

In this Issue:
Studies in Rebellion - p. 2
University Probes
and Publications - p. 3
Money Before Mecca - p. 4

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 18, No. 22.

June 1st, 1957

Threepence

"If I had to choose between betraying my country and betraying my friend, I hope I should have the guts to betray my country."
—E. M. FORSTER.

THE leaders of the 'democratic' countries have, rightly, been most scathing in their denunciation of the apparatus of state security which has been a characteristic feature of every totalitarian régime of this century.

Both the Nazis and the Communists have gone to extreme lengths in the extent of their information-gathering about their subjects. In every shared flat in Russia, we are assured by the shocked liberal democrats (and they tell us that every flat in Russia, except the luxury apartments of the Party bosses, is shared by many persons), the State has planted its spies, who report to the secret police any deviationism, any bourgeois reactionary thoughts expressed by the other tenants.

Under the disgusting Nazi régime children were encouraged to inform against their parents and the spying activities of the State's agents extended into every corner of the nation.

One of the things which Britain set out to fight against in 1939 was precisely this apparatus of internal spying. True, this wasn't made very clear in the beginning—few things were very clear at first—but as the struggle deepened, more and more was discovered about the bestial nature of Nazism, which had, after all, found many admirers in high places in this country prior to 1938.

In 1941 the Grand Alliance with the Soviet Union was created, and no further mention was made of the vast network of internal spies maintained in that country—except to praise it, perhaps, for its efficiency in routing out German agents and other enemies of democracy.

By and large, however, the democracies have managed to pride themselves on the fact that they have been able to maintain national security without the extensive organisations of narks which the dictator-

THOUGHT POLICE REACH OUR UNIVERSITIES

ships need. And in Britain particularly the attitude has been that the various checks which the law provides are sufficient to safeguard the inalienable liberty of thought and expression of the individual which is the pride and glory of the democratic way of life.

The Embarrassing McCarthy

Thus it was that when McCarthyism hit the United States of America it created considerable embarrassment for America's friends. It wasn't only the open smear tactics developed by the junior senator from Wisconsin that were so deplorable—though they were bad enough. The thing that shook most thinking people was the disclosure of the extent to which spying and informing was being carried on in a supposedly free country.

Most deplorable of all the fields where the FBI apparently maintains its army of narks is the universities. The open activity of McCarthy's investigation committees has died out. McCarthy himself was thrown aside (his work having been most effectively done), when he became more of an embarrassment than an asset, and now he has literally died out. But plenty of information has been forthcoming about the activities of FBI agents on the campus, and many have been the expressions of concern on the part of those enlightened individuals sufficiently courageous to speak out, about the effect upon independence of thought among American students of the fear of discrimination that can follow the

creation of a dossier bearing your name.

According to observers, American students are becoming more and more reluctant to express any non-conformist idea, however vague and slight. Since the mildest liberal viewpoint can be construed as betraying the under-cover Commie, this perhaps is not surprising. Only deplorable.

It Couldn't Happen Here

But although this was all embarrassing for the friends of America in Britain, it was put down to the brash vigour of that young country, where everything seems to tend towards extremism. The old mother

The Snark's Judgment Now Valid?

"Transportation for life", was the sentence it gave,

"And then to be fined forty pound."

The jury all cheered, though the judge said he feared

That the phrase was not legally sound.

—LEWIS CARROLL,

"The Hunting of the Snark."

On Monday (May 20), Lord Goddard ruled in the High Court that fines totalling £1,000 would have to be paid by a widow and her son, as personal representatives of a man who died in prison in 1953.

Counsel for the Crown submitted, and his lordship did not disagree, "that the debt remains until the whole term of imprisonment fixed in default of it expires". It was a test case with no precedents.

country looked down on the young giant, and saw the excessive zeal of the witch-hunters and the creeping tentacles of the State police as nothing more than a temporary rash, as growing pains which maturity would cure. After all, it couldn't happen here.

Unfortunately for such smugness it not only could but does happen here. In the House of Lords last week Lord Chorley drew attention to the increased activity of MI5—Britain's secret police—in the universities. (See University Probes and Publications page 3)

Lord Chorley maintained that the unique relationship between teacher and student could hardly survive if the teacher was called on to do 'what many teachers regard as spying for the State'. The teacher was torn between his loyalty as a citizen and his loyalty to his work. He went on:

"I sometimes think that if the national leaders realised the sort of subterfuges and tricks which the security officers use for the purpose of obtaining information, and the evils which result from the material they get, those national leaders might think again"

Lord Chorley is general secretary of the Association of University Teachers and at a meeting in Cardiff of the Association's Council, he said that MI5 are claiming to have 'assistance' from members of the teaching staff at nearly every university in Britain.

There were members of the Council who were prepared to justify MI5's activities on the grounds that they were comparable with a prospective employer seeking a reference for an applicant for a job! But

there was loud applause when Professor Montrose of Belfast said: "I cannot see how it is consistent with the position of anyone in a university to accept the position of a Government agent."

"We must make it absolutely clear to all university teachers that no man can with honour remain a university teacher and do that kind of secret work." He added: "Our Government in asking university lecturers to do this work is undermining national security even more than those foolish people who give away secrets."

Implications for the Future

The implications of this development are enormous. It is an extension of the State's powers which can find acceptance only through the spread of the concept of the State being entitled to subjugate the thought of the individual to what it claims is the common good—a concept which owes more to the 'progressives' with their pathetic reliance upon the State as the channel of emancipation than it does to the old-type reactionaries. Such 'progressives' as may suffer through the activities of the FBI and MI5 should remember how much encouragement has been given these organisations by the 'success' of the secret political police of the Soviet Union.

Continued on p. 4

ALGERIA—THE UNENDING TOLL

ALGIERS, MAY 26.

French security forces killed 738 Algerian rebels and captured 168 during the past week, according to reports reaching here. Losses among French troops were put at 37 dead, 43 wounded, and six missing.

In terrorist attacks on civilians 116 Moslems and eighteen Europeans were killed. Three European girls and two men, travelling in a car, were killed in a rebel attack in the Mascara area of Western Algeria yesterday—*Reuter*.

Krupp Moves In

A LOT of people were surprised when Alfred Krupp was released from prison after serving less than half of his 12-year sentence for war crimes. They were staggered when it was announced that he was to collect £55 million for various earnings of his huge industrial empire in order that he could set up in business again.

The kind of people who are surprised by these apparently fantastic events are those who believe what they are told and swallow wartime propaganda about 'the enemy', without troubling to understand the shared interests of the upper crust of the world.

Perhaps by this time it will come as less of a surprise to hear that Krupp is going into the atomic power business.

Not, of course, to make bombs. Adenauer has established that Germany does not want to make or own nuclear weapons of her own. He has also established at different times that it would be a good thing if Germany did make or own nuclear weapons. Future expediencies, therefore, can flow from either alternative according to which way the wind blows.

As long as Western Germany remains allied with the West, there is little need for her to become an 'atomic power' herself. The ultimate deterrent will be operated in her defence by America or Britain. It may conceivably come about,

however, that future leaders of Germany will want to dissociate themselves from any binding alliance with the West without losing atomic defence. In other words that a German government may want to have an H-bomb of its own some day.

The first step along that path is obviously to begin building an atomic industry. Just as Hitler created glider clubs for his Youth, who suddenly blossomed forth as fighter pilots, so Krupp will begin to create atom plants for peaceful purposes which may become very useful if ever the necessity arose to switch to not-so-peaceful purposes.

This, naturally, has not been admitted by either Krupp's or the German government. In fact shy Mr. Krupp won't talk about it at all. Such information as has been gathered indicates that the first plant will be a small one by British standards. 'But', said the physics chief of the firm supplying the equipment, 'if it is a success we shall go on to something bigger. The idea now is to produce electric power for an area round Dusseldorf.'

The plant will be fed with uranium. Germany is allowed to import a limited amount from Britain.

'But, in turn, it will yield more uranium and plutonium. We realise plutonium is mostly used for making atom bombs. Of course, we are not interested in getting it for that.'

Oh no, of course not!

'Peace News', Commander King-Hall & His 'Reflections on Defence'

Peace into Power Politics Won't Go!

WE would rightly be accused of being unrealistic if we assumed that H-Bomb tests could be halted or postponed in June 1957 by any other agency than that of Government. But how much "realism" is finding its way into print on the subject of peace which hardly bears examination in the hard light of political reality! All ideas which even only slightly deviate from the established patterns of thinking deserve encouragement, if only because they may be the oil which lubricates the rusted thinking mechanism of some of our fellow beings. But more than removing the rust and the cobwebs is required if we want to get anywhere!

Our pacifist friends recently added a two page supplement to their May 10 issue of *Peace News* to publicise Commander Sir Stephen King-Hall's "Reflections on Defence" in which he advocates passive resistance as the most effective weapon of defence for this country. And if we are to judge by the further publicity and comments by "leading British personalities" to this statement in subsequent issues we must assume that the pacifist movement not only endorses but believes Commander

King-Hall's "reflections" a practical and realistic solution to the present politico-military situation.

★

THAT passive resistance is possibly a more powerful weapon than a "defensive army" (and why not for attack—that is, in a social sense in so far as an exploited people in their defence will also be seeking to free themselves from economic and social inferiority?) is not a concept with which many anarchists would demur. What we object to in Commander King-Hall's "Reflections" and, which it appears to us, our pacifist friends overlook in their anxiety to clutch at any straw, is that he views passive resistance as a military weapon, in the power-struggle between states and not as a weapon by the people against the armed aggression of the State! This is not a doctrinal quibble—after all the H-bomb will not discriminate between pacifists and anarchists; we are all faced with the same danger of complete annihilation and we shall certainly not avoid this common fate by disagreeing with friends for the sake of disagreeing—and on the use of words, at that.

Commander King-Hall refers throughout to the West as the "free world" and to the West defending an "idea" which he defines as "our notion that we should be free to order our lives in accordance with certain practices and principles of a democratic character". We would not emphasize these examples of uncritical political appreciation did he not add that "the tension between the West and the Soviet Union is often and correctly described as an ideological struggle" (our italics). For the Commander his "reflections on Defence" are an attempt to put forward a strategy of defence of the West against the assumed aggressive intentions of the East which, in relation to the weapons at the disposal of the Powers, will be effective. That is, he assumes that the values of the West are unquestionably right and that in the present distribution of armed might, passive resistance is perhaps the most effective weapon for the defence of this country. Indeed, he suggests that

a Royal Commission should be established with the task of expressing an opinion upon the problem of whether our way of life could be defended by passive resistance and if so what the plan would be.

Continued on p. 3

BOOK REVIEW

STUDIES IN REBELLION

IN the popular image the anarchist is bearded, cloaked and armed with bombs. He is sinister, un-English, a foreigner. That is usually enough. If closer inspection is invited, the foreigner turns out to be a Russian.

There is at least this much to be said in favour of the caricature: in the 19th century it was above all four Russians who developed and enriched the anarchist tradition—Bakunin, Herzen, Kropotkin and Tolstoy. Why this should have been so, needs little explanation. In an age of real material, and apparent moral and political progress, Russia remained an obstinate citadel of feudal tyranny. It was a society in which the nobles sat firmly, if at times uneasily, on the backs of the sullen peasantry. The intelligentsia—that part of the nation which aspires to independent thinking—was composed of three main groups; the plebeian *raznochintsy*, dissatisfied, angry and iconoclastic; the liberals, sprung from the gentry, dissatisfied but hoping, wistfully, for better times; and the radicals, also usually gentry, but distinguished from the liberals by a deep implacable hatred of the existing order. In such a situation, for men who feel strongly about human relationships, rebellion becomes a moral necessity. The radical search for roots leads inevitably to the posing of the ultimate questions of human existence: God is put in the dock and men become anti-theists; the principle of government is questioned and men become anarchists. It was not that Russians, rather than other men, are naturally anarchist: it was that the Russia of the 19th century Tsars was a society which made men, willy-nilly, into anarchists.

The social and cultural history of this peculiar society is the subject-matter of Dr. E. Lampert's brilliant essay: *Studies in Rebellion* (Rout-

ledge and Kegan Paul, 1957, 30/-). In the form of biographical studies of three characters, Belinsky, Bakunin and Herzen, he traces the roots of the tradition of 'revolutionary Russia'. It is not a book about the ideologists or the political thought of three revolutionary thinkers, such as is the stock-in-trade of the average academic historian of ideas. Its emphasis is on the ethos and inner character of the revolutionary movement and its main concern is to elucidate the attitude which underlay the thought and activities of these three men. For those whose appetites were whetted by Isaiah Berlin's broadcast talks on 'A Marvellous Decade', this book is a 'must'. Like most readers, I am no specialist in 19th century Russian thought; I read no Russian and am in no position to dispute, academically, Dr. Lampert's interpretations. Instead, I have to judge his book by the only standard open to me: my own revolutionary attitude and its sources. And, by this standard, I feel impelled to say: 'Yes, this is an authentic work. This is a study which illuminates the revolutionary psyche. I can understand how Belinsky, Bakunin and Herzen thought as they did and, in understanding them, my understanding of myself is deepened and enriched'.

I.

Vissarion Belinsky (1811-1848) made no pretence to be either a

philosopher or a social and political thinker. His enduring claim to fame lies rather in the contribution he made as a literary critic in a period which saw the budding of the flower of the great Russian novel. Endowed with an accurate instinct for what was good and what was meretricious in the literature of his day and aided by an extraordinary gift of empathy with his authors, his judgments established standards which were essential in creating the intellectual climate necessary for great art. But, for him, life and literature were not distinct: they were the warp and woof of a single reality. His protests against the false in art were, therefore, inextricably blended with his protests against the shams in social existence.

The student of his thought will need to trace the influence exercised on him at various stages in his brief career of Schelling, Fichte and the inevitable Hegel. But the essential clue to a full appreciation of him is that he was, as Dr. Lampert puts it, a rebel by temperament as well as by conviction. Soviet writers, with their Procrustean categories, are wont to distinguish between his idealist pre-socialist phase and the subsequent materialist and revolutionary-democratic one. Belinsky himself, however, provided a more accurate summary of his own intellectual development: 'God was my first thought, mankind—my second, man my third and last one'. And

the revolution that he aimed at was more fundamental, more radical than any social revolution—a revolution on behalf of the human person. It was this respect for the human person which finally made Belinsky an anti-theist. Anti-theism, as one might expect, is a more radical position than mere atheism. Atheism, in the main tradition of Western thought, is based on the denial of the existence of God. The concept of God is examined at the bar of reason and found wanting. Expressed more temperately the judgment reduces to agnosticism: a confession of ignorance and of the inability of mankind to express a judgment. Anti-theism, in contrast, denies not merely the existence of God but God himself. God is examined at the bar of humanity and pronounced guilty.

It was this that was Belinsky's position: his atheism was not a question of unbelief in a proposition which could be proved or disproved; it was an attitude of deliberate and avowed refusal. It was the attitude later expressed by Ivan Karamasov to Alyosha in Dostoevsky's novel, *The Brothers Karamasov*: "In the last resort I do not accept God's world and although I cannot but admit its existence, I do not in the least degree permit it. The world may attain the highest degree of harmony, a universal reconciliation, but this will not atone for the innocent suffering of the past . . . I absolutely repudiate the highest harmony; it is not worth the tears of this one tortured child."

"The motive of Belinsky's atheism," writes Dr. Lampert, "was moral, not intellectual. He was no sceptic or agnostic mildly pleading for the incredibility of a theistic universe. 'To believe and not to know', he said, '—this may still have some meaning for man; but to know and not to believe does not mean anything at all'. The atheistic motive was linked with his central pre-occupation with the human person. He was moved by a passion for human freedom, which has led others beside Belinsky to despise the attitude, servile, frightened and egotistical as it is, of believers who look for God and find only such reflection of their own self-will, as God the potentate, the guarantor of social values and civilisation, the receiver of petitions, the domestic servant, the sergeant major, the general supply and welfare officer or, for that matter, the gratifying object of a vague and sloppy pursuit of eternity."

For Christians a man may be good and virtuous, a moral paragon, but if he happened to be born before A.D. 30 he cannot be a Christian. So it is with the Marxists. Belinsky died of consumption in 1848 without having read *The Communist Manifesto*: ergo, his

socialism was utopian. Our own generation has learned, all too bitterly, the value of the distinction between 'socialism-utopian and scientific'. We will admit, then, that Belinsky was a utopian. He had read the early French socialists and was influenced by them. But he was no gradualist; nor did he go along with them when, from some abstract theory of the nature of man, they deduced a schematic social order into which the coming generations were to be fitted. In his view, socialism was made for man, not man for socialism; and he establishes his case for socialism on the basis of the moral values of human freedom and personality. One quotation will suffice to exhibit the spirit of Belinsky's socialism. It is a passage which Dr. Lampert describes as 'almost pathetically high-flown' but, allowing for that, its affirmations will find a response in every rebel's heart. Belinsky looks forward to a time "when no one will be burnt, no one brought to the block, when the criminal will beg to be made an end of as an act of saving mercy, and there will be no punishment, but life will be left to him as a punishment, as death is now; when there will be no senseless codes and conventions, when no terms and conditions will be imposed on feeling, when there will be no duty and obligation, and when will yields not to will but to love alone; when there will be no husbands and wives, but lovers, men and women; when the loved one will come to her lover and say: 'I love another', and he will answer: 'I cannot be happy without you; I shall suffer my whole life long, but go to him whom you love'. And he will not accept her sacrifice, if through magnanimity she desires to remain with him, but like God, he will say to her: 'I will have mercy and not sacrifice'. There will be no rich and no poor, neither kings nor subjects; but there will be brothers, there will be men and women and in the words of the Apostle Paul, Christ will yield his power to the Father, and the Father . . . will ascend his throne anew, but now over a new heaven and a new earth."

G.O.

(To be continued)

VIEWPOINT

THE MYTH OF PAY INCENTIVE

THE principle of proportionate monetary reward for more responsibility and important work is so widely accepted that an angel would surely hesitate to question it. As an example of the axiomatic nature of this un-Jesus-like, yet Christian-tolerated rule I recall the £7 per week farm labourer's look of utter amazement when I suggested that he was just as important to the human race as the Prime Minister: he thought I was daft.

Like a fool, then, I rush in to challenge this law of human nature. I challenge it on grounds of ethics and expediency.

First let us examine the relative importance of occupations. Take the Prime Minister and the Dustman.

The major consideration is the availability of replacements—and it is here that a common fallacy obscures the true issue. What we must realise is that whilst there is only one Prime Minister to replace there are *thousands* of Dustmen: for every deputy Prime Minister we require thousands of deputy Dustmen! and, furthermore, if anyone thinks that refuse bins need not be emptied regularly let them read up on the Great Plague once more. The truth is that we might profitably have foregone the the luxury of a Prime Minister on some historical occasions—but we can never discard the Dustman. Churchill myths—yes but Dustman myths?

Why should a Prime Minister be paid more than our Dustman? Does he need more food? Does he need more warmth, clothing, beer, fags? Of course not. On the contrary a harassed Prime Minister can have little time to use the extra money except for doctor's fees in the absence of a Welfare State system.

Apart from all that I am sure that if the Prime Minister were given the choice of carrying out his present duties at a Dustman's wage (plus expenses) or emptying refuse bins at his present salary he would choose the former.

Now, to get down to fundamentals, is it necessary to bribe human beings in order to make them do some useful work?

It will not be disputed that human beings really do express an instinctive urge to stay alive (do I hear someone mentioning the H-bomb race in questioning tone?) and will expend a surprising amount of energy towards that end. With very few exceptions we are all capable of working efficiently. So that if these capabilities are not in evidence the circumstances must be unfavourable—very unfavourable. What are these circumstances?

Superstition is fed wholesale to the many, in a continual desperate attempt to stave off evolution or revolution, by the fear-ridden "privileged" few who

have, by circumstances governed by tradition, found themselves in that "enviable" position. It is a vicious circle which would collapse the moment enlightenment entered upon the scene. The "high" and the "lowly", the strong and the weak, the young and old, ugly or beautiful, career helplessly in this myth-driven wheel of misfortune and ignorance.

Strange though it may seem the most powerful backer of this pay incentive myth is Christianity, or, as in this country, the Church of England. For this body is privileged to impart what is purported to be an absolute ethic to the children in this country.

In contradiction to the "take no heed of worldly pleasures" policy of the Sermon on the Mount, the Church sets an example to the would-be business man: the salary scales in that Church are a veritable Jacob's ladder with a treasure at the top—£7,500 for the Archbishop of Canterbury! As each little Christian child develops so does the Myth, quietly, naturally, unquestioned, until he comes to full Christian manhood—and joins, unashamed, in the rat race for more cash with an appetite that can scarcely be satisfied.

I have raised this matter with Christians many times but only two have been sympathetic towards my argument. One of them, a well-known layman, told me he once suggested, to the members (atheist and Christian), of a discussion group he had formed, that they all make a monetary sacrifice. The following week nobody turned up!

Well, as Professor Burrows Dunham wrote, in "Man against Myth", the primary needs of humans are food, shelter, clothing, companionship, play and sexual love. And, as the old saying goes, "enough's as good as a feast." So, does the millionaire stand to lose any happiness in giving up his possessions and taking a modest salary? No, he stands to lose the fear of the slump, the Wall Street crash. He would know his real friends. He would have nothing to fear from the poverty-stricken mob, ripe for revolution and revenge.

There is another aspect, too: the over-worked, highly paid executive, if he shared his salary and his work with others, would be a happier and more efficient contributor to the welfare of Mankind.

But it is a Myth that will die hard. Avro Manhattan's recent book "The Dollar and the Vatican" has been refused a review by all of the popular press editors. It does something worse than attack the Churches—it attacks the mighty dollar. That is, of course, anathema to Fleet Street. And things are getting rapidly worse.

ERNIE CROSSWELL.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

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

New Books . . .

- Hearts not Heads in the School A. S. Neill 7/6
- That Dreadful School A. S. Neill 7/6
- The Problem Family A. S. Neill 7/6
- Sexual Behaviour in the Human Female A. C. Kinsey 56/-
- From the Other Shore Alexander Herzen 15/-
- The Guillotine at Work P. G. Maximoff 17/6
- Political Philosophy of Bakunin 42/-
- Studies in Rebellion Evgeny Lampert 30/-
- The Breakdown of Nations Leopold Kohr 30/-

Second-Hand . . .

- Tomorrow is Already Here Robert Jungk 6/-
- The Task of Social Hygiene Havelock Ellis 4/-
- Lust for Life Irving Stone 6/-
- Seven Red Sundays Ramón J. Sender 5/6
- Modern Rationalism Joseph McCabe 5/-
- The House of the Dead Fyodor Dostoevsky 3/6
- The End of the World Joseph McCabe 3/6
- The Future of Bolshevism Waldemar Gurian 2/6
- In Defence of Sensuality John Cowper Powys 4/-
- The Socialist Movement 1824-1924 (Part 2 only) Arthur Shadwell 3/6
- Guild Socialism Re-Styled G. D. H. Cole 3/6
- Biographical Dictionary of Freethinkers (1889) J. M. Wheeler 6/-
- The Golden Ass—Apuleius (tr. W. Adlington) 3/6

Periodicals . . .

- Organic Functionalism May, 1957 2/6
- 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.1

THE EVIL THAT CANNOT EXIST

Continued from p. 3
is 1/8d.] Poverty has driven many husbands to encourage their wives to prostitute themselves, and Lastik complains of "their impudence and shamelessness" because "they are certain of immunity in Poland." Lastik also met "society women whose husbands earned quite decent salaries, but who increased their income through prostitution." His conclusion: the prevalence of prostitution is not, as Engels maintained, due solely to social misery, but quite as much to socialist "blindness and falsehood."

Where prostitution is the direct result of economic deprivation a reasonable social system would eliminate the need for women to take to the streets. But as Alex Comfort states in *Barbarism and Sexual Freedom* it is possible to overstate the economic factor in prostitution. More important he writes, in the light of more recent information, where social factors such as the removal of sanctions which had existed in the older social pattern and the changed status of the family. English prostitutes are largely recruited from the psychopaths and those who are mentally defective.

A reasonable attitude to sex in this society would eliminate much of the dangers of disease which result from hole in the corner sexual acts. But it would also take away some of the excitement for people who derive a lot of their pleasure from the "secret affair".

As society exists there will always be a market for sex, and our roving reporter tells us that even respectable ladies who are bored with their husbands will often co-operate for the price of a drink.

WANTED

More Financial Support

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 21

Deficit on Freedom	£420
Contributions received	£335
DEFICIT	£85

May 17 to May 23

Glasgow: J.M. 4/-; London: K.M. 2/-;	
McKeesport: J.R. £1/1/0; London: J.S.*	
3/-; St. Louis: E.S. £1/1/2; Seattle: W.V.	
den H. 14/-; Minneapolis: D.S. 6/7.	
Total ...	3 11 9
Previously acknowledged ...	331 16 4
1957 TOTAL TO DATE ...	£335 8 1

Fire Fund

London: Anon. 2/3; London: W.F. 5/-;	
Glasgow: J.M. 3/-; London: V.T. £1; Lon-	
don: E.M. 2/6; Freiburg: R.A.A.R. £1/13/0;	
Uddingston: G.H.M.S. 1/-; Hong-Kong:	
M.S. 10/-	
Total ...	3 16 9
Previously acknowledged ...	119 7 4
TOTAL TO DATE ...	£123 4 1

WANTED

More Readers!

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 18, No. 22. June 1, 1957.

Peace into Power Politics Won't

Go! **Continued**
from p. 1

And if a Royal Commission, which is a body appointed by the Government, "is not considered to be the best instrument" (by the Government?), then the Commander suggests that

"a special committee of the Imperial Defence College should be put on the job".

We think it will be agreed that we have not exaggerated when we suggested that the Commander's approach to passive resistance is not that of the integral pacifist who answers force with love, but of one who has discovered that in the nuclear age of peace or annihilation, passive resistance might well be a military-political weapon*. The Commander is no pacifist, no internationalist, no social revolutionary. At most it can be argued that he is a good Britisher without the blinkers that dog the footsteps of the brass-hats of Whitehall. To elevate this ex-naval brass-hat (or whatever naval backroom boys are called), this ex-politician and ex-parliamentarian to the heights, as does *Peace News*, is to display either a bad dose of the political bug or a political naiveté of which one had thought—and hoped—the pacifists had been cured as a result of their unsuccessful and disastrous flirtations with the Communist Party and its "Peace" campaigns.

★

WE refuse to be drawn by the arguments of those who believe that a state of permanent peace can be achieved either by the nations of the world arming to the teeth or by arriving at an agreement between them, a *modus vivendi* between the great powers, with the satellites of both sides lurking in the background, simply because there is no evidence to show that war is anything but an (not even *the*) instrument of power politics. The threat of war exists so long as nations and the struggle for power exists, whether the weapons of their armouries are H-bombs or peashooters. That struggle for power is political and economic, and in the final analysis has less to do with national interests than with the struggle for power of a political and/or economic stratum of society. If the threat of war is occasioned by ideological differences, as the politicians would have us believe, then how explain that Franco's Spain, which represents a form of government contrary to the basic tenets of democracy, in that it denies freedom of the Press, of organisation and the secret ballot, far from being a threat to "world peace" is, in fact, an outpost of American democracy? The same could be said of Tito's Yugoslavia (only last week the American government sanctioned the allocation of \$100 million for supplies of arms). The answer is that the threat to "our way of life" is military and economic strength, not "ideologies". Thus Nazi Germany was an "ideological" threat, Franco Spain is not; Russia is, Rumania or

*That he is woolly about his new "discovery" is evidenced by the following passage in which he couples Gandhist passive resistance with terrorism in Ireland, Algeria and Palestine.

"Gandhi's passive resistance campaign in India; the German passive resistance which defeated the French in the Ruhr in the 1920s; the Sinn Fein nationally supported terrorist campaign; the Israel victory over the British mandatory administration; the Algerian struggle; the EOKA movement in Cyprus; the resistance movements against the Nazis, all belong to this new development."

Albania aren't! But we must qualify these generalisations.

★

THAT is, we must define—or rather, re-define *ideology*. In the war and post-war years this word has lost all meaning, for it has become an excuse: in the first place to justify a war—and the sacrifices in human life and liberty—against a régime which the British government had done so much to assist in its rise to power, and in the second place to explain how a gallant ally (Russia) could overnight become a mortal enemy. It is significant that the "democracies" did nothing, or very little to prevent the growth of these ideologies which were at the opposite poles to capitalist "democracy". When however, they had lost all ideological significance, but had become world powers we either went to war against them, or did the next best thing, of maintaining a war economy in time of peace. (If military policy is based on ideologi-

cal interests how does one explain the need for Britain to develop its own H-bomb in spite of the fact that America possessed all the "know-how" for its manufacture?).

What, one might ask, has changed in Russian ideology during the past few months to warrant both the military *volte-face* of the British Government and the new American disarmament policy announced this week which, according to the *Manchester Guardian's* New York correspondent (27/5/57), gives to Mr. Harold Stassen "power to meet the Russians half-way in seeking agreement . . . [at the London disarmament talks and] to adjust American policy to changing conditions around the negotiating table"? Wars, power politics, as we are so often at pains to point out, existed before Lenin's time, before the emergence of national "isms", and when all the combatant nations were ardent supporters of capitalism, colonialism and power, and the bogey of communism

had not been dreamed-up. Even then they dressed up the loot and the power-lust in fancy dress and high-sounding motives. How much more necessary is the subterfuge today when the population as a whole is more deeply involved at the receiving end of wars!

★

THE question we would put to pacifists (and socialists and any other well-meaning people) is the following: Do you believe any government capable of acting in the interests of mankind for the sake of mankind? If you do, then we would be interested to have the evidence on which you base your optimism in government. If you do not, why are you wasting your time pursuing policies doomed to failure as well as adding to the confusion in the minds of your readers and followers? Governments may ban the Bomb, postpone the tests, abolish conscription and support disarmament proposals. But they will do these things for tactical reasons, and therefore when they consider such moves are expedient. Permanent peace is quite another matter; it cannot exist alongside power politics which is the basis of international policies to-day. If the H-bomb is abolished by agreement between the governments (and we do not think it will be) it will only be the signal for the rehabilitation of "conventional" weapons. We may, for reasons known only to the politicians, jump back from the fire into the frying-pan but from the point of view of humanity here and now this is but small consolation.

If we seek peace, permanent peace, we need to by-pass the political machine. Indeed we may have to smash it . . . before it annihilates itself and us.

Perhaps letters to the press and protest meetings are as outdated in the struggle for peace as are howitzers in the waging of wars.

PEOPLE AND IDEAS

UNIVERSITY PROBES & PUBLICATIONS

HARD on the heels of Barbara Castle's remarks on the case of a young mountaineer who after preparing an expedition to climb some Himalayan peak was refused entry into the country as a result of an adverse and secret report on him circulated by the Ministry of Commonwealth Relations as a result apparently of his having belonged to a university socialist society, comes Lord Chorley's protest in the House of Lords debate on university education on May 23rd.

Lord Chorley (of the London School of Economics) said that over the last few years the security services had infiltrated more and more into the universities, and had been requiring university teachers to disclose information about their students, and sometimes, more and more frequently now, about their colleagues.

"The relationship between a teacher and his student," he said, "is something which is unique, but it can hardly survive if the teacher is going to be called upon to do what many teachers regard as spying for the State on the activities of their students. . . . This is not something which happened now and then. It is going on all the time, and numerous colleagues of mine, working in the University of London, have told me that only last month they had been asked to report, not only on their students, but on their colleagues. . . . Some of the things I have heard have been almost unbelievable. A university teacher had been asked to find out what documents a colleague had in his room. This meant that a teacher was being asked to find his way into a colleague's study to see what was in his drawers." Lord Chorley asked for an investigation by the Privy Council, but Viscount Hailsham, Minister of Education in replying to the debate, made no mention of his allegations.

His picture of the University world lends support to Tony Gibson's recent remarks about the "Grey Generation" of students who "are characterised by a desire for social conformity, an unthinking compliance with authority", though in his opinion,

"The censorship of dissident opinion is largely internal in British universities. Those holding advanced opinions may hesitate to express them openly in print or before a larger audience than their immediate friends, for fear that THEY will hold it against them in the politics of academic advancement".

They certainly give us nothing to be smug about in reading the recent symposium in *The Nation* (see FREEDOM 27/4/57), on the "Cautious Young Men" at American universities, which reported that they are "wanting above all—so well conditioned are they by the prevailing social climate—to buy security for themselves in the full knowledge that the price is conformity" ("Why should we go out on a limb about anything?" one student asked, "We know what happened to those who did").

★

IN this country people have been noticing a change in student attitudes as a result of the events of last year in Suez and Hungary. It is too early to say whether they are more than a temporary development. Some people see the appearance of the third issue of the *University Libertarian*, and of the first number of a new magazine, the *Universi-*

ties and Left Review as portents of the changing university climate.

Here they are, the two Spring numbers: no direct comparison is possible because of the difference in size and price. *The University Libertarian* gives you seven articles on 16 pages for 10d. *The Universities and Left Review* gives you seventeen on 74 pages for 3s. 6d. The *U.L.* contains writers mostly familiar to readers of the anarchist press, it has struggled through to its third number with a lack of publicity and support, at the expense of its editor. The *U. and L.R.* contains articles by several of the 'big names' of socialist journalism, its arrival was heralded with a great deal of publicity and advertisement, it has sold 7,000 copies and has been reprinted.

In the *University Libertarian* an article on 'Religion without Morals' attacks both Christianity which has "turned our emotional life into such a nightmare", and humanism which "unconsciously and uncritically accepts Christian values and simply offers new excuses for maintaining the old forms of Christian behaviour". Bernard Withers writes about Conscientious Objection, Yoti Lane on 'Sex and Society' (no small subject!), and George Woodcock provides a reassessment of William Godwin, Wallace Hamilton in 'My Hard Life With The Berkeley Cops' gives a hilarious account of his attempts to adopt "A Positive Approach to Interpersonal Relations, based on mutual respect, etc.", and Tony Gibson

writes about the academic industry as a new form of the 'conspicuous waste' which Thorstein Veblen noted as a characteristic of all the élite groups which rule society. In the modern world conspicuous waste is not abolished but socialised, says Gibson, and of its academic manifestations he writes:

"In former times, those who used to pursue their idle curiosity and search for fun at the university as undergraduates, did so largely at the expense of their parents. The staff of the university were also dependent in some measure on the bounty of benefactors who sought to grace their ill-gotten wealth by associating it with learning. Although this is still the case to some extent, the trend has been steadily in the direction of establishing the right of all who shelter under the wing of the university to live at public expense. And why not? In the past, the laity were expected to feed the clergy in order that they might meditate, pray and lead a life of unproductive idleness while the mass of men worked. Now, as long as we in the university can despise the ignorance, crudity, banality and general worthlessness of what the non-graduate portion of the population spend most of their money on, we can comfortably relax in our libraries and laboratories confident that we are a worthy cause which they should be taxed to pay for. Our job is learning for learning's sake. If the crude and material-minded use the product of our discoveries as a means of processing cheese, or hoodwinking the electorate, or broadcasting Elvis Presley,

or exterminating each other, that is not our affair."

The most solid of the *University Libertarian's* articles is Gaston Gerard's 'Anarchism and Trade Unionism', in which, taking as a starting point two well-known articles of Malatesta ('Anarchism and the Labour Movement' and 'Syndicalism and Anarchism') he examines the history and present state of British trade unionism, finding ample evidence in support of Malatesta's arguments. He sees the present task of anarcho-syndicalists not as trying to create new 'revolutionary unions', since "the anarcho-syndicalist is faced with an inescapable dilemma at the present time: he can either choose to keep his organisation revolutionary, in which case it will be small and ineffective in defence; or he can choose to make it large and effective for defensive purposes at the sacrifice of its revolutionary potentialities" and he points out that "the hopes placed by the anarcho-syndicalists in the unofficial workers' committees that have sprung up since the war have not been fulfilled". Rather, he thinks, the position that those anarchists who work in the industrial sphere should take in relation to trade unionism is "to participate in them as rank-and-file members with the two-fold object of (i) making anarchists by spreading anarchist ideas and explaining to their fellow-workers the root causes of their disillusionment with the trade union leadership and policies and (ii) acting as a prophylactic against reformist and bureaucratic tendencies".

★

IN the *Universities and Left Review* there is a lot of interesting reading matter too. Isaac Deutscher on 'Russia in Transition', Claude Bourdet on the French Left, K. A. Jelenski on Destalinisation, Professor Cole on 'What is Happening to Capitalism', and articles on the New Conservatism, the future of Marxism in the social sciences, on Town-planning and Housing, on Socialism and the Intellectuals, on Dickens, on commitment in the arts, and so on. The general atmosphere of the magazine is that of dissident Marxism.

This is the difference between the two magazines: the *U.L.* reflects a heretical, sceptical attitude, its emphasis is social rather than political. The *U. and L.R.* mirrors the views of people who have been disillusioned by the experience of socialism both in its Western welfare-state form, and in the Stalinist icebox, but still think in terms of political socialism and Marxism. They are fundamentally politicians: even in the article by Graeme Shankland on the Crisis in Town-Planning, the assumptions of the politician stick out like the stale sponge-cake in a custard-trifle. Our cities, he concludes "are the centres of our economic life, a measure of our culture, the test of our ability to govern". "Any old heresy will do", writes the editor of the *University Libertarian* in asking for contributions, and certainly if his magazine only succeeds in peddling old heresies it will be more useful than its rival which to judge from its highly successful first number is hawking old illusions in new verbiage. C.W.

THE UNIVERSITY LIBERTARIAN. No. 3, Spring 1957, costs 1/- by post from Freedom Bookshop or from the publisher, 13, Bannerman Avenue, Prestwich, Manchester. Annual Subscription 2/10d.

The Existence of the Evil That Cannot Exist

IT seems that not only do prostitutes exist in the workers' fatherland but they have their syphilis problems too just like the capitalist West. Since the spread of syphilis is much less dangerous to Western Democracy than the spread of socialism it ought to welcome these signs of normality from behind the iron curtain. For did not Lenin and Marx say that prostitution was a capitalist evil which would disappear under a new system of social justice? Presumably since prostitution is flourishing socialism is withering!

There are no specific laws which apply to prostitutes in the Soviet Union therefore when caught most are released at once, although some are sent to labour camps. (No doubt depending on the extent of their talents in other directions). Moscow *Trud* campaigning against this display of private enterprise states that:

These women are breaking a basic law of socialism. He who does not work does not eat.

In Poland, according to Radio Gdansk, where black and red zealots work hand in hand, 230,000 known prostitutes manage to dodge the wrath of God and the Commissars. The tragedy is that half are not yet 25 and of these one in three is not yet eighteen. Salomon Lastik, in

Nowa Kultura states that they belong to a generation that has matured in the conditions of The People's Republic of Poland. He found, that:

"over 80% of prostitutes were from working-class or peasant families which are pitiless for every moral slip. The unfortunate daughter is expelled from her home and her fellow workers turn against her." The syphilis rate is more than twice what it was in Poland three years ago, largely because "after the official statement that prostitution had been liquidated a number of venereal dispensaries closed down."

Tracking down young "gulls" (Baltic word for the trade), "glories" (Poznan's description), "artists" (in Cracow) and "debris girls" (in Warsaw, where many practice their trade in dilapidated, damaged houses), earnest Investigator Lastik found only 5% of Warsaw's prostitutes prospering, although his figures do not include "society ladies, presumptuous divorcees and widows with a nice flat and a telephone who are visited by introduction (cost of a night of love: 1,000 zlotys)." Of 310 "notorious prostitutes" interviewed, 106 were homeless. On cold and rainy nights they committed petty offences "for the purpose of being arrested and obtaining at least a temporary roof over their heads, a warm nook and a spoonful of warm food."

In the provinces the situation is worse. "Unfortunate women, who are homeless, covered with vermin and filth, are selling their bodies for 5 to 20 zlotys [a zloty

Continued on p. 2

Money Before Mecca

FOR those naive folk who still cling to the illusion that ideological motives divide nation states, or hold them together, the reasons behind the present conflict between some of the Arab states should suggest to them that the anarchists might be right after all when we maintain that economic gain is the prime motive which moves rulers to make allies or enemies, and not the issues of right and wrong, justice or injustice, which their public utterances would have us believe.

We might suppose that with all eyes turned on Mecca the Arab leaders in times of crisis would hang together to defend each other against the Christian hordes, but when division spells more power and wealth for some we find that, like Christians in the West, they will cheerfully tramp on each other in the scramble for a larger slice of the cake.

History shows when countries unite after decades of conflict it is not because they have piously forgiven one another for past misdeeds but because it is found that unity pays off better than division. Iraq and Saudi Arabia, no exceptions to the rule, have formed an alliance rising out of fear of Soviet penetration in the Middle East and greed for the wealth which they will derive from the large oil companies of the West. (If they could have been sure of the same dividends from Russia they would have come to terms a long time ago). King Feisal, whose "line has waged a blood feud intermittently for over half a century with the usurping Sauds of Arabia" drew up a communiqué with King Saud last week in which they each pledged themselves to oppose all attempts at foreign interference and hailed the "new era of cordial relations" between their countries. Without making it too apparent that they disapprove of Nasser it was implied in a statement from Iraq's Premier, Nuri as-Said, who said that martial law in Iraq, which was imposed after the invasion of Suez would be retained as long as Moscow continued to create trouble "among our neighbouring countries". When asked if Nasser was aiding the spread of communism, his careful reply was: "He has been criticizing me, but I don't want to criticize him." Walking warily, Iraq is nevertheless in a strong position. A few

months ago as the only Arab country to sign the Baghdad Pact she was isolated from the rest of the Arab world. Now that passions have cooled down over the British and French actions in Suez the other Arab states with the exception of Syria and Egypt are realising that their best interests lie westwards.

In addition neither Iraq, Jordan nor Saudi Arabia are anxious to have Nasser hailed as the Middle East Messiah; is he not an upstart who originated among the people—a revolutionary who would like to see an end to the traditional ruling class? (and put himself in their place of course).

Although Nasser has forced shipping users of the canal to accept his terms at the moment, plans are now afoot between the big oil companies which, if they materialise in the future will make Suez less important as a waterway, and it is these plans which are largely influencing the other Arab states. Nasser cannot 'go it alone' indefinitely and will sooner or later have to make a choice between East and West. It is unlikely that he will want a permanent alliance with Russia while the rest of the Arab countries are in opposition.

It is reported that thirty of the world's top oil industrialists gathered together at Shell-Mex House to discuss plans for a proposed 1,000 mile-long pipeline stretching from the Persian Gulf through Iraq and Turkey to the Mediterranean port of Iskenderon.

This line would handle 800,000 barrels a day by 1960, and a second line might later be added. The new pipelines, along with those now running through Syria, could together handle far more oil than used to go through the canal. More impressive than the pipes, the world's shipyards are building nearly 300 monster tankers (over 40,000 tons) too big to pass through the 46-ft.-deep canal. By 1965 tankers would be able to haul some 4,000,000 barrels daily around the Cape of Good Hope for less per ton than shipment now costs through the canal in smaller tankers. Western Europe's total pre-crisis consumption was less than 4,000,000 barrels a day.

Iraq lost about £25,000,000 in revenue when Syria blew up the pipelines last November, and although the Premier in answer to Syria and Egypt's cry that Arab oil must be shipped across Arab land, has said that Iraq would oppose any plan to divert oil from existing pipelines, a way of getting round this problem has already been suggested by the oil companies; they are not really trying to by-pass Syria but are merely preparing to meet increased demands, and a pipeline across Turkey would be "an expansion not a diversion". Presumably the plan is that if Syria continues to be awkward the "expansion" would become the main pipeline. Under these conditions Syria would have little choice but to accept their terms. It is just another tremendous racket where the ruling minority in every country play for the highest stakes regardless of the consequences to each other or the people whom they rule.

In the meantime Israel, who seems to have gained little from her alliance with France and Britain over Suez, waits—forgotten—to get her ships through the Suez Canal.

What to Do?

DEAR EDITORS,

Please allow me to comment on the letter from F. W. Letchford, and your editorial on it, in *FREEDOM*, 18/5/57. F.W. is not asking "what must I do to be saved?" but "What must I do, now that I am saved?"—and when you get a question like that, you are getting results. When readers get tired of just reading *FREEDOM*, and want to do something, a very, very important thing is happening, and if the anarchist movement were able to make use of this urge, then it might begin to move.

But I don't think the question is fully answered by your saying, in effect, "Indulge in anarchist activity". The problem needs much thinking about. What do you mean by 'activity'? Holding meetings, selling *FREEDOM*? We can't all do that. If F.W. is really an anarchist, his sense of social responsibility and his values will show in his daily attitude and behaviour to his neighbours at work and at home, and his activity will follow the lines suited to his talents and temperament. He may hunger and thirst after the social revolution just as much as any regular contributor to *FREEDOM*, so he ought not to feel guilty if he bellows with conviviality and belches after a good feed—surely the stars of *FREEDOM* do that too!

I am sure F.W. doesn't live out his life as a complete lie; surely he tends his honest opinion when it is asked for, on any of the fundamental issues of life? Surely, he doesn't let his colleagues (or mates) ram the *Daily Express* headlines down his throat every day? And surely, if F.W. behaves as an anarchist, firmly and pleasantly, in his present environment, he will do more good for the movement than by yelling about it from the house-tops?

Is it then that F.W. finds his present environment stultifying? Is he depressed at being unable to make any headway against the dogmatic ignorance of authoritarian-reared, convention-ridden conformers? I don't know the cure for this, but since he lives in London, he has greater opportunities for congenial mental intercourse than us who live in the backwoods.

Still, is it not time that those of us who have graduated from *FREEDOM*'s learners' class seriously considered what we ought to do now? In *FREEDOM* 9/2/57, Victor Valente asked readers in Edinburgh to contact him, with the object of forming a discussion group, resulting in immediate friendship, and I him, and we arranged a meeting. This resulted in immediate friendship, and I realise now what a chump I am for not asking *FREEDOM* to help in introducing me to fellow anarchists when I came here three years ago! V.V. and I are now planning to contact all anarchists in Scotland and North England, within visiting distance of each other, to bring them out of isolation into an association which, we hope, will be more concerned with living out our anarchism than carrying it around like an ingrowing toenail.

I hope some readers in this area will be interested enough to write me or Victor Valente, c/o The Broughton Bookshop, 7, Broughton St., Edinburgh.

Yours sincerely,
Peebles, May 21. GEORGE GILFILLAN.

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

Anarchists and Responsibility

In *FREEDOM* of the 18th May, F. W. Letchford raises an issue, developed editorially in the same number, that is of primary importance to every serious anarchist, a constant conflict of loyalties and responsibilities.

Many regard anarchism as synonymous with irresponsibility, some select special responsibilities to avoid larger responsibilities. The values of capitalism have coloured the personality to such an extent that many regard anarchism as a sort of free capitalism, those with a high standard of physical comfort tend to avoid action that might endanger that standard within present society.

There are however real conflicts of responsibility for those with dependents which can of course lead to taking a short-term view. If one applies one's anarchist views to education and sexual activity of children, there is likely to be a point where one comes into conflict with the State with all its power to remove a child from the care of its parents. In trying to ensure a relatively free environment for one's own children there is a temptation to be discreet in other activities.

Letchford asks 'do we have to wait for persecution in order to gather strength?' The question is rather I think do we have to wait for the revolution to live more fully? The answer is, I think, emphatically no. To create an economic and social environment of voluntary association even to a limited degree should be the immediate aim of the anarchist seeking to experience a fuller satisfaction of co-operative activity and gain knowledge of the difficulties and snags of a free society particularly when the influence of authoritarian society is strong. That such an enterprise is possible by a group of balanced individuals on anarchist lines must be accepted, otherwise one would be swept by pessimism to impotence.

The anarchist as I see it has the following personal responsibilities:

1. To his own and to children generally.
2. To those with whom he is intimately associated.
3. To himself, for self development to eradicate the influence of capitalist environment on his own personality.

Whither Socialism?

DEAR FRIENDS,

Whither Socialism(!)—Whither Anarchism? It seems to be asking for too much too soon—human perfection.

For anarchism to succeed, society must rid itself of the one thing that pervades it in all forms—past and present—the power complex (that word!) Since the beginning of organised society, people have been divided into—to use a Freudian (?) phrase—the "leaders and the led". Can *FREEDOM* give any example of a flourishing—or once flourishing—anarchist society that lasted for decades? Please don't flog the Trobrianders—Neill and Reich have had their whack.

No, if the power complex is to be analysed completely, we do not have to examine only the ambitious politician, the Wall Street tycoon or the bowler-hatted foreman—some still wear bowlers, I imagine—we have to examine the whole meaning behind competition. What causes the fanatical drive to get to the top, not only in the world of business, but in sport, the arts, in intellectual pursuits. It's surely not just economic factors; this competitive spirit, this desire to be one up on one's fellow-man, has always existed.

Anarchism is strictly an individual philosophy, enjoyed and adopted by individuals; influencing society certainly, but never likely to be adopted by it. Beware of the Homburg hidden under that copy of *FREEDOM*—sorry Sir Herbert.

Libertarian may be a "vague, umbrella word", but as you admit, we have a mutual preference for an open society; we like to keep our umbrella well open, not rolled tightly—sorry Sir Herbert.

I can foresee an operative libertarian society functioning in its widest sense—not moneyless may be; not without its quota of competition; not perfect; but without hydrogen bombs, without poverty, without ignorance. This is the best that we can expect of imperfect man. *FREEDOM* can do much to influence us towards this life, but please, not total anarchy, we are not up to it.

Yours,
Sheffield, May 23. PETER LEE.

4. Association with other anarchists to secure by example and propaganda an emotional and intellectual attitude that will result in a state of anarchy.

5. Personal relationships with non-anarchists and application as far as is possible of a non-authoritarian attitude, together with a resistance to authoritarian behaviour by others.

6. Collective resistance by anarchists and others to coercions by the State and to injustice and inhumanity.

The conflict of responsibilities facing anarchists could be dealt with more effectively if anarchists could bring themselves to practise within their own circle the principles of mutual aid that they so ardently preach.

ALAN ALBON.
*Communitas, Eastleigh,
Cirencester, Glos.
24/5/57.*

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.

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP MEETINGS

JUNE 2—John Smith on
WHY I AM AN ANARCHIST
JUNE 9—No Meeting
JUNE 16—John Bishop on
SNOBBERY
JUNE 23—Donald Room on
ANARCHISM & RELIGION
JUNE 30—Max Patrick on
IS THERE A RULING CLASS
JULY 7.—Laurens Otter on
HISTORICAL DETERMINISM
REVISITED
JULY 14—Jack Robinson on
WORK.
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 THOMSON speaks

Every Friday and Saturday:
SOCIAL EVENINGS

AFRICAN FORUM MEETINGS

32 Percy St., Tottenham Court Rd., W.1.

Mrs. HANA OTUDOR
Unofficial Nigeria Delegate
and E. NDEM
of Ibadan University College, Nigeria
will speak on
NIGERIA IN AFRICAN POLITICS
Tuesday, June 4, 7 p.m.

Followed by Social.

FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

Postal Subscription Rates:

12 months 19/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)

6 months 9/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)

3 months 5/- (U.S.A. \$0.75)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies

12 months 29/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)

6 months 14/6 (U.S.A. \$2.25)

Cheques, P.O.'s and Money Orders should be made out to *FREEDOM PRESS*, crossed a/c Payee, and addressed to the publishers

FREEDOM PRESS

27 Red Lion Street

London, W.C.1. England

Tel.: Chancery 8364

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

ERRICO MALATESTA:

Anarchy 6d

Vote—What For? 1d

M. BAKUNIN:

Marxism, Freedom and the State. cloth 5s

ALEX COMFORT:

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

PHILIP SANSOM:

Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step 1s

JOHN HEWETSON:

Sexual Freedom for the Young 6d.

Ill-Health, Poverty and the State cloth 2s. 6d., paper 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.