Apartheid bill were burned as a sign of protest. While a lecturer at the University was addressing the meeting it was broken up by students who support the bill. It is significant that the Nationalist students were not curbed by the knowledge that a member of the University staff was addressing the meeting.

By supporting the protest many of the lecturers are jeopardising their own positions on the staff of the University as they will be the first to go when apartheid is introduced.

# ANNOUNCEMENTS

GROUP

SERIES OF FOUR MEETINGS ORGANISED BY THE INTERNATIONAL ANARCHIST CENTRE

HISTORY OF ANARCHISM MAY 12-To be announced.

TRUST

MAY 26-Sid Parker on

IS THERE A RULING CLASS? Subject to be announced

ANARCHISM AND RELIGION Questions, Discussion and Admission

**OPEN AIR MEETINGS** 

\* 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.)

> Speakers: CONRAD LYNN SAM WEINER

WEDNESDAY, MAY 1st AT 8 p.m.

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 39/- (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.I. England Tel. : Chancery 8364

Continued Sticks and Stones from p. 2

pejorative . . . and a singularly inappropriate one at that. "Theft" would be no pejorative at all if property were not

respected! It was a perfectly honest and simple man, too, who said very solemnly to a Peace Pledge Union meeting I once attended, "We don't disapprove of war because it's going to do us any harm; we disapprove of war because it's wrong!" (or in other words "because we emphatically disapprove of it.").

Nor, it grieves me to admit, is such deluded or dishonest word-twisting absent from contemporary anarchist propaganda, or even from the columns of FREEDOM. Its most impressive appearance in FREEDOM-the classical example, one might say, of argument by pejorative on the part of an anarchist-occurred a few years ago in an article (translated from a French journal) on Assassination and Elimination. The thesis of this article was that the execution of revolutionaries by those in power was to be condemned because it was "assassination" (assassination is the French for murder), and the assassination of the powerful and their lackeys by revolutionaries to be condoned because it was "elimination". A correspondent was quick to point out that if this were accepted, the revolutionary would need no justification for any killing done by him, beyond the fact that he had done it.

A more recent, though less serious, instance concerns the radio play The Man from Thermopylae. The hero of this drama runs away from a battle to avoid being killed, decides to commit suicide because he feels unwanted, goes back on his decision when he finds something to live for, and then learns that the gods have decided to keep the world because it includes him. The message of the play is that the man who behaves according to personal expediency has personal integrity, while the loyal, self-sacrificing, vow-keeping Charlies have none. But

when it was first broadcast, FREEDOM's reviewer came to the surprising conclusion that the play deals with the conflict between integrity and expediency! The only possible explanation is that he was using "integrity" and "expediency" to mean, not what the dictionary says they mean, but simply "behaviour I approve of" and "behaviour I disapprove of". To say there is a conflict between these is a rather pointless truism.

Some time ago I lectured a group of anarchists on the basic mechanics of propaganda: how it is necessary to attract influence, to put your point before his

I replied at the time, as near as I remember, that I had defined "propaganda" as the attempt to influence behaviour by influencing thought, and that if the comrade wished to reject this definition, to make "propaganda" a swearword and call anarchist propaganda "education", that was up to him. I have changed my opinion since then. It is all very well for statesmen and demagogues, whose business is to acquire a following of fools, to make specious distinctions between our strength and their stubbornness, our discretion and their cold feet, our victories and their massacres, our education and their propaganda. But anarchist propaganda is aimed (or ought to be aimed) at intelligent persons of independent mind, who would be most unfavourably impressed by such verbal trickery.

There can be no harm in pejoratives and melioratives as such; but that anarchists should allow them to masquerade as facts or arguments is quite inappropriate, and quite indefensible on grounds of either expediency or integrity.

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 14

the attention of whoever you wish to attention wanders, to make him retain your message long enough to act on it, and so on. During the discussion I was told the anarchists had no use for propaganda; what anarchists used was educa-

April 5 to April 11 Chorleywood: S.E.E. 5/-; London: P.H. £1/1/0; London: Anon, 6d.; London: S.B.\* 1/9; Cape Town: P.K. 1/-; London: E.P.\* 10/-; Oxford: Anon.\* 5/-; London: J.S.\* 3/-; London: A.S. 2/6; London: Hyde Park Sympathisers 3/9; London: H.M.\* 1/9; Sutherland: R.V.W. 6/-; Collaroy: R.G. £3/1/0; Chelsea, Mass.: J.M. 14/-; London: W.E.D.\* 10/-; Hitchin: H.E.H. 10/-; London: F.W.L. 2/6; London: Anon. £5/15/0; Glasgow: J.W. 6/-; London: G.G. 1/-. 14 0 9 ... 248 15 4 Previously acknowledged

1957 TOTAL TO DATE ... £262 16 1

Freedom Press Fire Fund

Castle Douglas: J.A. 10/-; Leeds: G.L. 1/-; Coleman's Hatch: S.M. 2/-; Preston: W.A. Le M. 3/-; London: C.S. 5/-; London: D.R. 10/-: Northwood: E.H. £1/1/0: London: W.E.D. 10/-; Hitchin: H.E.H. 10/-; London: L.C.W. £1/5/4; Lincoln: R.L.D. 2/9; Nice: A.C. 2/-.

... 5 2 1 Previously acknowledged £34 4 7 TOTAL TO DATE

GIFTS OF BOOKS: London: J.R.: London: F.W.L.