

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"The State furnishes no machinery for arriving at justice . . . The penal law simply takes a man into its hopper and grinds out a criminal at the end."  
—CLARENCE DARROW.

## The United Nations Report

# HUNGARY: WAS IT ALL PROVOKED?

AFTER the Soviet Union had ignored United Nations demands to withdraw her troops from Hungary, and the Hungarian Government had refused to allow the U.N. Secretary-General, Mr. Hammarskjöld, to enter the country to see the situation for himself, the United Nations set up a special investigating committee to report on the events of last autumn.

That committee has just presented its report, and its publication brings to life again all the hopes and fears, the wonderment with which we watched the uprising and achievements of the Hungarian people, and the contempt and despair with which we saw their ruthless suppression by the tanks and artillery of the Soviet Red Army.

A serious objection to the objectivity of the report is that it is compiled entirely from evidence gathered outside Hungary, mainly from refugees, and is therefore one-sided. This, however, is not the fault of the committee. Entry into Hungary was refused the committee as it had been refused Mr. Hammarskjöld, and the Hungarian Government declined to offer any information or to make any pronouncement to the committee. Recently, however, the Kadar Government has extended an invitation to Mr. Hammarskjöld—but by this time the reign of terror has established such a grip in Hungary that any evidence the committee could gather would be only that which could be given without fear of subsequent punishment. In any case the invitation was not extended to the investigating committee, but to Mr. Hammarskjöld himself, mainly, it is thought, because any formal contact with the head of the United Nations would bring a little prestige to the Kadar Government, which still finds no support among the Hungarians except those in the reconstructed AVH.

Although there is now no organised resistance from the people, there can be no doubt of the hatred with which the quisling Kadar is regarded, nor that the régime is maintained only through the continued presence of the Soviet Army and the campaign of torture, imprisonment and arbitrary arrest carried on by the secret police.

### Not Much New Evidence

The committee does not present much new evidence that was not known to those of us who followed events closely last autumn. The only really significant piece of new information is the fact that the Soviet Union was preparing troops for action three days before the students' demonstration outside the radio station in Budapest at which the fighting began. And it should be remembered that it was the action of the AVH in opening fire on the hitherto peaceful demonstrators that turned a demonstration into a violent revolution.

Looking at this evidence, one is tempted to ask how much the aim of the Soviet Government, and their stooge at the outbreak of the rising, Ernö Gerö, was to provoke an outbreak of violence in order to crush it and with it all vocal opposition to the régime?

In looking at the causes of the Hungarian uprising, we must remember Poland. At Poznan the explosion had occurred which brought Poland to the verge of a revolution against the Soviet occupation. It had been averted only because the Russians were able to bring Gomulka out of cold storage and pop him into the saddle in time to divert public unrest into more harmless channels. But still Poland was seething with student demands, workers' agitation, and protest throughout the country for the "liberalisation" which was being talked about in Moscow but which was not manifesting itself in fact.

In Hungary the same process was beginning, but there was no Gomulka available. In any case, the Russians were loth to provoke an all-out rising in Poland because of the effects it would have in East Germany, but had no such geographical problem in Hungary, in any case a much smaller nation than Poland. Having decided, therefore, that what had happened in Poland was not going to happen in Hungary, there remained for the Soviets only the problem of how to put a stop to it without making complete nonsense of the 'liberalisation' talk.

### How to Stop It?

In the circumstances it was not difficult to provoke demonstrations. When Ernö Gerö returned from talks with Yugo-Slavia on October 23, he was expected by the students to adopt a sympathetic attitude to their demands for more freedom of expression and the removal of such things as the compulsory learning of Russian in all schools—demands which they had made at open meetings on October 22. Instead, however, Gerö's broadcast was truculent in tone and refused to meet any of the popular demands either of the students or of the workers. Following this, the students called a demonstration outside the radio station and sent in a delegation to seek permission to broadcast their point of view. This delegation was in the building so long that the crowd began to get restive when the rumour got out that one of the delegates had been shot. Shortly after 9 p.m. on this date—October 23—tear gas bombs were thrown from upper windows of the radio building

and a few minutes later AVH men opened fire on the crowd, killing several and wounding many more.

### AVH Ambulance Trick

Of this incident the report says: 'Insofar as any one moment can be selected as the turning point which changed a peaceable demonstration into a violent uprising, it would be at this moment when the AVH, already intensely unpopular and universally feared by their compatriots, attacked defenceless people. The anger of the crowd was intensified when white ambulances with Red Cross licence plates drove up. Instead of first-aid teams, AVH police emerged, wearing doctors' white coats. A part of the infuriated crowd attacked them, and, in this way, the demonstrators acquired their first weapons.

'Hungarian forces were rushed to the scene to reinforce the AVH but, after

hesitating a moment, they sided with the crowd. Meanwhile, workers from Csepel, Ujpest, and other working-class districts learned of the situation by telephone. They seized trucks and drove into Budapest, obtaining arms on the way from friendly soldiers or police, or from military barracks or arms factories known to them.

'From about 11 p.m. the radio building was under attack with light arms and, at midnight, the radio announced that clashes had taken place at "various points" in the city. During the early hours of October 24 the demonstrators seized the radio building, but were driven out of it again. At the offices of the Communist party newspaper, *Szabad Nep*, other AVH guards opened fire on unarmed demonstrators. Later insurgents who had obtained arms overcame the AVH and occupied the newspaper offices.

Continued on p. 4

## Bevan on the End of Democracy

MR. ANEURIN BEVAN made some illuminating remarks in a speech at Manchester last week. He stated that in his view, the existence of the bomb was "the end of democracy in Great Britain and America so far as the issues of peace and war were concerned".

"The H-bomb is essentially a weapon of surprise," he said, "the one who uses it first might win."

"But you cannot have an argument about declaring war. You cannot have a debate in the House of Commons as to whether we propose to declare war on the Soviet Union, because they will be looking in and overhearing the argument . . . You cannot give the Russians 24 hours' notice that you are going to send a few H-bombs over to encourage them in negotiations. The H-bomb, by its very existence, withdraws from the

people all control over the issues of peace and war. It is essentially a weapon of dictatorship . . . In other words, you cannot embark on an H-bomb war after the traditional negotiations of war have been made, because your potential enemy will act at once. The pressure will be upon us to act."

This is a very strong argument for banning tests; it is a very strong argument for disarmament generally. It is a very strong argument for men getting together to ensure peace before it is too late and past the point of no return. But the militarists in the Pentagon, the War Office and the Kremlin, combined with the politicians in Washington, London and Moscow do not understand this kind of argument, they only know that at whatever cost to mankind they must be the ones to drop the bomb first—they must be the ones who might win.

## For the Sake of Humanity

### Please don't Ban Our Bomb

—Says the Pentagon

THERE is alarm and despondency at the Pentagon building—the top military brass in the U.S. is worried about the possibility of President Eisenhower actually succeeding in negotiations with Russia for suspension of hydrogen and atomic bomb tests. The Service chiefs are busily lobbying all available Senators to try and put a stop to the whole idea. They need not worry for there is no reason to suppose that any more will come of the latest proposals than came of all the others. When asked how the United States could back out of an agreement on banning tests without loss of prestige, certain military, scientific and legislative sources said France or Britain could be expected or encouraged to turn down such an agreement. So much for their sincerity of purpose and good intentions.

Current U.S. armament policy has as its first premise that Russia and America shall, at all times have equal strength in weapons for total annihilation—or better still, that America should be the stronger. This policy is no doubt precisely the same as Russia's. The catch is that neither country is ever quite sure of its equality and is therefore not prepared to agree to the suspension of tests. Each country in turn puts up a plan of some sort, which it strongly hopes will not be accepted, if agreement looks at all possible one side always finds some point

which it knows cannot be accepted by the other and the negotiations cease. Such is the pattern of disarmament talks and the real intentions behind them.

The Pentagon militarists are not alone in their efforts to keep the H-bomb going, they have the support of the Atomic Energy Commission which has recently been dealing with the humanitarian plea for a ban on bomb tests. Testimony has been given before a Senate sub-committee by leading atomic scientists who support the A.E.C. They say:

*A ban on tests would be anti-humanitarian because an almost clean bomb could evolve from new tests.*

Surely those who thought that George Orwell went too far in his book "1984" with his doublethink theories, must now agree that he was right.

The scientists referred to above apparently put forward the argument that since they are now able to make almost "clean bombs" which do not produce radio-active by-products, these bombs would not wipe out humanity even if there were a world war—therefore to ban testing them would be anti-humanitarian! It is not necessary to point to the flaws in this argument for there is in fact no argument—it is not even arguable that a scientist who is prepared to put a view such as this is to all intents and purposes a lunatic.

## Contradictions in Mao's Contradictions

THE full text of a speech by Mao Tse-tung to the Supreme State Conference on February 27th, 1957, has now been released. Parts of the speech (discussed a few weeks ago in FREEDOM) were at that time circulating among Polish Communists and contained the heretical view that people in Communist countries had the right to strike and riot, and duly acknowledged the contradictions between the leadership in China and the mass of the people.

A close examination of this equivocal statement suggests that its timing is not entirely unrelated to events in Hungary and the reported unrest among the Chinese workers. We do not hold out much hope for great change under the "people's democratic dictatorship" since control still remains firmly in the centralised state, but the deceptive "honesty" of washing the dirty linen in public may give rise to some interesting repercussions in China and the European Communist countries.

We are told that contradictions exist in China between the working class and the national bourgeoisie. But unlike the contradictions which exist between China and the outside enemy, the internal conflicts among the people are non-antagonistic. At the same time there is in China a class struggle within the ranks of the people, between the exploiter and exploited—the national bourgeoisie and the working class—which is an antagonistic one. But, it is held, 'in the concrete conditions

existing in China, such an antagonistic contradiction, if properly handled, can be transformed into a non-antagonistic one and resolved in a peaceful way.'

'Contradictions in a Socialist society are fundamentally different from contradictions in old societies, such as capitalist society. Contradictions in capitalist society find expression in acute antagonism and conflicts, in sharp class struggle, which cannot be resolved by the capitalist system itself and can only be resolved by Socialist revolution. Contradictions in Socialist society are, on the contrary, not antagonistic and can be resolved one after the other by the Socialist system itself.

'Since the contradictions between ourselves and the enemy and those among the people differ in nature, they must be solved in different ways. To put it briefly, the former is a matter of drawing a line between us and the enemies, while the latter is a matter of distinguishing between right and wrong . . .

We leave the dialecticians among our readers to straighten out the contradictions in these statements because we must confess to being rather confused.

How does Mao Tse-tung propose to distinguish between right and wrong and having done so deal with the problem?

'Ours is a people's democratic dictatorship, led by the working class and based on worker-peasant alliance . . . Its first function is to suppress the reactionary classes and elements and these exploiters in the country who range themselves against the Socialist revolution . . . and, for a specific period of time to deprive

landlords and bureaucrat-capitalists of their right to vote and freedom of speech . . . The second function of this dictatorship is to protect our country from subversive activities and possible aggression by the external enemy . . .

But . . . 'Any attempt to deal with ideological matters or questions involving right and wrong by administrative orders or coercive measures will not only be ineffective but harmful. We cannot abolish religion by administrative orders; nor can we force people not to believe in it. We cannot compel people to give up idealism any more than we can force them to believe in Marxism . . . we can only use democratic methods, methods of discussion, of criticism, of persuasion and education . . .

'Under ordinary circumstances, contradictions among the people are not antagonistic. But if they are not dealt with properly, or if we relax vigilance and lower our guard, antagonism may arise . . . Such antagonistic actions on a fairly wide scale as took place during the Hungarian events are accounted for by the fact that domestic and foreign counter-revolutionary elements were at work . . .

We have always maintained in face of Communist claims to the contrary that not only are the Communist countries as capitalistic as the "free" ones but that there are no visible signs of them moving towards a socialist society. Mao confirms our former view when he states in the following terms that exploitation still exists:

'The basic contradictions in Socialist society are still those between the rela-

Continued on p. 3

# OPEN LETTER TO A YOUNG MAN

The News Chronicle's Feature page last Friday was given over to the publication of the statement of an eighteen-year-old Conscientious Objector to the Bristol Tribunal. They call it "A Young Man's Testament", and explain in the adjacent editorial column that they publish it because they believe, without sharing "the socialism, the atheism and pacifism" of its author, that his views "should be widely read and examined. When so many people are behaving like ostriches, it is encouraging that young people should attempt to come to grips with the crisis facing mankind". The editorial however proceeds to pour cold water on the young man's youthful enthusiasm, and at the end one wonders what impulse impelled the editor to publish a document the first paragraph of which is loaded with heresies of a magnitude which would have cost many an editor his job.

"I am an atheist, my religion is socialism, and I look forward to the day when the worship of God will be replaced by the service of man. I do not believe in

the infallibility of any political leadership or in the immaculate conception of any Government policy."

★

Edward Rasey, is an eighteen-year-old shop assistant in Downton, Wilts. His mother is a widow, and in his own words: "I come from a poor family". From his photograph, he strikes one as bright-eyed, happy extrovert, and one can assume that he is a "prominent member of the local Labour Party" because he possesses the natural enthusiasm of youth and its optimism. We may be wrong, but we guess that at the moment a career means less to Edward Rasey than working for the realisation of an idea.

There are many bright-eyed Edward Raseys in the world, in spite of what we are told about the feelings of hopelessness and helplessness among our youth to-day. The real problem is that most of them soon lose their optimism, their enthusiasm. And even their dogmatism, which is fresh and positive, is

not replaced by understanding born of experience and increased knowledge, but just wilts through neglect and by the various processes of adjustment to the ways of the world as it is!

Because the passing of the years has not dimmed the fires that lighted the road of life in our teens (this is not the same as saying, as do some of our critics, that "the trouble with anarchists is that they never grow up") we feel we may, perhaps, have

things to say to Edward Rasey, and to young people who have been overlooked by the (doubtful) limelight of Fleet Street, which may help them in that difficult period, in that no-man's-land between adolescence and adulthood, when all the forces of conformism are at work to tame, domesticate and neutralise rebellious, vital, cock-sure youth. And the "Open Letter" is the time-honoured method of combining the personal with the general.

and recognition of, power political issues.

You on the one hand deny "infallibility" to governments, while on the other you "give notice" that you will not support the government until it governs along the lines which you think will bring peace in the world. These conditions include the abandonment of military alliances in the West, and the use of nuclear weapons in any circumstances, negotiation with the Soviet Union "for a general disarmament agreement". But you also demand that

We must declare that in no circumstances will we go to war without the sanction of the Security Council.

Don't you see that when you say this you are recognising the "infallibility" of governments, even if it is of only some governments? Quite apart from the fact that you are admitting that war can in certain circumstances be justified as well as being the means for solving human problems? The *News Chronicle's* editor, and apparently the Bristol Tribunal too since they have granted you "conditional registration", labels you a pacifist as well as a Socialist and atheist. I am delighted you have convinced them, if this means you will avoid having to play soldiers for a couple of years, but if one is to judge by your photograph you will not rest on your laurels, and you will re-read your Statement and try to sort out your ideas so that you may better understand what you believe, as well as what is going on around you. For instance you write "Modern warfare is utterly immoral". By "modern" you mean atomic warfare, as the paragraphs preceding this statement of faith clearly reveal. I don't know, but I suspect that your father was killed in the 1939-45 war. Are you suggesting that because this war was not all-embracing—that it only eliminated some 20 million human lives, as against possible annihilation of all mankind in an H-bomb war—it ceases to be in the category of "immoral" wars?

I don't think you are a convinced pacifist or anti-militarist because you are obviously not yet clear in your mind what the basic issues are. But then I don't blame you for having

Continued on p. 3

## Dear Edward Rasey

I have read your statement to the Bristol Tribunal with interest and deep sympathy. As one who is, in years, at the frontiers of youth and middle-age, I feel that I am in the happy position of being able to recall vividly my attitudes when I, too, was eighteen, yet at the same time not being racked with rheumatism, indigestion and tired feet, can still think objectively rather than biologi-

cally—an important consideration when you realise for instance that the disastrous British policy in Suez last November was probably determined more by the condition of the then Prime Minister's stomach than by national or other interests!

In spite of the fact that I had an anarchist background, I felt a sneaking admiration for the Labour Party—and even for Mr. Saklatvala the Communist when he won at Battersea!—not, I now realise, because the Party represented what I wanted, but because it was ag'in the Conservatives. I too declared that I was an atheist (as a result of regular Sunday morning attendance at the Secularists platform at Marble Arch and Bertrand Russell's "What I Believe") and a Socialist (it was Lansbury's *Daily Herald* then) but, if I may say so, my socialism had not behind it the conditioning propaganda machine of a successful bunch of Labour politicians, who were much more politicians than socialists. You became aware of your social surroundings when the Labour Party was not a struggling minority but the Party in power. You were born into a world in which power politics was the norm to which Labour as well as Conservative politicians were inexorably committed. (Admittedly power politics is as old as politics, but so-called socialists who engage in it, are essentially a post-war phenomenon). It is not surprising therefore that many of the forceful, and to my mind, positive things you say in your statement, are nullified by a quite understandable (which does not mean acceptable!) concern for,

## BOOK REVIEW

### Saint Simonians in England

THE SAINT SIMONIANS, MILL & CARLYLE, by Richard K. P. Pankhurst. Sidgwick and Jackson, 21s.

AMONG the early theorists of socialism the name of Claude-Henri de Rouvroy, Comte de Saint Simon (1760-1825) has an honoured place. Many of the stock phrases of socialist discussion, such as 'from each according to his abilities, to each according to his deeds' and 'the government of men shall give way to the administration of things', are

directly attributable to him. For a short period in the 1820's and early 1830's, before their judicial persecution by the French government, his followers constituted the most important of the socialist sects on the Continent and their influence persisted long afterwards, manifesting itself in curious places and projects not least of which was the project of uniting East and West by the Suez Canal.

In present perspectives, Saint Simon's theories have added significance. On balance, socialism before the publication of *The Communist Manifesto* was fundamentally libertarian in character. Common to all socialists was the insistence on the importance of the social as distinct from the political principle. Among some schools, such as the Owenites, this emphasis went so far as to deny the utility of political action: the new society was to be achieved by the voluntary association of the oppressed, by the pooling of their limited resources for the creation of a new social system 'within the womb of the old'.

The significance of the Saint Simonians lies in the fact that, while agreeing on the importance of the social principle, they insisted on the need for a new political order. True, this new political order was to be very different from the old aristocratic order and the current bourgeois parliamentarism, but it was to be a political order none the less. Despite their championship of the poor and their courageous, if mystical, espousal of sexual equality, they were not libertarians. Liberty for them signified licence and social equality, they believed, was abhorrent to nature. Their ideal was a hierarchical social order, a completely planned society led by *les industriels, les savants and les artistes*, in which all men performed useful work and were rewarded in strict accordance with their performance.

Recognising the relative impotence of the intellect as a motive for action, the sentiments of mankind were to be directed by the Father, Mother and Apostles of a new religion—the New Christianity—of which Saint Simon had been the prophet. Production rather than happiness was designated as the prime purpose of social organisation and this was to be achieved under the wise guidance of applied scientists, in the widest sense of that term. Although attacking the institution of private property, especially in the form of inheritance, the Saint Simonians were not fundamentally anti-capitalist; they recognised no inherent conflict of interest between workers and employers but only the conflict between *les industriels* or producers, on the one side, and *les oisifs*, the old privileged classes, on the other. In essentials they were totalitarian in outlook and they were the first to predict the coming of the managerial revolution and to rejoice in its coming.

For the greater part of his life Saint Simon sought to discover the single overriding law of human development. His conviction that there was such a law to discover gave him a deep sense of historical mission. His, he thought, was the destiny to reveal to mankind the true path of social progress. Each morning,

therefore, he instructed his servant to wake him with the words: "Monsieur le comte, you have great things to do!" Like other self-appointed Messiahs, he ended up by being slightly potty. His followers were pottier still. They developed the socialist aspects of his thought and *Enfantin* (1796-1864) added to it the doctrine of the androgynous nature of God from which he deduced that, since both men and women were made in God's image, equality should prevail between the sexes. They constituted themselves as a church and began the search which would bring to fruition their divine mission—the search for the female Messiah who would sit on the left hand of *Enfantin*, the Father, believing that she was to be found on the banks of the Bosphorus and probably in a harem. There was a lot of good sense in what they had to say, especially in their criticisms of contemporary society, but it was mixed up with a lot of nonsense expressed in highfalutin' apocalyptic utterances.

As part of their efforts to put humanity on its proper course, they organised in 1832 and 1834 missions to Britain, a country for which they had a high regard as the home of industrialism. To begin with, they were somewhat chary about directing their appeal to the British working class: they aimed rather at converting the intellectuals and one of them, *d'Eichthal*, made a great play at wooing first John Stuart Mill and then Thomas Carlyle. Both showed initial sympathy for their general ideas but both, in their different ways, were repelled by the pseudo-religious trappings. Later, during the hectic days of the Grand National and the Derby lock-out, the missionaries appealed direct to the British workers and they won the support of that indefatigable Owenite journalist, the Rev. J. E. ("Shepherd") Smith, editor of *The Crisis*. Of all the radical groups in England, they had most in common with the Owenite Co-operators. But they could not persuade most of the Owenites to abandon their opposition to politics, while the egalitarian sympathies of the early Co-operators made them hostile to the Saint Simonian ideas of a hierarchical order and distribution according to deeds, not needs. Later, the Owenites themselves were to take on something of the character of a religious sect with Owen as the 'Social Father' but to the end they remained fundamentally libertarian in outlook. It was not for them to be the precursors of managerial technocracy.

It is the activities of Saint Simon's followers in the England of this period which is the theme of Dr. Pankhurst's new book. The story perhaps hardly justifies full-scale treatment but the incidents are worth recording and he does it well. Yet another lacuna in the history of the British working class movement has been filled by it. But there remain bigger gaps, notably the later history of the Owenite movement. As the author of the life of William Thompson of Cork, the great Owenite economist, Dr. Pankhurst is well qualified to write such a history and I hope that he can be persuaded to tackle it soon.

GEOFFREY OSTERGAARD.

## FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

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

### New Books . . .

Men Against the State  
James J. Martin 16/-  
From the Other Shore  
Alexander Herzen 15/-  
Testament of Experience

Vera Brittain 21/-  
Eagles' Nest  
Anna Kayan 15/-  
The Truth About Columbus

Charles Duff 25/-  
Madeleine Ferat  
Emile Zola 16/-  
'New Statesman' Profiles

(ed.) Kingsley Martin 21/-  
The Company She Keeps  
Mary McCarthy 15/-  
To the City of the Dead

George Woodcock 25/-

### Cheap Editions

### and Reprints . . .

The Romantic Exiles (on Herzen  
and Bakunin) E. H. Carr 2/6  
News from Nowhere

William Morris 4/6

### Second-Hand . . .

Corydon  
André Gide 4/-  
To Beg I Am Ashamed  
Sheila Cousins 3/6  
The Day of the Monkey

David Karp 3/6

A Coat of Many Colours  
Herbert Read 4/-

Revolution, Etc.  
Jack London 4/6

The Free Child  
A. S. Neill 4/-

Focus  
Arthur Miller 3/6

The Wisdom of the Heart  
Henry Miller 4/6

The Common People (1746-1938)

G. D. H. Cole and  
Raymond Postgate 5/6

Women  
August Bebel 5/-

What is Property?  
Pierre-Jean Proudhon 15/-

The Way of all Flesh  
Samuel Butler 4/-

### Pamphlets . . .

The Tragedy of Spain  
Rudolf Rocker 1/-

The Truth About Spain  
Rudolf Rocker 6d.

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

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

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

## Real Life Fiction

AS a form of literature the fictionalised presentation of real life incidents is unsatisfactory since it leaves one uncertain whether to blame life or lack of art. We have had *Sailor on Horseback* (Jack London), *Adversary in the House* (Eugene Debs), *Lust for Life* (Van Gogh), *The Preacher and the Slave* (Joe Hill), *Boston* (Sacco and Vanzetti). Now appears *Compulsion* by Meyer Levin\* which deals with the trial of Leopold and Loeb in the twenties for the murder of Bobby Franks (a young boy), and of their defence by Clarence Darrow.

The real-life characters' names are disguised and the book suffers from a swivelling viewpoint between the narrator (a reporter on the case—presumably Levin himself), to the main protagonists and to straight reportage (Darrow's defence speech is reprinted almost verbatim).

The Omniscience of the central character is rather disconcerting since the motives of the murderers are not really sufficiently explained. There is a layer of Freudianism-for-infants to explain how they came to commit the crime, and a hint of the homosexual relationship between the two.

There are some hints of the moral deterioration in international affairs and the atrocities committed in concentration camps and in war which illuminated the act of these two, but this is mere hindsight and there is no fundamental social philosophy

expressed to give coherence to this pastiche of snapshots from the front pages of the twenties.

In a foreword the author shyly compares his use of an actual case to Stendhal's *Scarlet and Black*, Dostoevsky's *Crime and Punishment* and Dreiser's *An American Tragedy* but the lack of significant form in Mr. Levin's book makes the comparison odious.

The case itself is of great interest and the book as a presentation of a problem is of interest but there is no apprehension of the situation by the author. But perhaps his location so near to the heart of the matter makes it impossible to have the scientific detachment necessary to present an acute analysis of the central figures. At the same time the author's lack of a coherent social philosophy (apart from a vague humanitarianism) gives him no unity of outlook to which to relate the events. It is obvious he cannot feel sympathy with the murderers yet he cannot express even Darrow's detached pursuit of legal rights and Darrow's detestation of capital punishment.

It is unfortunate that the work of fact masquerading as fiction has to drag about with it the ball and chain of real life but the scenes in the court room with Darrow for the defence have the real stuff of drama which Mr. Levin's fictionalization lacks. J.R.

\*Muller, London, 20s.

## Open Letter to a Young Man

Continued from p. 2

formulated a political philosophy, or a philosophy of life at the age of eighteen! In a way I think that the fact that you should be as politically conscious as you appear to be, and "a prominent member of the local Labour Party" to boot, causes me more sadness than pleasure. I'll tell you why.

First let me say that I applaud the life-force which makes you declare—and did you notice, by the way, the raised eyebrows in the *News Chronicle* editorial comment?—

because I would rather live than die, I would choose conquest by Communism to annihilation by H-bomb.

I applaud your declaration because I agree with your qualifying statement of faith

I do not believe that the human spirit could not survive any Communist invasion. The human spirit is indomitable and unconquerable.

Such utterances are in keeping with the photograph the *News Chronicle* publishes of you! But when you state

"In time of total war, conscientious objection is useless. The harm has been done, and it is too late to protest"

you are denying all the values you have previously defended. That is you are admitting that you are only a cog in the party machine, which in its turn is part of the machinery of State. Don't you see that when you declare that the "human spirit" can survive, in spite of any régime that seeks to control it or crush it, you are asserting a faith in the strength of the individual and those human values which alone can bring dignity and stature to Man? Resistance to the State is not a matter of dates or situations—that is a characteristic of politicians not of human beings or idealists. I would even say that resistance is, from the point of view of morale, more necessary when the situation is most hopeless, for it is in those moments that the flame of human freedom is really threatened with extinction.

I think that while you have understood so many of the intricacies of the party and international political game, and your scepticism of the motives of governments is admirable ("their actions when they seem sordid, stupid and cruel, are sordid, stupid and cruel"). Nevertheless, I feel that your hopes for a peaceful world in which, to quote your own words, there will be "gaiety, hope and colour", are anchored to what I would call authoritarian agencies—such as the Labour Party, the United Nations and Government.

I suggest you study the anarchist arguments against political parties, governments, the State, as a means of extending your political horizons as well as of getting the whole political business in some kind of true perspective. Then you will not expect much from politicians in the achievement of that "future bright with hope" to which you look forward.

I think the failure of many young people to live up to early expectations is only partly explained by the many new forces which impinge on their lives as they grow up and make "either/or" demands on them. (You may, for instance find yourself falling in love with a girl who wants you all to herself and who as a result resents your political activities. You may or may not resist! It will probably depend on which is most important to you at the time, or on whether you can convince

your lady-love that she and your activities can co-exist and flourish!) But I also believe that much of the "wastage" in Left-wing movements is the result of progressive disillusionment, of hopes, vested in political leaders, which never materialise. Anarchism, instead, places the emphasis on individual responsibility and seeks to achieve a personal freedom that is bound up with a deep sense of community; a combination of self-dignity and love.

It is true that you express pretty forceful views about the present duplicity of governments and the low cunning of politicians, but you nevertheless believe also in the possibility of honest governments and politicians. It seems to me that you cannot have considered the problem of power and its corroding effect on human beings. Good government is a myth both in practise (search history for a good government!) and in theory. For you, good government is "government by the people", that is a body through which the will of the people is expressed. This, to my mind is sheer wishful thinking; there can be no reconciliation between the individual and government. Government is born of deep divisions in society, and whatever you may believe was achieved by the Labour Party in lessening these divisions between men, it is quite clear from their recent policy statements—such as those on Equality and on Pensions—that they have no intention of disturbing the basic fabric of society. All that concerns them is that the rulers, the technocrats, the managers and big bosses shall be chosen from all strata of society, and to this end they advocate equality of opportunity for all . . . to rise to the top. But if there is a top—so much there be a bottom—of the ladder! And in the circumstances there can be no effective expression of the will of the people since there is no objective community of interests in such a society. Take the case of Property.

If the community is composed of those who own property and of many others who do not, it seems to me quite obvious that there can never be unanimity of views on how best property should be managed for the common good. Property owners will resist every attempt to change the *status quo*, while those whose possessions can be accommodated in a suit case will favour all measures which give them access to control over, or ownership of, some of that property. This unbridgeable gap is exploited by the politicians to further their political careers, and so often what is called "progressive legislation" is in effect only the by-product of the party political struggle.

I mention this because it seems to me that you place great hopes in the Labour Party and that in effect you believe its leaders are concerned with the well-being of the people, whereas I would suggest to you that they are at present principally interested in winning the next elections, and that once in power they will act just as all governments behave! In other words politicians are interested primarily in Power, just as a cobbler is interested in boots and a shipowner dreams of ships. Power is the politicians' job; mankind is his instrument not his objective!

We perhaps haven't got very far. There is not the space in one issue of FREEDOM to discuss your statement point by point. But I think, if you have the time and interest to look through back numbers of FREEDOM you will find many arguments and solid facts to counter some of your uncritical hopes in "good" government. And a healthy scepticism of politicians combined with your enthusiasm and optimism in the future, will strengthen and not weaken, your efforts for a better world.

Sincerely,

"ONE OF FREEDOM'S EDITORS."

London, June 24.

## SCIENCE COMMENTS

THE need for a drug that will reduce the "excess of libido" in the world and rid one temporarily of the "torment of unsatisfied sexual desire" is tentatively advocated by the editor of the newsletter of the International Planned Parenthood Federation. In spite of phosphorilated hesperidin and o-diazo acetyl l-serine, contraceptive techniques are not developing as fast as nuclear devices as instruments in the fight against overpopulation. Methods range from religious demands for sexual abstinence to legalised abortion, and a pill to reduce libido, it is suggested might find favour with students, and faithful spouses temporarily parted by circumstances such as war; one might also add by the catholic church for use by non catholics, and in the culinary sections of some middle class women's organisations.

A committee formed last year to co-ordinate research work sponsored by the Planned Parenthood Federation of America into improved methods of birth control believes "that a time has now come for a marshalling of universal resources for the control of the world's mounting population pressure, and that knowledge now exists to make possible steady advance toward achieving that control if sufficient support can be provided". The newsletter mentions that present research projects include the clinical testing of steroids affecting ovulation; a study of the anti-fertility effects of plants; clinical studies of foam tablet contraception; and in China the swallowing of live tadpoles is considered to be an approach that has possibilities.

From Calcutta comes more promising news, of a compound m-diethyl hydroquinone which is anti-aestrogenic and anti-progestogenic in action, can be given immediately after a menstrual period, and requires neither calculation nor study of the calendar. This compound has not yet had a clinical trial.

LABOUR COUNCILLORS may chain themselves to gates to demonstrate that this island is defenceless in an H-bomb war, but some others have more hope. Without publicity deep bomb-proof shelters have been constructed in London to accommodate "essential services" and enable them to continue functioning, although they may have little left to administer except themselves. No tickets are available for the general public so far as I know.

A civil defence study group set up by the Federation of American Scientists has reported according to the *New Scientist*, that effective civil defence is possible in America and would have to consist of the following. Officially encouraged dispersal of new industry; stock-

piling of a food supply equal to two years' consumption outside likely target areas, and two years' estimated need of medical supplies, as well as increased industrial stockpiling; and the provision of a fall-out shelter for everyone and deep shelters for at least 20 million people, and deep shelters for one-third of the present U.S. industrial capacity.

Sweden has more advanced plans, for according to the *Manchester Guardian* in a district of Stockholm near a major crossroad there is a semi-circular opening in a solid wall of rock. It is the door of a garage capable of holding thousands of vehicles. It is armour-plated and in the event of an air-raid warning the door would hermetically seal the entrance, and transform the garage into an air-conditioned shelter, a model town with flats, electric power station, and stocks of food and fuel, capable of sheltering 20,000 people. This, together with fifteen other shelters already built would enable one-fifth of the inhabitants of Swedish towns to shelter underground. There is room for 1,200,000 people in the shelters which are linked by underground road and railway and contain shops, theatres, cinemas and amusement arcades. But life will not consist of uninterrupted pleasure and leisure for it is claimed that production underground will be only thirty per cent. less than at present.

ARE THE trade unions doing enough to ensure satisfactory safety standards for the increasing numbers of workers with atomic energy, in nuclear energy establishments, power stations and medicine, from the dangers of radiation? Exceptionally high safety records have been claimed so far, but it has been reported that deaths from leukaemia in American radiologists are nine times as great as for other American physicians, relative to the numbers at risk, and leukaemia, a cancer of the blood, is probably the most easily induced delayed effect of irradiation of the whole body. Recent work has shown that the incidence

of leukaemia is proportional to the radiation dosage. The most sensitive indication of radiation damage is a reduction in the number of white cells in the blood, but by the time such a change is detectable it may be too late to prevent the development of leukaemia.

The only satisfactory solution, for atomic energy is here to stay, is for every individual to have a radiation chart kept, recording total exposure from all sources, and for the total to be kept down to a safe lifetime dose—if there is such a thing.

The Medical Research Council has suggested that an individual should not be allowed to accumulate a total dose of more than 200 r in his lifetime and that this dose should be distributed over tens of years. Others have suggested that 30 r over the reproductive life should be the maximum dose, but these figures are speculative and certain to be reduced in the future. There is work for the trade unions here.

THIS MUST be the American silly season for the army department has started to check the offspring of about 3,000 soldiers who were involved in one of the less successful wartime experiments known as cannon defense light. This was an attempt to frighten the German army with high intensity carbon arc lights mounted on light tanks. A few of the American soldiers who took part in the experiments around Lowther Castle near Penrith are now complaining of impotence or sterility, others have wives who have had miscarriages, etc., and claims for compensation are being formulated. No complaints have yet been made by any of the British troops involved, but the War Office is making sure by denying all responsibility for the experiment.

The light from a carbon arc is not so very different from sunlight, so for one reason if not for another the human race seems destined for a life underground.

BROS.

## Mao's Contradictions

Continued from p. 1

tions of production and the productive forces, and between the superstructure and the economic base . . . in joint State-private industrial and commercial enterprises capitalists still receive a fixed rate of interest on their capital, that is to say, exploitation still exists . . .

. . . Industrialists and businessmen must still take part in the study and ideological remoulding. Though they were taking part in enterprises as workers living by their own labour, yet they were still receiving fixed interest payments and had not yet cut themselves off from the roots of exploitation. Between them and the working class there is still

a considerable gap in ideology, sentiments, and habits of life.

We notice that although the first task of the people's democratic dictatorship is to suppress exploiters who range themselves against the Socialist revolution, businessmen and industrialists are still receiving fixed interest payments. Presumably those who do not actively oppose the régime can carry on the job of exploitation if they agree to study ideological remoulding.

Why should all these contradictions occur in a socialist state? The reason put forward by Mao is the youthful nature of the Chinese Socialist system; it has not had time to mature nor have the people become accustomed to change. Government workers are still inexperienced but are nevertheless constantly trying to achieve a balance between production and the needs of society.

Allowing for the reasonable implication that no society can change overnight and that mistakes must be made in the process of adjusting an exploitive society to an equitable one, it is obvious that this cannot be done by the use of force through a State machine which has merely changed its name and not its basic character.

Next week we hope to discuss other points raised in Mao Tse-tung's statement, some of which may mean that more freedom will be "granted" to some sections of the people. From the standpoint of social revolution as understood by us however we suspect that Mao's concessions bear a strong resemblance to the sops offered to the people by democratic governments—wiser in the ways of ruling than the openly totalitarian forms of government.

## 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.

### HERBERT READ :

*Art and the Evolution of Man* 4s.

*Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism* 3s. 6d.

*Poetry and Anarchism* cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d.

*The Philosophy of Anarchism* boards 2s. 6d., paper 1s.

*The Education of Free Men* 1s.

### GEORGE WOODCOCK :

*New Life to the Land* 6d.

*Homes orhovels?* 6d.

*Railways and Society* 3d.

*What is Anarchism?* 1d.

*The Basis of Communal Living* 1s.

### TONY GIBSON :

*Youth for Freedom* paper 2s.

*Food Production and Population* 6d.

*Who will do the Dirty Work?* 2d.

★

### 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.

## Letter from London

## Where are the Propagandists?

ANARCHIST groups often have to listen to complaints that they are clannish and sectarian, difficult to get into. Many people on the fringes of the movement in London, for example, are unsure of the composition, or even the existence, of the London Anarchist Group, and they often ask how they can join.

The LAG, however, like every other anarchist group, is a functional group, and its function is to propagate anarchism by whatever means are at its disposal. Apart from individual contact and discussion, for which membership or even the existence of a group is not necessary, these means of propaganda in fact consist of little more than the holding of meetings, indoors and outdoors, and the distribution of anarchist literature.

Not everyone can speak in public, at first. This really means that not everyone can speak in public until they try, for like every other job, it is something that has to be learned. Apart from the question of special aptitude, which makes the difference between an outstanding speaker and a merely competent one, there can be few people who can express their ideas in conversation—and what anarchist can't?—who could not learn to express them from a platform with vigour and liveliness if they chose to make the effort.

## Selling the Paper

As far as the distribution of literature is concerned, even this effort is not necessary. The easiest place to sell anarchist papers in London is at Hyde Park on a Sunday afternoon, where on a fine day a couple of sellers have been known to sell one hundred copies of FREEDOM as well as other papers and pamphlets. No special training is necessary to do this. At its least, all that is required is to stand with the papers on show and the customers come and get it; the more extrovert sellers find it a livelier job if they cry slogans or wisecracks to attract attention.

Besides Hyde Park, there are always meetings going on held by other organisations, where it is possible to sell a few (sometimes many) copies—especially if the headline happens to be relevant to the theme of the meeting.

What applies to London applies also to practically every other big town in the country where outdoor speakers have

recognised pitches to which all those interested in the circulation of ideas come to listen and buy literature. Even if no anarchist platform is practicable, it is easy enough for a FREEDOM seller to get rid of a few copies around other people's meetings and thereby make contact with others of like mind which can in time lead to the founding of a group. Libertarians too easily tend to think of themselves as isolated. If they make an effort they might find that they are not as much alone as they thought.

## Living or Propagating?

The real trouble seems to be to find people who think it worth while to do any of this. Anarchism finds its expression in our lives either by our living it or propagating it—or, ideally, both. Not everyone is prepared to disrupt his established life to live more anarchistically in a society which is hostile to the free life. Although in point of fact in large towns one can live almost as one wishes as long as one does not constitute a nuisance to anyone else by so doing. In London, certainly, the individual is so anonymous that nobody cares what the hell you do as long as you don't interfere with your neighbours. In small communities this may not apply, for part of the price you pay for social integration is that everybody knows your business. But anyway, if anarchists want to 'practice' anarchy by living in community then they form their own environment which can be a shell against the hostility—if any—of the outside world. And they will, after all, have their love to keep them warm.

The propagation of anarchism, however, means no such disruption of everyday life. If one can rationalise the dichotomy (pardon!) it is quite possible to live a most bourgeois life from nine to five and then blossom out as a revolutionary in the evenings and at weekends. For those for whom the poverty of bohemia or a community is not attractive, or with family responsibilities, or who simply prefer urban life with three square meals a day or who find satisfaction in their work even as it is, this represents the nearest one can get to anarchy until there is a large movement capable of influencing society.

The point here is that there will never be a large movement to influence anything if there is no propaganda for the idea. All of you at this moment read-

ing these words have been contacted because someone was making propaganda, either individually or through the spoken or written word, and introduced you to these written words, which are produced by people interested in propagating the ideas of anarchism.

## Reason for Organisation

The only reason for the existence of such anarchist organisation as there is, is to spread the word. There is no other need for anarchists to work together. We may enjoy each other's company socially, but so do the members of a sewing circle. Now what is rather sad is that there are so many who call themselves anarchists who are prepared to be only 'consumers' as it were. Who enjoy the company of anarchists, take sustenance and encouragement and information out of the efforts of the 'producers', but do not appear to think that those producers also need encouragement and sustenance and information.

Encouragement for anarchist propagandists comes when a new comrade becomes active. It is possible to sustain one's enthusiasm with the knowledge that the work bears fruit all the time although it may not always be obvious. The aim of the anarchist writer or speaker is partially achieved if he weans someone away from authoritarian thought or practice. If someone resists conscription, achieves sexual happiness, stops voting, or in any way enlarges his stature or widens the horizons of his life as a result of learning from the anarchists, then that is a cause for our satisfaction. But our work can only have a cumulative effect when it is taken up by others, when the new 'converts' realise their responsibilities and, in making the ideas their own, make the spreading of them their own task as well. Anarchist propaganda should create a kind of snowball effect, with at least a noticeable proportion of new comrades becoming propagandists themselves.

Unfortunately this doesn't appear to happen. At a time like the present, which is absolutely bristling with issues on which anarchists should have plenty to say—automation, H-bombs, colonialism, Communism, police powers, re-armament, nationalism, etc., etc.—we find apathy as much among the anarchists as among the general public. There never was a time when the anarchist propagandist had so much ammuni-

tion and such opportunities to put over the case as he has to-day. Every kind of government and every political party has provided material for the anarchist and the very apathy of the general public is an expression of their disillusionment with all the accepted alternatives.

## An Opportune Time

The destructive case for anarchism finds more and more acceptance to-day, and it is our contention that the first step towards getting people to see the force of the constructive case is to undermine the grip of authoritarian ideas upon their minds. In this task the history of the last few decades is on our side. It is our fault if we do not take advantage of this. And it is precisely our own fault if the anarchist movement remains small while we do nothing about bringing our ideas before more and more people all the time.

Just why there should be a dearth of anarchist propagandists at this time is a little difficult to see, but a dearth there certainly is. Is it the slow creep of gradualism that undermines a revolutionary attitude? Is the one-man revolution disintegrating the movement? Is the H-bomb making everything seem hopeless? Whatever it is, it is a sad thing to have to report that for the last three weeks we have been unable to find a comrade in London willing to come forward and take responsibility for literature selling at Hyde Park!

For comrades abroad and in the provinces, the continued appearance of FREEDOM from London may seem to point to the existence of a militant movement here. And it is rather strange that we can run a bookshop, a club, a weekly paper printed on our own press, and yet not find more than a couple of regular outdoor speakers nor anyone prepared to stand and sell FREEDOM regularly at the gates of Hyde Park, other than a couple of women comrades who are no longer young and who have already served the movement for many years. (One is a veteran of the Russian revolution, the other a war resister of 1914-18!).

## Where are the Young Comrades?

Over the last three weeks both these reliable comrades have been on holiday. But where are the young comrades to take their places? The Irish and Catholic papers find dozens of sellers. Even the *Daily Worker* can still find someone prepared to stand and sell it! But this paper, expressing a point of view which is finding more and more relevance as each day passes, which voices the attitudes (roughly) of those who support our platform and frequent our club, and which, for all its faults, would be sorely missed by libertarians in this country if it were to disappear—this paper cannot find half a dozen comrades willing to come together and form a rota to make easy the task of putting it before the Hyde Park public. Let alone the great British public in general!

It is not only the apathy of the general public that is depressing for the anarchist propagandist. It is the apathy of the anarchists. Let those therefore who want to know how to join the London Anarchist Group ask themselves first what they are prepared to do to earn membership. As we said in our second paragraph, an anarchist group is a functional group; it should consist only of

## INCIDENTALLY . . .

Jayne Mansfield, who has just finished filming John Steinbeck's *The Wayward Bus*, says that the war of the sexes will never be resolved because there's too much fraternising with the enemy.

## PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 25

Deficit on Freedom	£500
Contributions received	£355
DEFICIT	£145
June 14 to June 20	

London: S.B.* 2/9; London: E.S. 3/6; London: J.S.* 3/-; Oxford: Anon.* 5/-; Danny: P.O. 7/8; Charlton: J.B. 12/-; London: J.W.A. 2/-.	Total ...	1 15 11
	Previously acknowledged ...	353 19 6
	1957 TOTAL TO DATE ...	£355 15 5

\*Indicates regular contributor.  
GIFTS OF BOOKS: Hong King: M.S.; Oxford: M.T.; London: Anon.; Bristol: E.B. & N.O.

Fire Fund  
Per Osmar: San Francisco: Comrades, £37/2/0; Detroit: Refrattari Group £17/10; Amsterdam: A. A. van S., £25.

Total	79 12 0
Previously acknowledged	120 7 10
TOTAL TO DATE	£199 19 10

Hungary: Was it All Provoked? Continued from p. 1

"While fighting was in progress at the radio building, the first Soviet tanks made their appearance in Budapest at about 2 a.m. on October 24, and were soon in action. However, no official announcement was made of the Soviet intervention until 9 a.m."

## Soviet Troops Ready

The significant part about this is that three days before this demonstration and the AVH opening fire, Soviet troops had been preparing for action. The report says that it appeared that the Soviet authorities 'had taken steps as early as October 20 to make armed intervention possible'. Evidence existed of troop movements or projected troop movements from that date on, and Soviet troops from outside Hungary were used even in the first intervention.

Again therefore we ask: *Was the firing by the AVH on the evening of October 23 a deliberate act of provocation to stir the people to violence to provide the excuse for bringing troops to crush popular opposition to the régime?*

And did the whole plan come unstuck when the Hungarian troops sided with the people? The early movement of Russian troops might have been originally a precautionary measure, purely to back up the Hungarian Army, but when it defaulted, the Russians had to go it alone—which would explain the initial pretence at withdrawal while Imre Nagy was a short-lived leader of the Government, for while the Russian forces might have been considered sufficient to stiffen the Hungarian army, they were obviously not enough to take on an alliance of the Hungarian forces and the people in arms. The Soviets therefore knew that Budapest would be too hot for them, so pretended to withdraw and yield to popular demand only in order to bring up reinforcements.

By November 3, agreement on the withdrawal of Russian troops appeared to be near, and a four-man Hungarian delegation was invited to a banquet by the Soviet military command at Tokal, near Budapest, to settle the final details. The report tells us how this meeting ended:

## Delegates Arrested

"It was nearly midnight when the party was interrupted by the arrival of General Serov, chief of the Soviet security police, who entered the room accompanied by the MVD officers and ordered the arrest of the Hungarian delegation."

By 5.20 the next morning, Soviet troops were attacking the capital. At 7.57 a.m. the following appeal was broadcast by the Hungarian Writers' Union:

"This is the Hungarian Writers' Union! We appeal for help to writers, scholars, writers' associations, academics, scientific organisations, and the leaders of intellectual life all over the world. Our time is limited! You all know the facts; there is no need to explain them. Help Hungary! Help the Hungarian people! Help the Hungarian writers, scholars, workers, peasants and intellectuals! Help! Help! Help!"

But no help was forthcoming. By this time the West was preoccupied with Suez and had no time for the Hungarian people. When have governments ever had time for the people—except as they can be used?

Referring to the rôle of the American-sponsored broadcasting network Radio Free Europe, the committee said it appeared that certain broadcasts "helped to create an impression that support would be forthcoming for the Hungarians". It felt that "in such circumstances the greatest restraint and circumspection" were called for in international broadcasting. Which seems to us mild criticism indeed.

The report has of course been denounced by the Soviet Government as American propaganda, although

in fact the U.N. was careful to pick a committee as impartial as it could be. It consisted of delegates from Australia, Ceylon, Uruguay, Denmark and Tunisia, and announced its regret that it had not been allowed to go into Hungary itself. As it was, the committee amassed its information from interviews with more than one hundred Hungarians who were involved in the rising. It would appear to be as factual an account as we are likely to get of that fantastic period. We look forward however to the publication some day of a full account of the work of the revolutionary councils, the student organisations, and the workers' councils and the way they set about their self-appointed tasks of running their own affairs. This will be the material of real value and interest to us.

## NOW—WHAT ABOUT REPORTS AN CYPRUS AND SUEZ?

THE U.N. committee's report on Hungary is welcome, but we must insist on that organisation showing its impartiality when considering interference by large nations in the affairs of small, and the suppression of elementary freedoms by occupying powers.

We therefore call for an independent and impartial committee to be set up with full investigatory powers to report upon the situation in Cyprus and upon the events last autumn in the Suez Canal zone. While they are at it they could also go on to Kenya and Formosa and Okinawa, and a special committee should, in our opinion, be set up to investigate the degree to which the United Nations Charter is honoured in Spain—a sovereign member of the United Nations.

What hopes?

active members, and has no need for passengers. If 'sympathisers' wish to become 'comrades', therefore, let them become active. They will soon find that the LAG is not a closed shop, any more than is working membership of the Malatesta Club or any other anarchist group that we know.

All we ask from the anarchists is that they put into operation the idea which most of us accept—"From each according to his ability, to each according to his need". From anarchists for the movement; how about it? After all, if we are ourselves the movement it is in our own interests, isn't it?  
London. P.S.

## 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 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

## 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.

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