

In this Issue :

People and Ideas - - p. 2

Sacco and Vanzetti - p. 2

**The Awkward Question-
A Suggestion - p. 4**

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"Modern society is only an extremely refined form of barbarism, which bolsters up both individual and collective insanity, and often is one with them."

—BART DE LIGT.

Vol. 18, No. 34

August 24th, 1957

Threepence

Outcome of Five Months Talk

DISARMAMENT DEADLOCK

THE most astonishing feature of the London disarmament conference between the four powers of the West (Britain, Canada, France and the U.S.A.) and Russia, is not that after a period of five months no agreement whatsoever has been effected, but that it should ever have been supposed by relatively sensible or responsible people that anything of the slightest importance would be achieved.

Almost the entire Press has written of its great disappointment at the current situation, which has been high-lighted by Mr. Zorin's attack on Western policy in regard to the negotiations and by Mr. Khrushchev's similar denunciation. The Russian attitude (quite rightly) is that the West has been stalling, and of course, this is equally true of Russia, though she has succeeded in making it appear less obvious and in consequence is in a stronger position to make propaganda for the benefit of world opinion.

But as each succeeding disarmament conference maintains the unbroken record of dismal failure it is difficult to understand why anyone other than a politician should think there is any chance of making headway. There have been so many conferences with so many varying aims and so many possibilities of disagreement and so many good

capitalistic reasons for failure; what else should we expect but just that?

Why then are the conferences held if neither side has any intention of allowing any progress to be made? There are two main reasons: firstly it is generally deemed advisable by governments to give an appearance of attempting to solve the disarmament problem, either as a means of quietening public opinion at home or the rumblings of an opposition party, or in order to impress the neutral and apparently peaceful elements in the world. Secondly, because a disarmament conference is as good a medium as any to bargain for economic and political aims, for discussions on the balance of power in various areas and on spheres of influence.

It would not be unreasonable to suppose that the *real* and *basic* problem of disarmament is that the *two sides should disarm*, and yet as it always turns out no such simple procedure is at all possible. In the present instance the situation has been more complicated than usual by the fact that the Western powers have been undecided amongst themselves as to what their proposals should be. Surprisingly enough Russia has actually made a straightforward proposal of a 15 per cent. cut in military budgets all round, but naturally has received no

straightforward reply from the West. Conversely the West has outlined a plan for a gradual cutting down of nuclear arms production which Russia has successfully evaded.

The real issues are therefore conveniently and inextricably tangled into the thorny and apparently impossible problems of German re-unification, German disarmament, the "open skies" and aerial inspection plan and which bases are to be inspected, suspension of nuclear tests with or without control of nuclear production, and many more difficulties which might be overcome if it were not for the fact that all are constantly made inter-dependent one upon the other.

This however is the technique and becomes the excuse for achieving nothing. The fact of the matter is that since both sides are bent on political power neither has any intention of weakening its chances of obtaining a relatively stronger position by threat of arms by agreeing to a reduction or an inspection of any sort. Furthermore the economic structure of both East and West is geared to the production of armaments. (An obvious instance of which is the "necessary" re-arming of Germany so that she shall not have an unfair economic advantage over the rest of Europe).

In any event neither side trusts the other to stick to any bargain which might be made, and it is out of the question that any agreement will be permitted which really allows full supervision. Disarmament therefore becomes an impossibility unless both East and West wish to disarm, in which case it would be simply a matter of planning a reduction in armaments. . . . Whilst it remains a question of world influence and domination by any and all means possible there is no method by which agreement can be reached.

The history of disarmament con-

In British Guiana

THE VOTER PROPOSES, THE GOVERNOR DISPOSES

AS we go to Press the government has not yet announced its intentions regarding the future of British Guiana, for it should be clearly understood that in spite of Dr. Jagan's overwhelming victory at the recent elections it means nothing! The lesson the government learned from the 1953 elections is that democracy is not for those who will not play your game. So in the interim period, apart from using its powers to blacken the name of the Jagans and to convince the electorate that they would be much better off if they voted for the British government's blue-eyed boys, they also modified the constitution so that if things went wrong they could quite easily be put right without again having to suspend the constitution and making themselves the laughing stock of the world. This time there are only 14 elected seats in the Legislative Council, and the Governor has up his sleeve the trump cards if and when required: he can nominate a further eleven members to the Council. And assuming that this is not enough to prevent Dr. Jagan setting up a Communist régime and threatening the United States, the Governor has powers to overrule anything the Legislative Council may agree upon if he so wishes. Apparently Dr. Jagan is prepared to form a government on these terms. He is reported as being anxious to show that though admittedly a Communist he is also a responsible and democratic

politician. Such twisted thinking shows what a good Party man he really is!

If one is to judge by an editorial in the *New York Herald Tribune*, American political circles are more worried by the results than are Whitehall and Fleet Street. Whilst recognising that the British have taken the necessary constitutional steps to clip Dr. Jagan's wings the *Herald Tribune* continues:

Thus there is no question of a Communist-controlled government in British Guiana for the present. But neither is there any question of Dr. Jagan's tremendous popular following in spite of strenuous efforts to attract voters to democratic parties.

If Britain continues to follow a policy of granting home-rule and independence to former colonial territories throughout the world, then British Guiana will one day be an independent South American state. How, before that day comes, will it be possible to educate the people of Guiana to elect truly democratic officials? This is a question which should command increasingly anxious study, in Washington as much as in London.

What hypocrisy! What they really mean when they talk of "educating the people to elect truly democratic officials" is how does one condition the people to vote for those candidates who are the stooges of American and British interests. No voter in British Guiana ignores who Dr. Jagan is and where his sympathies lie: the British government has during these last four years seen to that. And yet they vote for him rather than the pro-British candidates or even the "respectable" faction of the P.P.P. Surely this is "the worst cut of all" so far as Anglo-American "democracy" is concerned. A free election and they show their gratitude by declaring that of the two evils the Communist is the lesser!

Far from seeking to educate the voters, the *Herald Tribune* should start campaigning for democracy in the "democracies" so that even simple natives can distinguish them from totalitarian systems!

Operation Concluded in Oman

ONLY the political apologists in Parliament and their blind followers will be able to convince themselves that British military intervention in Oman was motivated by ties of friendship, unless it is that friendship is merely a euphemism for economic interests.

Britain established herself in the Persian Gulf area over 150 years ago when her main concern was to protect the passage to India. At the same time she arranged protection for rulers around the Gulf against marauding tribes. Nowadays Britain's interest is oil, the dominating factor in Middle East politics.

The arguments put forward by the Government as a justification for her military aid to the Sultan in the present dispute between him and the Imam are that the Sultan was recognised as the sovereign over Oman as well as Muscat in a treaty drawn up in 1920. The Imam challenges this claim and according to an American report had in 1920 won from the then Sultan "grudging acknowledgment of the Imam's rule in the mountains". Whether the claims on either side are true or false will be of little real concern to those whose main interest is the control of oil already in existence and the hope of more to come.

In 1950 the Sultan granted the British run subsidiary of the Iraq Petroleum Company a concession to drill for oil in the Omani hinterland. Two years ago when oil drillers went to work near the northern border they were attacked by the Imam's tribesmen who were afterwards successfully quelled by a few hundred men sent by the Sultan under the control of British officers.

The Imam's brother fled to Saudi Arabia from where he returned two weeks ago complete with 200 modern rifles and a supply of up-to-date automatic weapons. As far as the reports now go, the Sultan with British troops, weapons and RAF fighters has again put down the opposing ruler, if only temporarily.

The issues between the Arab contestants are more clearly defined than those which exist between Britain and America in relation to the Middle East.

Saudi Arabia has broken off diplomatic relations with Britain, but all concessions in Saudi Arabia are wholly American. Even in the areas where British "protection prevails" U.S. oil money is dominant for U.S. companies own 50% of the stake in Kuwait, 100% in Bahrein, the Neutral Zones and Dhofar, 23.75% in Muscat and Oman.

The question is, did aid for the Imam come from Saudi Arabia? And if so was America aware that weapons were being supplied? Did she then warn Britain what was happening, confident that the Sultan would call for aid from Britain? America is anxious to establish herself as a "friend" of the Arab nations and is reluctant to become involved in disputes which can be left to British "diplomacy". If embarrassing situations result America can always express public disapproval, as she has done already on a number of occasions.

The immediate issue with which America is occupied is the forthcoming debate before the Security Council on Hungary from which she is anxious "not to distract world attention or diminish Western Unity". Even so, Britain cannot afford to forget American stakes in Middle East oil.

In the meantime the old country has another imperialist competitor panting for its share of the loot. Following the deal with Syria over the Russian-built oil refinery Moscow has offered to build roads, railways and hydro-electric stations, and as if in reply to the offer, pro-Soviet army chiefs have taken complete control in Syria.

The Western powers console themselves with hopes that Nasser will not encourage Communist domination in the Middle East. They may be right, he has a lot to gain from a closer tie with the Western powers.

Will we then discover that Israel is not after all a "gallant little state" to be protected but instead has become a nuisance to America and Britain, for it is unlikely Israel will quietly sit back and allow such strength as she has to be diminished.

But anything is possible in the struggle for wealth and power.

Notes on the Algerian Struggle

The Point of No Return?

IT tells us something of the French mentality that the 14th July—the national holiday and the day the people stormed and destroyed the hated state prison, the Bastille, in 1789—was celebrated this year by a monster military parade in Paris (an annual occurrence, which an outsider finds difficult to reconcile with the event being commemorated!) and included some thousands of paratroopers as well as military equipment engaged in the Algerian war of repression which were especially brought over for the occasion. The traditional street dancing was banned since the government ordained that this 14th of July was to be a day of mourning for Algeria. The evening press headlined this show of France's military might in a vain attempt to prolong the myth, which has been repeated so often since the 1914-18 war as to be by now accepted by many Frenchmen as an absolute—a biological fact—that the French fighting man is the best in the world. The myth, and with it the pride of many Frenchmen of the old-guard, have suffered several set-

backs since the "glorious" exploits of the 1914-18 massacre: May 1940 and Indo-China are bitter pills which French pride cannot easily swallow; (as for Suez they simply refuse to recognise it as a political blunder and a military fiasco). To admit defeat in Algeria as well, would be the final humiliation and the relegation of the glorious "poilu" to the pages of history—or mythology!

THERE is surely something sinister in this linking of the *Quatorze Juillet* with military repression in Algeria. It is a marriage of the *forces of freedom*—storming the Bastille, liberating the prisoners and then destroying the prison—with the *forces of repression*—the military parade in which the paratroopers in their camouflage uniforms, which in fact made them stand out from the rest*—were

*And in which later they bespotted themselves through the streets of Paris with starry-eyed fiancées on one arm and proud, chaperoning-prospective-mother-in-laws on the other.

given a place of honour. Just as the Bastille was the then symbol of repression so are the paratroopers to-day those largely responsible in Algeria for the arbitrary seizure and torture of Algerian "suspects"—French as well as Moslem—which has shocked the world and not a few Frenchmen (even though only a few among them have displayed the courage to speak out against these excesses). Thus 1789 was being commemorated not by a pageant of freedom but with the glorification of those very forces against which the destruction of the Bastille was directed.

GENERALISATIONS about national characteristics are often wide of the mark. It was reported from Algeria last week that the French forces had killed some 1,000 "rebels" in a two-day campaign, an indication that military operations were if anything being intensified. Paris and the large towns of France, on those same days were deserted.

Continued on p. 3

On Being Against the Atom Bomb-4

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 18, No. 34. August 24, 1957

ALGERIA Continued from p. 1

Shops and cafés, factories and work-shops were closed and shuttered. Paris and France was on holiday, war or no war. National honour was in cold storage for the month of August. Mr. Frenchman had discarded his sober town dress (and those decoration ribbons which for the rest of the year he wears in his buttonhole with the same pride as the Englishman his prize rose or carnation) for a white cap and shorts which painfully reveal that he draws a line between patriotism and a good table (and explains the paradox of the French government which receives support for its military policy in Algeria but falls when it seeks to pass measures of taxation to raise the money to finance it!).

How interested is the average Frenchman in what is being done in his name? Is he, in fact, more involved in the Algerian venture than the average Englishman was in the "pacification" of Kenya? Is national pride any more than skin deep, strongly felt so long as personal interests are not also mobilised? Again, it is difficult to generalise. We can imagine that most Frenchmen in France are not all that emotionally involved in the fate of their countrymen in Algeria, though the relatives of these in France, as well as those of the members of the armed forces (more than 400,000 strong) obviously are. And however divided the "experts" are on the subject of whether Algeria is an economic asset or liability to France there must be nevertheless many Frenchmen whose economic well-being is directly linked to France's ability to maintain its colonial grip on Algeria. These people are the active, vocal, propagandists for the strong hand policy in Algeria, and as one knows only too well, one militant for a wrong cause is more effective than a thousand apathetic supporters of even a good cause.

There are undoubtedly more active supporters of the government's policy in Algeria than active opponents. And one feels that in France this is due not so much to a lack of critics of the government as to a lack of people sufficiently unconcerned with material privileges and status to be prepared to risk these in the interests of conscience and human dignity. No one for instance likes the police, and everyone knows about police methods when dealing with recalcitrant "suspects". Yet it is only recently that some publicity has been given to and some public protests voiced against police powers. Similarly with the campaign in Algeria which, let us not forget, has been going on for no less than thirty months during which time the government admits to having killed 36,000 Algerians and lost 4,000 of its own forces. The vocal, militant opposition is still limited to a very small number of people, mainly writers. There has been no resistance by members of the conscript army nor among workers in the factories supplying materials and equipment for the Forces. And the Left as a whole has con-
 ★
 nived at the situation by its silence.

GOVERNMENTS are not concerned with emotions such as pride which influence the ordinary man in his actions. Governments will willingly swallow what pride they have and eat their words a hundred times over if thereby their "cause" is furthered or protected.

Viewed from this angle it seems to us that the French government's desperate attempt to register a mili-

THE leading article of the July 6th issue of FREEDOM contains the only discussion I have yet seen that bestows any illumination upon the subject of the Clean Bomb, and neatly completed the article I had in mind to write concerning opposition to the bomb. My point of view faces out across the same barren fields as those inspected by the writer of that article and mapped so accurately by him; and the comments that follow are for the most part comments upon what he wrote.

Can we believe the story about the purified bomb? Perhaps the editor is right, that a whitewashed bomb is being

tary victory in Algeria is much less a question of protecting the lives and privileges of the million French Algerians than it is a last bid by France to be considered one of the Big Powers—a consideration not of prestige but of power!

The military operations have now reached a point where the government at least cannot stop them: an army of 400,000 supported by a further 200,000 police, Territorials and special security auxiliaries using the latest military weapons short of atom bombs, and resorting to terrorism against the civil population is being urged on by the French Algerians to an all-out war of extermination of the Moslem population. (At the beginning of the struggle "rebels" were being killed at the rate of 200 a month; in 1956 the figure had reached 1,400 a month, and in the first four months of this year, 2,600 a month. The news last week that 1,000 "rebels" had been killed in two days would indicate that the killing is becoming less discriminating; that all Algerians are being considered as "rebels"). The situation on the "rebel" side is no less determined, and many of the terrorist acts are as indiscriminate as those of the French.

The tragedy in Algeria is that violence has assumed such proportions that it now obscures the issues it sought to resolve. Perhaps the only hope that it will be stopped before the bloodbath reaches huge proportions is that as the struggle drags on so both sides become more and more divided among themselves and demoralisation sets in. To our minds the French fear this more than do the "rebels" who have so far managed to carry on their struggle with an armed force a tenth of the size of the French conscript army. The government's stern measures† against the growing criticism of the Algerian venture and the abuses perpetrated not only against Algerian "suspects" but against French critics in Algeria (a number have simply "disappeared" which everybody understands to mean that they have been "taken for a ride" in the best American gangster tradition) is a pointer. Newspapers which criticise and expose the abuses are being seized and journalists and editors prosecuted. Far from destroying criticism this way it seems to act as a stimulant to many who have so far remained silent. It is sad that the French conscience has taken so long to express itself. It may yet be in time to save thousands of victims in a struggle from which politically France might reap some consolation prize in the world power alignment but which in the long run can only end with the expulsion of the French from Algeria.

The days of 19th century colonialism are over. The symbols of the new imperialism are not the muzzles of a gun and a whip, but dollar bills and technicians. It's more profitable and the new imperialists can pose in the guise of philanthropists!

†The latest Emergency regulations it should be noted are applicable not only to Algerians living in France but to Algerian Frenchmen too.

used for whitewashed nuclear tests and that the thing is as dirty as ever. But I think there are good reasons for believing that the contrary is tending to become true.

Technically a method sooner or later must be available to dispense with all or practically all of the preliminary "kick" provided by Uranium fission in form of available neutrons and heat for the subsequent fusion of Hydrogen into Helium. Without neutrons and without heat the fusion or Hydrogen bomb cannot begin to react; once it has begun to react there are of course no fission products such as Strontium-90 released by it. Such Strontium and other radioactive elements as there are formed will have originated from the already split nuclei of Uranium. The room of the Hydrogen bomb is entered with the Atom bomb as key. It is the dirty key to which one supposes the scientists are directing their cleaning-up efforts. More unlikely things than this have been accomplished.

Official information has been persistently given out only within the last two months concerning the clean bomb. If it is just a lie it is a lie that could have been thought up before. At the Congressional investigation in the early part of June one scientist was asked whether it was true that there could be no fusion without fission (i.e. that a "dirty" atomic explosion had to come before a "clean" hydrogen explosion) and the impression left was that this was very much the case. However soon afterwards Eisenhower gave as a reason for continued bomb-testing the excuse that U.S. scientists were close to achieving a clean bomb that did not scatter harmful radioactive elements. To my knowledge this was the first time such a motive behind the tests had been publicly disclosed. Then followed the arguments referred to in FREEDOM of June 30 on the part of the American military officials, that it was more humanitarian to continue the tests in the quest of a clean bomb than to discontinue them. Several statements issued by the Atomic Energy Commission were thrown around in the evasive and confusing manner we are accustomed to with that agency, of which the "96 per cent." story was an example. I quote from the letter column of the *New York Post* (date lost, but approximately a month ago):

Several weeks ago the nation's newspapers including *The Times*, ran front page headlines and stories announcing that according to the Atomic Energy Commission, the U.S. had or knew how

People & Ideas

Continued from p. 2
 found themselves "banned from the mails", a recent feature of the American Post Office's censorship has been the occasional destruction of periodicals sent by post from Iron Curtain countries (even to Universities and professional anti-communists). The Post Office's solicitor replying to protests about this blandly stated that the Post Office does not act as censor, it merely "administers the laws affecting matter in the mails".
 Alistair Cooke, contrasting the poor postal service in the United States with the efficient and obliging telephone systems, which are not a state monopoly drew the obvious inference. And a book appeared in America a few years ago with the title *The Myth of the Post Office* (by Frank Chodorov), which, no doubt sang the praises of 'free enterprise' letter carrying. That this public service should be carried on for private profit is not really a very appealing idea, but there is no doubt that there is a Post Office myth, the myth that it is the kind of activity that can only be carried on by centralised state departments.

I would like to discuss this further next week. C.W.

★
Postscript: Since the above was written, a front page article by the *Manchester Guardian's* industrial correspondent reveals that because of the impending postage increases a number of public bodies and commercial firms, including the London Electricity Board and several gas boards are thinking of delivering their own mail to save money. The North Western Electricity Board has already achieved a saving of nearly £10,000 a year by delivering bills by hand instead of through the post. An editorial comment suggests that these private posts are 'unfair' since they are simply milking the local traffic. But this does not apply to the 'illegal' device (reported in the same issue) adopted by business men in Walsall who found they could save money by sending catalogues to Holland in bulk and then having them posted to English customers!

to make a 96 per cent. clean H-Bomb. Within days the *Times* Sunday news review informed readers that "To-day's bomb is 96 per cent. cleaner than the 1954 bomb" which was 60 per cent. dirty and 40 per cent. clean. I wrote the *Times* to point out that on that basis, we did not have a 96 per cent. clean bomb, but as I calculated, a 59 per cent. clean one and that the A.E.C. had misled the press into misleading the people.

In a letter to me the news review editor said, "I am afraid we did slip on that one although it was not entirely our fault. We did try very hard to get a full explanation from the A.E.C. as to what a 'clean bomb' and specifically what a 96 per cent. clean bomb means. I am afraid we have not yet found out. Our story was in error indicating that we did."

A. KLEIN.

My point is not to reveal that the august *New York Times* is only human and errs—but that Messrs. Strauss and Libby purposely give out ambiguous, misleading statements on such a vital matter. So much so that even the highly intelligent *Times* is confused. And this being so, how are the people to know what really is the truth?

There seems to be something to the clean bomb story all the same.

ROUND THE BEND - 3

Psychology to the Rescue?

(Continued from previous issue)

A general appreciation of the fact that civilized man is possibly going further round the bend, has led to a change in attitude towards mental illness. Illnesses vary in their respectability from decade to decade. Prof. Titmuss employs a gimmick for shocking audiences into attentiveness when he lectures on public health; he casually remarks that when he discusses his ulcer on the morning bus none of the other passengers mind until he gets on to the subject of his venereal disease. The latter is still not respectable. It is becoming increasingly respectable however, to refer to one's bouts of insanity (vide Mr. Pinfold). This is an entirely desirable development and may presage a greater understanding of the nature of sickness whether we label it "mental" or "physical". It is generally agreed that mental illness is in the province of "the psychologist". What a psychologist is, is anybody's guess: most people think of him as a psychoanalyst who can psychoanalyse his victims on sight.

It is time that people realized that psychologists are in general as little competent to lay down the law about mental illness as are grocers, accountants, actors or clergymen. A large proportion of psychologists, particularly in America, know little and care less about the affairs of human beings. Humans are unsatisfactory things to study (they will think) and so whole schools of psychology have turned to white rats instead. The rats cannot answer back and contradict the university professors. There are schools of so-called "experimental psychologists" who deal with humans, but they tend to limit themselves to the safe and harmless pursuit of the study of memory for nonsense syllables, of optical illusions and the comparison of lifted weights. Those psychologists who study the real affairs of human beings are a small and not very popular minority.

When the man-in-the-street thinks of the psychologist as a psychoanalyst he is reacting to the remarkable impact which the work of Freud and his collaborators has had on 20th century thought. One of the important things which Freud has forced us to realize is that the conscious self is but a small part of a man's personality and that the consciously declared aims and attitudes of a person are therefore to be regarded with a good deal of reserve. As stated in an earlier part of his article, Freud although a brilliant and far-seeing man in his own speciality, was naive in the political implications of the institution of war. He reached an anarchist position in the realization "... that the State has forbidden to the individual the practice of wrong-doing, not because it desired to abolish it, but because it desired to monopolize it like salt and tobacco."⁵ But Freud nevertheless regarded warfare in terms of the release of the pent-up aggressive impulses of civil-

Lastly I would consider the emotional needs of scientists to have themselves absolved by the public of the charge of radiation-mongering. This alone is probably a large incentive to their producing something that can be called "clean".

What is the reason behind public opposition to bomb-testing? The reader may know that in previous articles I have been trying to play down the "radiation hazard", but when the body of that argument has been stripped to its bones what remain, as I was careful to point out, are a danger of genetic damage that cannot be exaggerated since even the smallest quantity of radiation may be directed in a path that will effect change in chromosomes; and a danger of cancer, leukaemia and other afflictions, that has been exaggerated, but a danger which still has to be considered to exist.

Michael Wace wrote to the Editors (FREEDOM, July 13) taking issue with my estimate of the radiation hazards of bomb-testing, and of course he is right in the sense that no hazard at all is to be preferred to some hazard, however small. Perhaps I am wrong in suggesting that no reason exists to suppose that bomb-testing will increase the incidence of cancer. However this sort of remark was qualified by the statement that exposure to radiation is of course dangerous but release of radiation is not the chief nor the only threat against us that the men who test the bombs are making.

Continued on p. 4

ized man, without taking due cognizance of the fact that war is the affair of governments, not peoples, and that ordinary people have to be coerced, tricked and wheedled into taking part in modern wars. There is no spontaneous outburst of pent-up aggression which can be held to account for the declaration of modern wars; they are carefully planned and prepared for and the main problem of the State is how to force the people into accepting their rôle in the war.

Freud well appreciated the rôle of anxiety in the civilized society which he knew, and was deeply pessimistic in his later years. In 1929 he wrote:

"We cannot do without palliative remedies. We cannot dispense with auxiliary constructions, as Theodor Fontane said. There are perhaps three of these means: powerful diversions of interest which lead us to care little about our misery; substitutive gratifications, which lessen it; and intoxicating substances, which make us insensitive to it."⁶

For him, the mental ills of civilization were the inevitable price which man had to pay for his evolution up from the brute beast. Culture involved renunciation of instinctual gratification all along, and such renunciation involved the mechanisms producing anxiety which sours the lives of the well-fed and protected populations who have banished the conditions of pain and fear from their everyday lives. What unhappy philosophy of misery is this—are we doomed to the fate of Prometheus who having stolen fire from the gods (the equivalent of the Jewish myth of eating of the Tree of Knowledge) was eternally condemned to endure the peckings of the Vulture of anxiety?

We read of the heroic efforts to free the people of Sicily from their grinding poverty, to bring relief to the malaria-stricken millions of India, to spread Western standards of comfort all over the world—but do we follow this gift with a billion billion capsules of tranquilizers and mass produce the apparatus for shock-therapy? Do we make plans for converting the leper-hospitals to mental hospitals to anticipate the future need?

It is necessary to revise our ideas about sickness, physical and mental, and to realize that the present tendency of people in a well-fed Welfare State to go round the bend at an alarming rate is no mere accident, but a phenomenon which might have been anticipated when a megalopolitan civilization was planned. Nor is it a sheer coincidence that such civilizations should now be perfecting the means by which the technical triumphs of man may be obliterated from the face of the earth. G.

(To be continued)

5 S. Freud, *Thoughts for the Times on War and Death*, 1915.
 6 S. Freud, *Civilization and its Discontents*, 1929.

