

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"Experience should teach us to be most on guard to protect liberty when the Government's purposes are beneficent. Men born to freedom are naturally alert to repel invasions of their liberty by evil-minded rulers. The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in the insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well meaning but without understanding."  
—LOUIS BRANDEIS.

## U.S. DOUBLETHINK ON CHINA

### The Phoney Moralistic Approach . . .

A WHOLE page of the Sunday edition of the *New York Times* (June 9) was recently taken by "The Committee of One Million—Against the admission of Communist China to the United Nations" to make their "Appeal to all Free Men" not to Trade with the Enemy. The "Appeal" is two-pronged: politico-economic and moral. Economically, it is pointed out, trade between East and West has "yet to exceed more than a maximum of 3 per cent. for the total of the Free World", though it is also admitted that in 1955 "exports to the Communists" were increased by 15 per cent., and imports by 32 per cent., thereby recognising that there may possibly be room for considerable expansion of that "maximum 3 per cent."! And in any case 3 per cent. of "free" world trade may be neither here nor there for American big business (though somehow we would be interested to know how many millionaire business men are represented in this "Committee of One Million"!), but obviously for the smaller nations which will be the first to suffer in the future trade war, China's 600 million potential customers are not to be sneered at—and compared with Formosa's nine million, and in spite of Chiang's "liberation" army of old men—it is obvious that they are in no doubt as to where the future of China—as a market—lies!

To the arguments that Mao Tse-tung might well become the Tito of the Far East and break with the Kremlin, they deduce from the evidence available that the contrary is

the case, even assuming, which they do not, that Tito—who "continues to embrace the philosophy of Communism"—is "on the side of freedom".

Thus politically the "free world" has nothing to gain, and economically, apart from the Peiping régime and "perhaps a few individual traders in some nations of the Free World" no one would benefit from all-out East-West trade. Indeed, according to the Committee:

Such trade can only contribute to the destruction of a free economy. How can any manufacturer, working on the basis of a free competitive system, hope to ever compete in the world market with goods produced by the massive slave labour force of Communist China? To foster such trade, even in the hope of an immediate cash profit, is to ignore the obvious facts. Ultimate ruin faces any free economy attempting to compete on an equal basis with a slave economy.

(The trouble with these authoritarian champions of "freedom" is that one can never be sure what they are talking about. It leads them to such conclusions as that competition between a "free economy" and a "slave economy"—and what they mean by a slave economy is in fact *cheap labour*, which exists in Formosa, Japan, India and Africa, that is in the "free world", just as much as in the unfree territories of China and Russia!—ultimately faces the "free economy" with ruin. It is to admit that of the two economies or systems, slave labour is the most efficient, which even the most reactionary industrial psychologist (not

to mention Khrushchev and his expert advisers) knows to be false. Is it not of any political significance that in spite of the apparent possibilities of a cheap labour economy to bring "ruin" on the "free" economies, that in fact all the evidence is that the standard of living, even during the worst slumps was higher in, say, America than in Russia? In any case, the world is not divided into a slave economy and a free economy. All the world is a slave economy and all the people economic slaves, whether the boss is Mr. du Pont or those in Peiping or the Kremlin. Controlled or *laissez faire* economies have very little to do with slavery or freedom. To be obliged to work under one system and "free" only to starve under the other is a difference of words; the basic, biological, needs of the human belly are more or less the same whatever the geographical location or the political set-up).

SO much for the Committee's politico-economic arguments. But half the appeal is devoted to the moral objections to trade with Mao's China. They make quite impressive reading. But then we are all, to a lesser or greater degree, masters in the art of rationalising our actions however contradictory they may be and should be on our guard against being influenced by such moral exhortations as these, not in themselves—because as principles they have much to commend them, but because of the double-

think as well as the cynicism of those who utter them.

For free men to seek rapprochement with slavery is the height of cynical immorality. Such rapprochement would turn the key once and for all on the prison of Mainland China and shatter for all time the hopes of the Chinese people for liberation. To assume the possibility of co-existence between freedom and tyranny is to ignore the historical lessons which prove such relations impossible and to discard the moral heritage, which has evolved over the centuries, prohibiting free men from ever accepting the enslavement of their fellow human beings no matter where they may be.

THE Committee of One Million in the Appeal from which the above is quoted, publishes a "partial list" of its members. To our American correspondents the names will mean more than they do to us. But even from this side of the Atlantic, apart from a bevy of "Reps.", "Sens.", "Govs.", Drs., Bishops, Gens., Hons. and even Frs.,\* we

recognise the names of ex-Communists, "progressives", and/or professed democrats, such as plain Messrs. W. H. Chamberlin, Max Eastman, James T. Farrell, and Eugene Lyons of "Assignment in Utopia" fame, and a pioneer of the God-that-failed-movement, as well as of Prof. Sydney Hook, doughty champion of American academic freedom and esteemed contributor to that mixed-up, lib-lab haven of repentent ex-C.P.ers, *The New Leader*. When these American "purists" declare that trade with Communist China would be strengthening its economy and political stranglehold we cannot but be in accord (apart from the fact that those to whom they refer disparagingly as self-declared "realists" are convinced that the "Free"

Continued on p. 3

\*A reflection, quite irrelevant to the matter in hand: how puny is man in his love for titles, medals, ribbons—we noticed recently in France that it is not only old gentlemen who wear, however discreetly, that even a foreigner "spots" them, their Legion d'Honneur or other ribbons, but young men as well, which is much more depressing since theirs probably refer to some colonial or other repressive campaign. How many Englishmen, we wonder, will be proud to wear their Suez or Cyprus medals recently awarded by the Government as an International face-saver, let alone a permanent ribbon in the lapel of their daily apparel?

### . . . the Practical Approach

## The President Speaks

FOLLOWING the anti-American demonstrations in Formosa two weeks ago came the hint from President Eisenhower last week that the United States must reconsider her long standing boycott of Communist China. The two events are not entirely unrelated, and the timing of Eisenhower's statement to the press to the effect that it was unrealistic to continue opposing trade with Communist China ("trade in itself is the greatest weapon in the hands of a diplomat") was less likely to meet with public criticism after the anti-American riots in Formosa—all that remains of Nationalist China. People have to be conditioned to changing Government policy, and they are less likely to notice the change if minds are occupied with patriotic indignation.

In spite of the activities of the "Committee of One Million", referred to elsewhere, the hey-day of opposition to Communist China was in the period when McCarthy was at his rowdiest, but it has been obvious for some time now that a "reappraisal" was bound to take place.

This does not mean of course that a brotherly hand is being held out to Mao Tse Tung; it merely indicates that the U.S. can no longer afford the luxury of intransigence. Britain's decision to lift the ban on trade with Communist China will have repercussions both in Japanese and American business circles. For years Japan has been interested in trade with China in face of United States opposition (this has not prevented some clandestine trade).

A United States Government investigating committee reported two years ago that eventually Japan would have to be allowed to carry on trade with China on the grounds that her goods were flooding the U.S. market and causing serious concern to U.S. business men. In addition America would also like some of the spoils which can be gained from a lucrative Chinese market.

As the list of sponsors of the "Committee of One Million" demonstrates, there are still a number of influential people, including Secretary of State Dulles, set against any change in policy. But the argument put by his brother Allen Dulles (CIA Director) in favour of change should appeal to the Dulles mind, namely: "even a trickle of U.S.-Red China trade would give his agents great intelligence opportunities in Peking". The main argument hitherto put forward against any "liberalized" China policy is that the U.S. must take action which "would create international prestige for the Peking regime". It follows that if the flow of trade begins diplomatic recognition cannot be withheld indefinitely.

Although Eisenhower has stated that trade in the long run cannot be stopped he also played safe by pointing to the fact that the embargo against trade with Peking is a matter of law, and so long as "that law is on the books, of course, that is that". It has been pointed out however that the law to which he referred is the 1917 Trading with the Enemy Act which President Truman invoked after declaring a state of national emergency when Communist China entered the Korean war. The President at his own discretion can return the embargo law to its stand-by status simply by declaring the national emergency at an end.

The President has indicated where his views lie. It is now a matter of political expediency when it can be considered safe to risk revoking the embargo. Hence the cautious feelers at a time when patriotic Americans are feeling peeved at the Chinese Nationalists.\* It is just another move in the political game and whichever government wins, the nameless millions always lose.

\*The people living under a particular régime are always assumed to be part of it. It is this kind of generalisation which makes the politician's job so much easier.

## Is South Africa a Good Risk ?

GEOGRAPHICALLY South Africa is a land of great beauty, politically it is positively ugly. Its rulers, assisted one must add by the majority of the white population, seem determined to bring it into world disrepute (and this is a difficult enough task in so morally uncritical a world), as they relentlessly continue their self-appointed task in spite of such criticism as is forthcoming and apparently oblivious of the inevitably catastrophic consequences which must follow from their actions. Whether or not there is, or ever has been an actual volcano in South Africa—there is one now; the repression of eight million Africans out of almost everything excepting a bare existence must of necessity create an ever-increasing and less tolerable economic and moral pressure which will eventually become so great that it will explode in violence.

There are no signs that the Nationalist government under Strydom has any intention of easing *apartheid* measures. On the contrary every day that passes brings forth new laws and regulations for the further repression of the Africans. The final goal of *apartheid* being the complete segregation and subjugation of the non-white populations, by any and all means which may prove necessary, there is not much effort put into a defence of the policy as in former years, for it has become altogether too blatant a persecution even for that.

Nor can there be much to hope for from the liberal elements in South Africa however good their intentions, for they lack numbers and have no political power. If they become too vociferous or militant they are arrested and accused of being Communist or of breaking the law in some other way; since even rough-justice no longer prevails it is not difficult for the Government to secure a conviction. A code which makes liberalism a crime has a limiting effect upon the most courageous of men, and this state of affairs will get worse not better.

### Uneasy Capitalists

It would seem therefore that there is nothing to be done but wait for a bloody massacre which might not occur for a quarter of a century or more. Or is there one other factor which could alter the direction of events? There may well be, and it comes from the unlikelyst of sources—capitalism itself; or to put it more accurately, the absence of capital investment in South Africa from abroad.

Mr. Adlai Stevenson's recent visit to South Africa has spot-lighted a situation which must surely be worrying the Nationalists, for it hits them in the only place where it really hurts—in their pockets. The American business man or financier, who alone has surplus capital for overseas investment, is not generally very particular about what he

invests his money in but he takes especial note of the degree of security which he gains for his investment.

Mr. Stevenson brought the matter out into the open by expressing doubts as to the political stability of South Africa (by which he really meant the economic stability), and he said that honesty compelled him to say—in Johannesburg in the heart of Afrikaner Transvaal—that Mr. Strydom's policy of total segregation did not seem either practical or realistic in a modern industrial state. He was not sure how American capital would react to the continuation of the Strydom Government—American financiers had many opportunities for investment nearer home.

There are certainly no moral issues to be found in this kind of statement, though we feel Mr. Stevenson is aware of them and is sympathetic towards the Africans, but it is unquestionably a powerful form of deterrent which could force the Nationalists either to alter their policy in some degree or even cause them to fall from power eventually. Last year the inflow of private capital almost came to a standstill and there is no reason to suppose that this year will be different, except that business men and perhaps governments also, will tend to withdraw their investments from South Africa as the racial industrial laws become

Continued on p. 4

PEOPLE AND IDEAS  
ANARCHY IN S.W.6?

NATURALLY the local paper's headline, 'Believer in Anarchy' caught my eye. It referred to the inaugural speech of the new mayor of Fulham, Councillor David Shopland, a Labour Party stalwart who at least uses the word anarchy in its correct sense. "I am a believer in anarchy", he declared. "What healthier aspect of humanity can you have than the getting together of a body of people to make themselves a badminton club or a tenants' social club just for the fun of it? I would like to see that spirit rampant in Fulham... it only wants the sort of communal opinion one finds in a village to make anything possible. Let us not laugh at the parish pump. Let us bring the spirit of the village into every street in Fulham".

His idea of the good life is in fact centred around the parish-pump anarchy so often extolled in this column—though we have never got so far as badminton. And if there is any meaning in those key words scattered around our descriptions of the kind of social organisation we envisage—decentralised, autonomous, intimate, and so on, they mean the kind of anarchy that Councillor Shopland was talking about, while the pejorative words of the anarchist vocabulary, apply to the sort of social organisation we get by default, for lack of the "communal opinion" that he sought. "If we had that spirit", he said, "Parliament would not have to consider the imposition of fines for throwing litter about". If we had that spirit, in fact, Parliament wouldn't be left with anything to consider at all.

The magnitude of this "if" on any scale bigger than that of litter, badminton clubs and well-tended gardens is the measure of the distance between the theory of anarchism as a social philosophy and its application to the physical structure of the world we live in. And the most strongly-founded criticism of anarchism is not of its desirability in theory but of its relevance to the mass-society of huge urban aggregations and large-scale industry. The PEP Broad-sheet *Can Communities be Planned?* asks, "whether there is a real need to revive the spirit of local communities, and whether planners, in trying to do so, are not moving against the tide of people's wishes, since with modern communications there does not seem to be a real need for people to focus their interests on a particular locality where they can pick their friends and spread their occupational, political and cultural concerns over widely scattered areas". This has particular bearing on a place like Fulham.

★

FULHAM is a segment of that inner ring of suburbs which filled up in the great Victorian expansion of the metropolis. It lies in that broad bend

of the Thames between Chelsea and Hammersmith with Kensington to the North East. In the early nineteenth-century Faulkner's *History* called it "the great fruit and vegetable garden north of the Thames", and it remained a cluster of villages until the great building boom of the period 1870-1910 (—no wonder Nikolaus Pevsner called it "one of the visually least attractive boroughs of London"). The population in 1851 was 12,000; in 1901, 137,000; in 1931, 151,000, and had dropped by 1951 to 122,000. The connoisseur of census statistics can tell you from these figures, just the kind of place it is—one of those working-class and lower-middle-class residential suburbs with an industrial fringe, rows and rows of bylaw terrace houses whose iron railings were melted down during the war, tall black barrack-schools of the London School Board and slightly less forbidding ones built later by the LCC, non-conformist churches holding out a promise of bliss on the sodium-lit trolleybus routes, junk merchants and flyblown drapers' shops full of buttons and cardigans, solid citizens working stolidly towards their pensions, footloose Irish and sad-eyed West Indians whose vision of the land of milk and honey ended in the North End Road.

When the Mayor said last week, "I know few more depressing sounds than that of two youths kicking a milk bottle along the gutter on a quiet evening", he had caught the spirit of the place. How did it get like this? I asked a friend who was born and bred in Dawes Road. "It was the slump that knocked the stuffing out of it," he said, "and it has never picked up again."

If you take the view that local pride, the sense of "belonging", and all the rest of it, are a sentimental hankering for the past in the age of mobility and easy communications, all this doesn't matter. But the fact is that it does matter to people in a negative way. We talk of "Frowzy Fulham", the local intelligentsia will talk of living "at the tatty end of Chelsea" or if they know it will remark that the origin of the place name is the Anglo-saxon *Fulenham*, the dirty place, while houses offered for sale at our end of the town are described as "near Putney". We have, not civic pride, but civic shame.

★

WHAT is it that Fulham lacks, by comparison, not with some self-sufficient and self-conscious community, but with its own neighbours? Two things at least, the sense of being 'on the map' and the sense of the past and of historical continuity. Hammersmith, for instance, is a place of similar appearance,

population and social structure, but it is a place that people come to, as well as go from. The Hammersmith Palais is the most famous dance hall in the world, the Lyric Theatre has an enviable reputation. Of Fulham's two theatres, the Granville at Walham Green, after sinking to the dreariest of nude shows, shut down, became a television studio and is now up for sale, while the Grand Theatre which Robert Newton used to run as the Shilling Theatre has been shut and shuttered for years and the sight of it makes you think of rats pulling the stuffing out of faded plush seats.

Or think of Chelsea: no one is ashamed of living there—it is, as Reginald Blunt said, "a community with an integral character and identity of its own; a place where the inhabitants like to cultivate mutual acquaintance and support local interests. So long as something of this cheery sociability and communal spirit can be fostered and maintained, Chelsea will continue to be a delectable spot, not unworthy of its

Anarchist Summer School 1957  
'BLUEPRINTS FOR SANITY'

AS we have already announced, the 1957 Anarchist Summer School will be held at the Malatesta Club, London, on the August Bank Holiday weekend—Saturday, Sunday and Monday, 3rd, 4th and 5th August inclusive.

The theme for the discussion-lectures is 'Blueprints for Sanity' and the lecturers will include Morris Simon, doctor and radiologist, Geoffrey Ostergaard, lecturer on government at Birmingham University and Robert Green, lecturer on psychology at London University.

A good attendance is expected at this year's Summer School and accommodation may prove to be limited. Comrades from outside London who wish to attend are therefore urged to write as early as possible and London comrades as well are asked to book their meals in advance.

Visitors to London usually require bed and breakfast for the Saturday and Sunday nights and all London comrades with accommodation available are requested to furnish details to the organiser as soon as possible.

All enquiries and information, please to:

JOAN SCULTHORPE,  
c/o Freedom Press, 27 Red Lion Street,  
London, W.C.2.

splendid heritage". This couldn't be said of Fulham, though in fact, Fulham has the same kind of historical, artistic and literary associations as its neighbour, though it does its best to obliterate them.

★

THERE is the notorious current instance of The Grange, an early Georgian house, not remarkable, but better-looking than most things built in Fulham since, the home of Samuel Richardson in the 18th century and of Burne-Jones in the 19th. Fulham Council sought to demolish the house and the adjoining one in order to build a block of flats on the site. A Captain Broadwood at the same time, wanted to restore the pair of houses and turn them into a maisonette and seven flats. In 1952 The Grange was in quite good condition except for the party wall damaged by the ruinous state of the house next door which had belonged to the Council since 1920. After a Public Enquiry, the Ministry of Housing made a preservation order. Over two years ago the *Manchester Guardian* noted that the battle between the Council and the would-be rescuers of the Grange had turned into "trench warfare". For the Council had noted that there was nothing in a preservation order "to insist that a council should prevent an historic house falling into such decay that it will have to be pulled down as a dangerous structure". And sure enough, following a further application by the Council, the Ministry decided last month "with regret" that it is no longer practicable to preserve The Grange and has given consent to its demolition. "Had Fulham Council been willing to come to terms with Capt. Broadwood at the outset, and had the building not become the ruin it now is, there would in all probability have been a good chance of restoring it".

The Council wanted to fulfil its duty to its citizens by building flats, and there are hardly any prospective sites left in Fulham. But no matter how much it tried, Fulham, no more than any other London borough, could not hope to house within its own boundaries, all the people that wanted housing. Its attitude over The Grange shows how disastrously ignorant it is of those intangible qualities of a town which made for that sense of the uniqueness of a particular locality and communal pride, which its mayor is looking for. It isn't a matter of any particular architectural merit of the building nor of any historical importance of its long-dead inhabitants. It is simply, as Lethaby said, that we need old buildings to remind us that we had grandparents. A minor Georgian house would not be missed in a town like Bath which is full of them, but in Fulham it is valuable for its rarity and

for giving something of that feeling of the continuity of history which its neighbours like Chelsea enjoy.

★

WHAT else is there in Fulham to remind us that human life went on before 1850? A few good houses in the New Kings Road and round Hurlingham and Parson's Green; the old Parish Church by the river; the Bishop's Palace; the Pottery, where fading lettering on the wall tells us that it was founded by John Dwight in 1671; an old chimney-sweeping business in Burlington Road which claims to have been there for 200 years; a cast iron gas-holder at the Imperial Gas Works which actually is scheduled as an 'ancient monument'. The Gas Works also envelops Sandford Manor House, the home of Nell Gwynne. Oh yes, and there really is a parish pump left, outside a junk yard at Walham Green. Then there is Fulham Football Ground at Craven Cottage, and Chelsea's ground at Stamford Bridge is actually in Fulham too. And that is about all Fulham's title to fame and uniqueness.

"Keep Fulham Tidy" it says on the litter bins, and as part of the belated tidying, a new park is being laid out bit by bit from the bombed sites at Lillie Road. There is one new school and a fair number of new blocks of flats, none of them remarkable from either an architectural or a town-planning point of view. There is music in the parks, dancing in the town hall and a fine promenade along the riverside. Opening the schools' painting exhibition at the Central Library last week, Eric Newton said that the selection of work would stand comparison with an international exhibition.

But what would make Fulham really come to life? If Councillor Shopland could discover the secret he really would be bringing anarchy to S.W.6.

C.W.

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!  
WEEK 24

Deficit on Freedom	£480
Contributions received	£353
DEFICIT	£127

June 7 to June 13

London: J.W.A. 10/-; Sheffield: G.P.\* 5/-;  
London: J.S.\* 3/-; Bakewell: D.M. 5/-;  
Welwyn: Joxer\* 10/-; Allentown: W.S. £1/15/0.

Total ... 3 8 0  
Previously acknowledged ... 350 11 6

1957 TOTAL TO DATE ... £353 19 6

\*Indicates regular contributor.

GIFT OF BOOKS: Bristol: E.B.

Fire Fund

Total to date ... £120 7s. 10d.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP  
OPEN DAILY

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

We can supply ANY book required, including text-books. Please supply publisher's name if possible, but if not, we can find it. Scarce and out-of-print books searched for—and frequently found!

New Books . . .

Compulsion Meyer Levin 20/-  
Marriage and the Unconscious E. F. Griffith 21/-  
Collected Short Stories Aldous Huxley 21/-  
Conjugal Life Honore de Balzac 15/-

Reprints . . .

The Young Lions Irwin Shaw 3/6

Second-Hand . . .

The Martyrdom of Man Winwood Reade 3/-  
The Game Jack London 4/-  
A General Selection (grubby) Sigmund Freud 3/-  
Christ Stopped at Eboli Carlo Levi 3/-  
All the King's Men Robert Penn Warren 3/6  
After Many a Summer Aldous Huxley 4/-  
Above All Liberties Alec Craig 5/6  
The Broken Root Arturo Barea 4/-  
The Will to Believe William James 3/6  
Ends and Means Aldous Huxley 4/-  
Mutual Aid Peter Kropotkin 12/6  
Friendship's Odyssey Françoise Delisle 4/-  
Why Was Lincoln Murdered? Otto Eisenschiml 4/-  
The Complete Works of Rabelais 8/6  
The French Revolution Thomas Carlyle 5/-

Periodicals . . .

Liberation, May 1957 1/9

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

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

Comment on the News (from Nowhere)

THE greatest stroke of luck in life is to be born and bred in a social environment where there exists to some extent an emotional and, more specially, an intellectual atmosphere which is conducive to one's development in that direction which one would take in any case, even if it were to mean travelling by the hard route. The trouble with the hard route is that it is exhausting and that one is tired upon reaching a destination which is in reality but a starting point for the job of adapting life to ideas. Is it hardly surprising then that some of those who have ideas fail in infusing their lives with those ideas and furthermore may in their despair, conscious or subconscious, fail to communicate their ideas with the greatest effect?

These thoughts are the outcome of a young man deciding to give voice in a world of which he is afraid, for always there is the awareness of knowing and understanding little; there are so many things, languages, books and opinions that, even if one is not prevented from speaking out, one can have little confidence that a sole human being can, at this precise moment, have any more authority of certainty than some of the many thousands who have left us their testimonies. I had intended to give my first impressions upon reading "News from Nowhere" by William Morris, and if there was any purpose in this it was I think to give the Editors an idea of just how the mind of one of the younger generation works, brought or caught up as it was after the virtual death of idealism in politics in a period of total and meaningless war. Such a task is really beyond me for even if capable of expressing ideas in a reasonably coherent manner, I detect inadequacies in another direction, i.e. objectivity. Camillo Ber-

neri wrote, "it is certain that the most intense feelings are the most human", from which it follows that to be and remain human one must be capable of feeling and feeling intensely, where warranted. How in this age of gross villainess is it possible to feel without becoming subjective and how, when one is only vaguely aware of one's own subjectivity, is it possible to emancipate oneself from this? Such awareness has really come home to me in trying to deal with Morris, for on glancing through his book a second time I realised what a few things I had remarked to myself upon; neither were they altogether concerned with essentials.

Morris endeavours, in fictional form, to transport a person of the nineteenth century to the twenty-first and to give an account of how he would like to find the society of that age in this country and the rest of the world. We find a loose-knit anarchial mode of life primarily based on agriculture, the production of goods being governed by considerations of pleasure and art, rather than of dire necessity only, as under capitalism. All property is in common, any money is therefore rendered useless. Love and the general bonds of loyalty and brotherhood cannot be commanded, for they are the rule rather than the exception; hence laws and government are rendered useless. Education is a pursuit rather than a compulsion, so that a general system of rigid organised schooling is rendered useless. On matters of public policy Morris argues that in a free enlightened society such as this, the apparent majority will be the real majority, and that the minority will concede this, if they are unable to obtain their way by persuasion.

Such is a brief outline of what it is understood the author intended to con-

vey. Unique among Utopians the book is at times tedious to read for its form is partly that of a travelogue and for those having little acquaintance with London and boat journeys up the Thames it is not unexasperating. The imbalance between the parts which are and are not mere description of this kind must have been even more distracting when the work was originally published in serial form in 1890. In addition there is that irritation caused by the mixture of fact and fancy, by the placing of certain events in real places and in a real period of time; now during the course of that period things are beginning not to correspond and this detracts from the prophecy which may be inferred from the romance, even though one may think this a less essential element thereof. (One can only hope that Orwell will not prove to be correct by 1984).

In "Journey Through Utopia" Marie Louise Berneri gives an admirable account of "News from Nowhere" with judiciously chosen extracts giving a fair chunk of Morris' ideas in a few pages where, incidentally, his work can be considered in the context of Utopias in general, in which of course it appears in very favourable light. She points out the things Morris did not deal with, at least in any great detail, presuming this to be because he felt that he should remain silent on matters with which he was not acquainted. I too think it is the general atmosphere of the story which is convincing. Who can doubt the sincerity of those closing lines—"Yes surely! And if others can see it as I have seen it then it may be called a vision rather than a dream." "It", as I see it, is the accomplished state of affairs.

Apart from the technical criticism

above which may or may not be considered valid or important, I think that it is in attempting to create a few pages of history leading to the state of affairs, where Morris is unconvincing. Marie Louise Berneri described Morris' attempts to "seduce us" and felt that he had really cheated in allowing the sun to shine during the whole of the guest's stay in Utopian England. This is for me a finger on the real sore. Morris saw a revolution and gives a more or less convincing account of it, until non-combatant reactionists begin dying of the worry of an unendurable life and many commit suicide. Thereafter very few pages are devoted to the beginning of the new life. The cause which was once hopeless, became triumphant, but the victory was that of violence and destruction. In contradistinction to this the state of affairs with which we are presented is the victory of brotherhood and construction. These paradoxical events are not sufficiently explained by Morris nor have subsequent events proved the reconciliation to be possible. One feels that democracy by consent is being applied to trivia after all major issues have been settled, in bringing the described state of affairs to what it is, by some unknown means. Morris has deliberately ignored the fact that the sun does not shine every day because the vision was so attractive with the sun and a little more wishful thinking, but who can deny a man a little hope of the sun shining when he so obviously wants it not only for himself but is prepared to address himself to "go on living while you may, striving, with whatsoever pain and labour needs must be, to build up little by little the new day of fellowship, and rest, and happiness". Yes, surely!

H.J.C.

## U.S. Doublethink on China

Continued from p. 1

world's economy will also benefit!). But, and it is a very big BUT which we address to these "progressives" among the Committee of One Million: you have lent your names to an appeal which could have with perhaps, even greater force, been applied to Franco Spain. And Franco has been admitted to the United Nations and the cultural organisations affiliated to it. You may argue that what he is doing is no worse than what America is doing in the Philippines, Britain in Cyprus and Kenya, France in Algeria, and Russia in Hungary. Agreed. But, if you use these arguments you will also say that it was a question of *force majeure*: that so far as the United Nations were concerned it could not be conceived without the Big Three—or Four. Again, agreed! But, dear Professor, dear Messrs. ex-Communists and uncommitted "progressives" of the '30's, what in that statement we have quoted, just north of the asterisk, could not have been applied word for word, sentence by sentence (assuming even that the West stands for Freedom, the East for Slavery—a simple-minded view we do not credit even you with sharing), to Franco Spain, which the United States is economically and militarily pumping, bolstering and supporting with as much enthusiasm as it is refusing to recognise the existence of a Mao China? We hold no brief for Mao's China any more than we support Chiang's Formosa, but for the same reasons as we are unequivocally opposed to Franco's régime in Spain. And when self-declared progressives, Reps., Senators, Bishops, Governors and the rest have the means to hire a page of the *New York Times* to warn the people of America and the world against trading with China, but have not even a guilty conscience where the strengthening of the oppressive régime of Franco is concerned, we cannot accept their values or their exhortations, as ours.

★

ONLY last week, a United Press report from Madrid quotes Franco as declaring that his twenty years' rule is justified as the only way of combatting communism and defending Roman Catholicism.

He told the world, with specific reference to his political enemies, that his victory in the Spanish civil war and the régime that followed were for "the good of the nation as a whole."

"We have done all that is possible to harmonize liberty with authority and order, but we have not bought popularity abroad at the price of endangering liberty at home."

"Nevertheless, the maturity and experience of the Spanish people permit us to try to improve the laws which regulate these freedoms with a view to a better and more perfect enjoyment of them."

If Franco's victory and his régime were "good for the nation" then there is no argument against Mao saying that his victory and régime are "good" for China. Equally, there are no human, no moral values, which can distinguish the obvious evil of the Mao régime from that of Franco. To convince us that their values are objective, the *Committee of One Million* must, next week, or next month, take another page in the *New York Times*. But this time instead of denouncing Mao Tse-tung we expect to see the name of Francisco Franco. The text need not be altered, only the name with the added denunciation of their Administration. We may then accept their good faith!

WHEN I suggested last week that we could assume that some of the purposes behind some of the bomb tests were laudable, the contention was not based on any detailed knowledge of why exactly bombs are tested. Like anyone else's my information comes from the semi-popular journals and these will cite facts discovered from particle-accelerating machines like the synchrotron, but mention nothing of any facts discovered from the bombs apart from such side issues as the radiation hazards suffered by test animals and similar information whose discovery does not require the detonation of an atom bomb.

There is no evidence publicly available to my knowledge that the tests have any scientific value and it is reasonable to believe that the information resulting from them is indeed of value only to governments and not to the governed—that it relates to technical details of manufacture so that bigger bombs may be built without wasting money. The purpose of suggesting that some of the reasons for some of the tests might be valid reasons was to stimulate independent thinking in myself on a subject that is clouded by contradiction from opposing experts and further confused by a jumble of statements, true, half-true and false, that are repeated by the public.

★

Much though you may admire Albert Schweitzer's volumes on Bach and love the memory of his playing, still that old muddler of a humanitarian is no strategist. His statement of April 23rd, 1957, is one of the most saddening things I have read, for you realize that this is a man with a good deal of influence through his prestige, the core of whose personality is shocked by the crime of the random discharging of radio-active particles into the atmosphere, but a man who yet channels his thoughts through the very institutions of government which are the cause of these particles eating their way into nature.

Schweitzer writes: "We are forced to regard every increase in the existing danger through further creation of radio-active elements by atom bomb explosions as a catastrophe for the human race, a catastrophe that must be prevented under every circumstance."

"There can be no question of doing anything else, if only for the reason that one cannot take the responsibility for the consequences it might have for our descendants."

"They are threatened by the greatest and most terrible danger."

"That radio-active elements created by us are found in nature is an astounding event in the history of the earth. And of the human race. To fail to consider its importance and its consequences would be folly for which humanity would have to pay a terrible price. When public opinion has been created in the countries concerned and among all nations, an

## Colonial Democracy Rationalised

IN recent months we have been tempted to reflect upon the seeming paradox of the Frenchman as we know him in France—gay, cultured, amusing and altogether a good fellow—and the Frenchman as we have read of him in the newspapers, busily repressing his colonies in a fury of reaction, double-crossing and war.

Upon further reflection the paradox assumes different proportions as we suddenly realise that the French are in no way different from the British in this respect. Kindly Frenchmen bear the same relationship to Algeria as do kindly British to Kenya; in general they take the view that "the native" should be grateful for the benefits brought to him by European democracy; amongst which are included education (political and otherwise), "progress" of all kinds, public health, employment, and of course the splendid opportunity to be a part of an Empire (or, more euphemistically, a commonwealth of nations).

The fact is that a large proportion of the public of both countries really believe that they are doing the backward countries a favour by their presence, and that any opposition to

opinion informed of the dangers involved in going on with the tests and led by the reason which this information imposes then the statesmen may reach an agreement to stop the experiments.

"A public opinion of this kind stands in no need of plebiscites or of forming committees to express itself. It works through just being there."

"The end of further experiments with atom bombs would be like the early sun rays of hope which suffering humanity is longing for."

Let us add another sentence in italics to this. *No government is going to stop testing atom bombs unless the scientists and other workers involved prevent the tests, or unless the military information to be gained has dwindled to a point where more testing is not economically justified.* I do not believe that a well-established government will be deterred by public opinion from pursuing an action that is important to it as long as it is able to control the public's opinion well enough to prevent that opinion from becoming active itself.

No government is going to object to the sort of "dignified protest" marches against the Christmas Island tests that have been reported from London. To be dignified in this context is to be paralysed. And to get as many children as you can in the march because of the fact that a child's actively growing skeleton takes up a larger amount of radio-active strontium per gram of calcium than does an adult's is to be just ineffectively sentimental. The passivity that has characterized political life in Britain since the war, especially the fake-militant left-wing groups that cluster around mama Labour Party and whom it occasionally with the Communists, has always been detectable beneath the surface of such protests dignified or otherwise. They give emotional satisfaction, one presumes, to the marchers and probably some satisfaction too to the men in the government directing the tests that antagonism to themselves is taking such a reliable and innocuous form.

Schweitzer's illusion that public opinion in Western countries can be effective short of threatening the functions of governments makes his statement, well intended though it may be, a hindrance to the prevention of atomic explosions. The government minds the usual petitions, parades and speeches that go with atom tests no more than the parson minds relatives at a funeral. Both are expected and neither change the march of events.

What can? Let us assume since the explosions are continuing that there are still good military dividends coming in from them. If the axiom stated above is correct then the only hope of an atomic cease-fire must be from some sort of direct action by the scientists working on the bombs. My plea therefore is for scientifically accurate reasons to be stated for our opposition to the bomb-testing and for a propaganda campaign

to be directed not at the government but at those instruments of the government who do the actual work—physicists and chemists being the main targets for persuasion, but laboratory assistants and transport drivers being worthy of it also.

It is unlikely that, unfortified by public approval openly expressed for several months, any significant number of these workers would end work on the bomb. But if a large number were to walk out the power of the government to prosecute the tests (though not the workers) would be seriously threatened. But so long as public protest is directed against the government itself, possibly including also the chiefs of the military services, the government will shield people who work on the atom-bomb from the public's outrage. Of what possible use can it be to protest to figures in the government when these are men who know nothing about how to make or break the bomb anyway?

Now if the prevailing opinion of the people in a country was one of encouragement of the workers concerned to desert their work combined with a firm disapproval of the nature of the work, it is possible that both the scientists and non-scientists would stop work on the bomb.

There are two reasons for taking the scientific group to be the most important. First they are less easy if not impossible to find replacements for. And secondly I doubt if the majority of the workers who are not top-grade scientists even know the nature of their work. Perhaps they are told that their work is in connection with the peaceful atomic reactors.

The focus of the public's attention and hence of contra-bomb propaganda should therefore be the scientists who do the most significant work on the bomb. More important than anything else I can think of is that the public's opinions should be well-informed of the nature of the dangers of the tests and not stem from hysterical misinterpretation and exaggeration. If the opinions are not

## Little Brother is Watching You

CALIFORNIANS had a good case of Orwellian creeps. While no Big Brother was watching them, they had flatly been warned that almost everyone else was—or could be—listening. The state senate Judiciary Committee, hoping to draft 20th century laws to cope with ingenious invasions of privacy, set many a Californian on his ear with a report on a lengthy study of electronic eavesdropping and wiretapping, found that for all the benefits of electronic enterprise there have also been some disturbing developments. Among them:

☞ Small, high-quality microphones that will pick up conversations anywhere in a normal-sized room and carry them—

based on facts and deductions that the scientists we want to reach can respect, then why should they be concerned with the opinions?

For this reason I cannot too strongly disagree with an opinion stated recently in *FREEDOM* that if you are against the bomb on scientific instead of moral grounds, your ground is shaky. No! Let us not introduce morals where scientific evidence will suffice. My morals are as valid as yours, and a good scientist knows it. Let us neither subscribe to the Schweizer type of plea: mal-selected evidence combined with oracular opinion and baby-cries. To get on good terms with the bomb scientists we must earn their confidence that we know what we are talking about and that we are not just echoing the voices and fears of infancy. If the scientist sees people hoisting placards against bone cancer he may react by saying to himself, "The worldwide distribution of strontium-90 in human bone is minute and we must work to maintain it at this safe level by making sure that as much as possible of the fission products are discharged into the stratosphere. Direct contamination of the atmosphere like the fall-out on the Japanese fishermen is what we have to avoid". And he goes merrily on with the bomb.

★

Which of the scares currently felt about the bombs are based on scientifically acceptable evidence and which are not will be suggested in an article next week.

## Another U.S. Crisis?

A White House spokesman reported to-day that President Eisenhower's cough was almost gone after his relaxation in the warm weather of Augusta, but his golf was suffering. He was hitting his woods and long irons well, but having difficulty with his approach shots.—*British United Press.*

either through undetectable, hairlike wires or radio transmission—to receivers or recorders that may be located in the next room or a car a block or two away. ☞ Pocket microphone and recorder units so tiny and effective that they may be operated undetected in an ordinary briefcase; e.g., a private eye could plant the briefcase in a conference room, pick it up at the end of the day and listen to as much as five hours of tape transcription. ☞ So-called wireless microphones packed into transmitters no bigger than a pack of cigarettes and so sensitive that they can pick up whispers in an average room, transmit them by radio to receiving and recording equipment hundreds of feet away. The wireless mike can operate as long as four days without running down. ☞ A wireless unit that can be hidden in a car to pick up conversation as well as to record and transmit signals reporting the starts, stops and changes of direction; the signals are picked up by another car following several blocks behind. ☞ A "shotgun" microphone that can be aimed at a point up to several hundred yards away, pick up even a hushed conversation. Fair game: conversations in a nearby house, a skyscraper across the street, a boat on a lake. Best protection against the shotgun: talk behind closed windows.

Much of the testimony came from private investigators and equipment manufacturers, who were reluctant to be too specific about their clientele. Nonetheless, in closed-door testimony, the committee learned that some companies employ the devices to listen in on what their employees are saying in rest rooms, company dining rooms and elsewhere in the plant. In Los Angeles some used-car dealers bug rooms where prospective car purchasers are left with their wives; thus the salesman can pick up tips for a new pitch by listening to the family discussion of who likes what and how much the family budget will stand. One expert related just how serious electronic warfare can get. An attorney who had learned that his opponent planned to introduce into court the tape recording of a secret meeting carried a powerful battery-operated electromagnet into court in his briefcase. He placed his briefcase near the opposition lawyer's tape. The magnet erased the recording, left the rival attorney with a blank tape and blank expression when he got up to play the evidence.

## A Letter from Clydeside

# The Weakness of Trade Unionism

THE recent strike of the Shipbuilding and Engineering workers once again raises the question of trade unionism. Some workers blame their leadership for their union's shortcomings; others blame the rank and file for being apathetic, for failing to attend their branch meetings and therefore failing to elect a leadership of their choice; others assert that the constitution and the structure of the union is at fault and that if only the workers would attend their branch and democratically change the constitution and structure everything would be just right.

It is true that leaders tend to think of themselves as a vanguard, and as indispensable because of the power they wield over their followers and so this belief assists in curbing any spirit of initiative the rank and file may have.

Leaders see any attempt by the rank and file to constitutionally introduce new ideas as a threat to their position and they iron out these ideas before they become flesh (all in a constitutional manner of course). In the main these leaders are generally affiliated to some political or religious faction and whenever the interests of the workers conflict with these factions the workers' interests are set in the background.

Another argument against the trade union leaders is the relatively high rate of salaries paid to them by the workers and supplemented by taking on other jobs, such as writing for the capitalist press. Their income puts them in another class and so they tend only to emancipate themselves—one by one. Any thought of the emancipation of the working class (if they ever had such a thought) falls by the wayside.

### Financial Fears

Since most of the union contributions are used for its sick benefit, unemployment, death benefit and superannuation schemes the union becomes more of a coffin club and a friendly society rather than a working class instrument of struggle. A friendly society necessitates large funds and the accumulation of such funds gives rise to capital investment. Investment in capitalist enterprises and war loans gives the union an interest in capitalist expansion. Is it any great wonder then that T.U. leaders should fear a strike which might endanger the funds?

It has been argued that huge funds are the best guarantee of militant action. The reverse is nearer the truth. The

thought of financial possession does not make a man a fighter but in fact often creates the fear of losing that possession.

I may hasten to add that I believe the thought of the union funds becoming dried up was one of the reasons why the recent shipbuilding and engineering strike came to an end. A thought which I believe was shared by both the officials and the rank and file. However, the absence of a cash box does not necessarily mean the absence of "guts". Some of the fiercest struggles have been fought on empty cash boxes. In April 1926 the miners entered a struggle with one week's strike pay in hand, yet the struggle lasted for over nine months. Let's bear in mind that the relatively wealthy unions of Germany submitted to fascism without a struggle whilst the impoverished unions of Spain revolted against Franco, took possession of the means of production and distribution for three years and were forced to succumb partly because they did not have the support of the international working class. We cannot however infer that leaders and well-filled cash vaults alone are responsible for improper working class organisation and lack of spirit.

There is some truth in the accusation that the working class are apathetic but I do not share the view that an enthusiasm for attendance at the T.U. branches would remedy anything of any consequence. I contend that if the worker wished to change the trade unions to something other than they are (i.e. wage bargaining institutions which merely dress the sores caused by exploitation of labour but do not cure them or even attempt to), he would be unable to do so, for the T.U. movement is part and parcel of the state machinery which defends the exploitation of labour by capital. In consequence, the constitution of the union and the rule book are not infrequently at variance with the desires of the rank and file, to keep them disciplined. It is through apathy of the rank and file that they have refused or failed to recognise the co-relation of the movement of *Laissez-faire* capitalism to state monopoly capitalism and the movement of craft guilds to labour bureaucracy.

With the development of large scale industry capital became an organised power. Since large scale industry necessitates huge capital investments capital has become organised on an industrial basis but the necessity to match it (organised labour on an industrial basis) has yet to be born. The working class has not adapted its method of organisa-

tion to cope with the changes in conditions. The workers still do not think in terms of organising as workers. They still identify their interests with fellow craftsmen and adhere to the principle of the usage of certain tools placing a man in a certain union with the result that men in a particular industry working in conjunction to produce a particular commodity find themselves organised in a host of different unions because they use slightly different tools.

### From Craft to Industry

Different interests (real or apparent) inevitably clash and so demarcation disputes arise. Poaching of members and inter-union strikes occur. Such a form of organisation prevailed in the middle ages and could be understood considering that a craftsman could produce a completely finished commodity by his own tools and labour but surely it is an anachronism in modern times when so many different trades combine with the aid of technicians, semi-skilled workers, labourers, transport workers, storemen, crane-men, slingers, etc., in the production of the same commodity. Observe how many varying types of workers contribute to the building of ships.

There is truth in the argument then that the structure of the union is at fault but again I say I do not think this can be remedied by more activity or greater attendance at the branch. In Parliament the boss class sees a barometer for gauging working class temper and should it tend to rise the boss is forewarned to introduce legislation to cope with it. As has been pointed out earlier the trade unions have become an integral part of state machinery and on the industrial field there is a barometer for assessing rank and file feeling and the lackeys of the boss in the trade union leadership are also forewarned and know just what to do.

Many workers are wise to the game of parliamentary politics in a negative sense. They know that in the game of power politics whoever wins the workers always lose, but they are not wised up in the positive sense. They do not know of any sound alternative.

Trade unionism could and did win concessions in wages and conditions during the growth and expansion of the Capitalist system but due to its structure as a reformist organ and now that the interests of politicians, capitalists and trade union officials telescope into each other in the Welfare State (a mild name for the total state in embryo) it can no longer do so.

What must be done? There has been a degree of truth in the criticisms asserted in the first paragraph but I contend that the main failure of unionism rests with man's failure to understand the nature of the society in which he lives.

### Free Association for Human Need

When the working class grows up to mental maturity by studying the nature of our society it will understand the need to change it and it will know that a new form of society requires new forms of organisation and new social institutions. I know that there are always anomalies between theory and practice and so we cannot lay down any complete blueprint for any future society but we can lay some foundation. If the economic structure of capitalism and the institution of political government is the cause of poverty, misery, disease, slums, war, etc., then they must be replaced by a society whose economic and social structure is based on human needs.

Since man's basic needs are adequate food, clothing, shelter and liberty then we must evolve institutions which are the best means of satisfying those needs. Liberty is best nurtured by free association of men for their common pursuits. Food, clothing and shelter is best attended to by those who produce it. So then for our social, intellectual, artistic and recreational pursuits let's create associations of all kinds which may link up locally, regionally and nationally for the best means of satisfying them on a voluntary basis. For the production of man's economic needs lets create organisations which shall organise production for, in Peter Kropotkin's words, "the satisfaction of man's needs with the least possible expenditure of human energy."

As has already been explained trade unions are incapable of this. The shop stewards' movement however, being based in the factories and being on a voluntary basis at workshop level, if rescued from the trade unions could become the embryo of an organisation aimed at workers' control of industry. If there is to be a rejuvenation of mankind this must be done. As the movement becomes a movement of the workers themselves, they will become conscious of their role—the need to destroy capitalism and politics. As the preamble of the I.W.W. puts it: "by organising industrially we are forming the new society within the shell of the old".

World capitalism has produced two world wars. Great cities have been de-

## Is S. Africa a Good Risk?

Continued from p. 1

harsher—and more impractical.

Mr. Stevenson is not alone in his criticism of South Africa; three other American politicians have also attacked the Nationalists—on moral grounds:

1.—Senator Theodore Green, chairman of the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee, published a report criticising South Africa's refusal to grant political and social equality to non-whites. This report was attacked by Mr. Louw in the House of Assembly.

2.—Vice-President Richard Nixon, after a 20,000-mile tour of Africa, presented a report to Mr. Eisenhower calling for an all-out attempt to win the loyalties of Africa's 200 million black inhabitants.

3.—Mrs. Frances Bolton, American Congresswoman, produced another report on her tour and denounced the Strydom policy. This also was denounced by Mr. Louw as a flagrant intrusion into the political affairs of South Africa.

### World Pressure May Succeed

Perhaps over a period of time, world pressure, political and economic, will succeed in thwarting some of the Nationalists' particularly oppressive measures, albeit for some of the wrong reasons. In any event total segregation will almost surely prove to be financially impossible for an economy which is presumably becoming steadily less stable, and many South African economists already consider it impossible—though total segregation may not be much worse than the present level of apartheid. Certainly it is difficult to understand how an economy based on the labour of the non-whites and management of the whites can hope to survive if the two races are totally segregated.

## FRANCE

# Private Medicine & Social Health

THE French press was much taken up, a short time ago, with articles and readers' letters (the latter mostly from doctors) about the proposed law in the name of the Socialist Minister of Labour, Albert Gazier. The proposal, which claimed to put an end to a long conflict, was resisted by the French Medical Association and various medical unions, while it was supported by most of the trade unions. In brief, the object was to fix the scale of fees for medical attention in such a way that the provisions regulating the working of the social security scheme could be applied effectively. Theoretically, the social security fund repays 80 per cent, of the cost of medical attention, but in fact (the scales laid down by "the men of skill" being extremely variable) the repayment to patients is calculated on a basis frequently, if not always, out of date.

The ministerial proposal took up an old demand of the trade-union movement and the mutualist tradition: to get the doctors to establish a scale of their consultation fees and to keep to it. Only a few eminent specialists and practitioners would be excluded from the system to be imposed, and the patient who went to them would be warned beforehand that he would be treated outside the social security scheme.

In the government's view two objectives would be pursued by thus bringing matters into focus: the reabsorption of the social security deficit, which is rising at the rate of tens of thousands of millions of francs a year, and progress towards putting into practice the medico-social "doctrine", i.e. free medical care. The doctors have been protesting and denouncing the proposal as an attack on "the medical apostolate", a proceeding

that harms the practitioner's independence, and a method whose result will be, in the long run, a lowering of standards in medicine.

However, the majority of communiqués issued by doctors' organizations are concerned with defending their members against the accusation levelled at them and aimed at the dichotomy: i.e. the system which amounts to making a patient "commute" between several specialists (for example, a radiologist, a cardiologist, a bioanalyst, etc.) for the greater profit of the medical fraternity, indeed for the direct profit of the G.P., to whom the specialist pays a commission on each patient sent to him. It is evident that behind the great principles that are always put forward, and beyond the moral indignation or the "Hippocratic Oath", very distinct interests are at work.

The trade unions, whose representatives participate in running the social security funds, are supporters of scales of fees for medical care, but they consider this measure only as a stage towards the organization of a modern medical service adapted to modern needs of health and hygiene. Individual medicine in fact corresponded with a certain level of scientific knowledge and still remains valuable for a certain number of illnesses, but it is certain that complete examinations requiring specialists, laboratories, and costly apparatus can only be done in centres organized and equipped for this purpose. Likewise, research, industrial medicine, and the control of diseases call for team work with division of labour. Some people have even, in various general congresses, posed the central problem: it seems unthinkable that social security, a public

service and known as such, should be organized on the basis of two private sectors: doctors and chemists.

It is in fact a problem that concerns the distribution of pharmaceutical products. In France the pharmacist in practice no longer plays any part, either in his shop or his laboratory, except to get the maximum profit from his diploma. The final work of preparation is done by his assistants; I say final because in fact the immense majority of products are sold in the form of specialities and are made by several large industrial enterprises. The patient receives a prescription from his doctor, takes it to the chemist, pays the bill in exchange for the goods, and presents it to the social security service for repayment according to the prices laid down, which vary with the products. All of which means loss of time and money. A better method, of which the idea is slowly making headway, would be to set up social security pharmacies where the patient would go to have his prescription made up free. This system would eliminate fraud, bureaucracy, and the deficit, since the chemists' profit margin would be recovered by the social security service.

The size of the campaign against the Gazier proposals allows us to foresee some of the difficulties in the way of the law's adoption. A big effort of propaganda and information on the unions' part would be necessary to overcome the obstacle of the medical interests. In addition it would be necessary for this effort to aim at structural reforms, notably the abolition of the famous Medical Association, an archaic organization, obstructive and anti-democratic, inherited from the Vichy laws.

S. PARANE.

vastated, millions of men, women, and children have been killed or mutilated. Now Capitalism threatens to destroy society with itself with the use of the H-bomb. The only force that can save humanity is the organised might of the working class at the point of production. Workers of the world should unite to destroy capitalism, the system of legal robbery and social destruction, and establish workers' control of industry to win a world of reconstruction, social peace and plenty.

Glasgow

R. LYNN.

## 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 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

## New York Meetings

### LIBERTARIAN FORUM

All meetings held at the Libertarian Centre, 813 Broadway (bet. 11 and 12 Sts.), New York.

Friday Evenings at 8.30.

June 28.—Conrad Lynn, CAN THE "AMERICAN FORUM" ADVANCE THE CAUSE OF SOCIALISM?

July 5.—Frank Branch, CAN THERE BE FREEDOM WITHOUT ANARCHISM?

July 12.—Joseph Spivak, A REVIEW OF THE BOOK "MEN AGAINST THE STATE", by Dr. J. J. Martin.

July 19.—Special meeting COMMEMORATING THE SPANISH REVOLUTION OF 1936. Speakers: R. Blackwell and W. Rose.

July 26.—Richard Lopez, N.Y. Local Organizer of the Socialist Workers' Party, PROSPECTS FOR AMERICAN RADICALISM.

Social Suppers will be held at the Centre

Saturday, June 15th at 7.30 p.m.

Saturday, July 20th, at 7.30 p.m.

(voluntary contribution).

## 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