"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.

Threepence

Vol. 18, No. 34

August 24th, 1957

Outcome of Five Months Talk

DISARMAMENT DEADLOCK

THE most astonishing feature of the London disarmament con- the London disarmament con- capitalistic reasons for failure; what the London disarmament con- capitalistic reasons for failure; what the Conversely the West has outlined a ference 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 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

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 themother than a politician should think selves 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

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 reunification, 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 arma-(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

tentions regarding the future of really is! 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

ferences in the twentieth century is,

on its own, almost sufficient proof

of the absurdity of expecting any-

thing to be achieved. The results

from those which have taken place

since the end of the war have been

an increase in the level of distrust,

a higher rate of denunciations and

accusations and a consequent tem-

perature drop in the cold war. The

London disarmament conference

promises to be no exception.

AS we go to Press the government politician. Such twisted thinking has not yet announced its in- shows what a good Party man he

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 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

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?

mentality that the 14th Julythe 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 my 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-

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 myth-

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 prisonwith 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 besported themselves through the streets of Paris with starry-eyed fiancées on one arm and proud, chaperoning-prospectivemother-in-laws on the other.

IT tells us something of the French backs since the "glorious" exploits 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

PEOPLE AND IDEAS

Hull, the G.P.O. and Lysander Spooner

WHEN the Postmaster-General announced, a month ago, the increased postal and telephone charges which are to come into force on October 1st. people learnt with some surprise and envy that the city of Hull in Yorkshire which is unique in owning its own telephone service, would continue to enjoy its very low charges including the twopenny call from public telephone boxes, which disappeared years ago elsewhere in Britain.

Hull, with its 51,000 telephones and 239 green and cream public call boxes offers an efficient and enterprising phone service, which, even if charges are raised to meet increasing costs, will still be far cheaper than the G.P.O. service. An exclusive private telephone with 200 free calls costs £7 a year. The present Post Office rate in the provinces is £9 a year with only 100 free calls, and after October 1st it will be £12 a year with no free calls. A business telephone in Hull costs £8 10s. with 400 free calls, and £15 3s. 4d. anywhere else in the provinces. When the national rates go up a business telephone including 400 free cails will amount to £19 per annum compared with Hull's £8 10s.

Hull's supplementary services include a free service for reporting leaking taps, a Santa Claus programme at Christmas, a recipe service, and information about television programmes and sports results. The Hull telephone manager announces that because of capital expenditure, the department, which made a profit of £33,000 in 1954, is now losing money, but that another £1 from every subscriber would turn the present deficit to a substantial profit. It is not yet proposed to raise charges.

The unique position in Hull is due to the fact that when the state bought up the telephone systems in 1912, the City of Hull, unlike other municipalities which pioneered telephone systems (Glasgow, Brighton, Swansea, Portsmouth and Tunbridge Wells), declined to turn in its licence to the Post Office.

Telephone users, from plutocrats to callbox queuers, everywhere else in the country, must, if they know of the situation in Hull, wonder what exactly the advantages of a centralised state system are, especially those many thousands of subscribers who, since the Postmaster-General's announcement on July 18th, have decided that so far as they are concerned the telephone service has priced itself out of existence, and have applied to be disconnected. The Postmaster-

General too, might remember the unpleasant shock it got when it last increased the charge for telegrams and found that the sharp decline in the number of telegrams sent cancelled out the anticipated increase in revenue. Significantly the charge for inland telegrams is one of the very few Post Office charges which will not be increased in October.

THE increase in postal charges for letters, postcards, printed matter and parcels also raises interesting issues, though there is no mail-carrying equivalent to the City of Hull to enable comparisons to be made. The Postmaster-General's explanation that eleven-twelfths of the additional bill was for Post Office wage increases was received quietly by M.P.s, whose own salaries had risen sharply in the previous week. Moreover, the Post Office wage increases were merely implementing the findings of the Priestley Royal Commission, appointed in 1953, which recommended that wages in the Post Office and Civil Service should be brought into line with those in outside industry.

At a press conference after his announcements the PMG said that he had only three alternatives. The first course open to the Government, he said, was to make the taxpayer pay, the second was to slash services, and the third was to increase charges. (He was in a happier position than his counterpart in the United States, who is having to make the postal service in the richest country in the world, the worst in the world, because the senators, with their eyes fixed on the voters back home, steadfastly refuse to vote him enough money to run the service properly). Inland postal services are by no means as good as they were before the war, and there doesn't seem from the outside to be much room for 'slashing', though no doubt the Post Office workers could suggest ways of increasing efficiency at the expense of bureaucracy.

Until Rowland Hill's day, the charge for postage was based on distance, and when he introduced the penny post in 1840 it was expected that the loss on long-distance mail would be balanced by the profit on short distances. The system worked at a loss at first but after

a time the expansion of business resulted in a profit. (Nowadays, for inexplicable reasons it costs less to send your FREE-DOM to San Francisco or Syndey than it does to send it to London). The uniform charge is a recognition of the 'to each according to his needs' principle, and it is possible to envisage the post as a 'free' service like the public library system. Personally, however, faced with the alternative of increased postal charges or increased taxation, since a single football pool promotor makes more use of the Post Office in a week than Freedom Press does in a year, or than I am likely to in a lifetime, I would rather the postal rates were increased.

INCREASES in postal charges always seem to come rather ironically. For just as we celebrated the hundredth anniversary of the penny post by putting the rate up from three-halfpence to twopence-halfpenny, so we commemorate the three-hundredth anniversary of the office of Postmaster-General by raising it again to threepence, at a time when his activities in letter-opening and wiretapping, long denied or glossed over, have been brought into the public eye to such an extent that even the most naïve and trusting citizen can no longer shrug them off as 'something that doesn't

happen here'. In a recent note in these columns Donald Rooum pointed out that these activities were in fact the original purpose of the Postmaster-General's office and that anyone "who supposes that the Post Office was created in order to make it easier for citizens to communicate with each other, is gravely in error". He went on to explain that Oliver Cromwell's purpose in 1657 in creating the office was

"to nationalise the existing postal services, and make illegal the setting up of new ones, in order that state officials might spy out 'the many dangerous and wicked designs which have been and are daily contrived against the peace and welfare of this Commonwealth, the intelligence of which cannot well be communicated except by letter of escript'.

"After the Lord Protector's death, the restored monarchy and successive governments allowed the Postmaster Act to remain on the statute book in order to

prevent wicked and dangerous designs against the Kingdom; and in order to discourage private (illegal) letter-carrying, they vastly improved the service. The most notable improvement was the introduction of the penny post . . . but the reason for this measure was that the State was losing its monopoly. Over half the letters written at the time were being carried privately, or in the world of Roland Hill, the Postmaster, 'smuggled'."

This highly interesting fragment of the history of our oldest nationalised industry, brought to my mind the struggle of Lysander Spooner, one of the nineteenthcentury American individualist anarchists, against the Federal Post Office, and fortunately there has just come to hand James J. Martin's Men Against the State which describes Spooner's activities. He had started in 1844 the American Letter Mail Company, and, says Dr. Martin:

"It was a source of embarrassment to the Democratic administrations of the period to see this company, as well as other letter mail companies, making profits from carrying letters for 5 and 10 cents each, while providing service somewhat more expeditious than that furnished by the federal postal system. Increasing complaints by patrons over the dilatory and expensive government operations finally provoked congressional action.

A bill came before the Senate providing for improved services, but it was pointed out that the private carriers would still be cheaper. To which the sponsor relied that there would be no attempt to compete with these firms. They would be put out of business by "penal enactment". Spooner claimed that the bill would be unconstitutional, since Article 1, Section 8 merely provided that Congress might establish post offices and post roads of its own. "The Constitution expressed, neither in terms, nor by necessary implication, any prohibition upon the establishment of mails, post offices, and post roads by the states or individuals". He pointed out that the power to establish and the power to. prohibit were two distinct powers, and that Congress distinctly did not have the power to prohibit additional mail services". He exhausted his resources in fighting the government over this issue, and the private companies were eliminated by an act of Congress providing stiff fines for carrying mails except through the government postal system. "The

gradual adoption of a rate of postage similar to that charged by his company nevertheless gave him a measure of personal satisfaction", and he has earned the title "the father of cheap postage in America".

Spooner, in his pamphlet Private Mails, opposing the government monopoly, besides the objections of slowness and costliness, and the objection that "Its immense patronage and power, used, as they always will be, corruptly, make it also a very great political evil", raised one very important point. He asserted, in Dr. Martin's words that:

"the establishment of a government monopoly over the mails, followed by the exclusion therefrom of such materials as it cared, was actually an infringement upon the freedom of the press. This latter meant not merely the freedom of printing papers and books but the freedom of selling and circulating them as well. This was a very important point, for without the latter, the former was of no value at all. Therefore this selling and circulating freedom implied the right of publishers to reach buyers in any manner they chose. Should the government be the sole carrier, it might ban the publications it did not approve

THE subsequent history of the radical press in America has proved his contention correct. And quite apart from those publications which have Continued on p. 3

Was this the Class Struggle?

Editorial Reply:

OUR reader, G.G., of Peebles, took us to task last week for not condemning the violence of the strikers during the recent bus strike-in fact his interpretation of our article ('Is this the Class Struggle'—FREEDOM 3/8/57) is that we tacitly supported the violent tactics of the strikers.

If he will read our article again, he will see that our remarks about the violent incidents were actually nothing more than recording the actual facts of what had happened. True we did not condemn the objectionable tactics of some of the busmen, but neither did we show any approval of them. The words 'wellorganised' were objective; whether G.G., FREEDOM or the Daily Express approve or not, the ambushes organised by the pickets were well-organised,

By referring to the RAF's action in Oman, we were not trying to make two wrongs make a right. We were attempting to show the hypocrisy of the Press which approves of the RAF bombings but holds up pious hands in horror at the 'hooliganism' of the strikers.

G.G. offers us six hypothetical possibilities, not, as he says for the sake of argument, but for the sake of understanding'. Unfortunately for his attempt at clarification, all his examples refer to himself getting round the absence of buses by either (a) walking or (b) to (f) getting or not getting a lift to town with a private motorist. All of which is pretty irrelevant to the actual struggles of the pickets, who were concerned to stop buses running with blackleg crews.

Violent incidents involving private motorists must have been very rare indeed. Perhaps some did occur, but if they did they were probably outnumbered by the cases where busmen continued to operate special school and hospital buses for children and the sick.

Like G.G., we agree that violence proves nothing. But a blind condemning of violence without understanding the underlying reasons, the background, serves no useful purpose either. If a large body of men-all conditioned by a violent society, nearly all having served their time in the Forces—are frustrated in what they consider to be their fair claims, are left inactive and dumb in their own cause for months while their leaders talk and talk but let them do or say nothing and are then given orders to act when the talkers have failed; what can anybody expect but explosions?

We most certainly agree with G.G. that different tactics—such as running the buses free-would have hit the employers without alienating the public, which is what is wanted. But such tactics are anarcho-syndicalist tactics and the busmen are organised in the Transport & General Workers' Union. They are not organised to be responsible, they are organised to do as they are told-to be irresponsible. No point in getting indignant when they act irresponsibly.

Lastly, we refer G.G. again to the last two paragraphs of our article, in which we explained why we were cool about the bus strike and would give our wholehearted support only when they go after workers' control. We really didn't sound all that happy about it!

Thirty Years Have Passed

SACCO & VANZETTI

ON August 23, 1927, Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti were executed for a crime they did not commit. The repercussions of their trial were such that even to-day a conservative newspaper* can publish an article about them entitled "Double Execution That Shocked The World". It is true that the article states that they were "really on trial because they were openly of Communist opinions", when any student of the case knows that they were not communists, but anarchists. But it is at least a tribute to the stand they made during their seven years of suffering that they are still remembered outside the circle of those who share their principles.

At the end of the first World War there began an infamous mass deportation of radicals from the U.S.A. Attorney General Palmer Mitchell, seizing upon the recent Russian Revolution of 1917 as an excuse, fanned to fever heat the anti-radical hysteria which sprang up during the war. His agents arrested thousands of socialists, syndicalists and anarchists. Beatings-up were common, "treat 'em rough" being the order of the day. Among those arrested was Andrea Salsedo, an active comrade of Sacco and Vanzetti. Salsedo, together with Robert Elia, was held incommunicado in the Department of Justice Building in Brooklyn. On May 3, 1920, his body fell from a fourteenth storey window onto the pavement below. The authorities said he had committed suicide, but his friends accused them of murder.

Two days later, during the evening of May 5, Sacco and Vanzetti were arrested while travelling in a trolley car. Sacco had in his possession a leaflet announcing a meeting of protest at Salsedo's death at which Vanzetti was billed to speak.

"THIS DAY AUGUST 23, 1927 NICOLA SACCO AND

BARTOLOMEO VANZETTI

workingmen and dreamers of the brotherhood of man, who hoped it might be found in America were done to a cruel death by the children of those who fled, long ago, to this land for freedom

Their voices are gone into all the earth and they will be remembered in gratitude and tears, when the names of those who murdered them-JUDGES GOVERNORS SCHOLARS

> have gone down into everlasting shame."

They thought their arrest was due to their radical activities. They were charged with murders committed during an armed hold-up at Braintree on April 15. Vanzetti was also charged and sentenced for allegedly taking part in an armed robbery at Bridgewater on December 24, 1919. They were found guilty in spite of the proofs of their innocence which were offered and they were sentenced to death.

The legal struggle to save them lasted seven years and only ceased the day before the State of Massachusetts ordered its executioner to electrocute them. In spite of the intervention of a famous and respectable Boston lawyer, the defence stood no chance of succeeding. Each time it submitted an appeal against the conduct of the trial judge, Webster Thayer, or on the basis of fresh evidence, it was Webster Thayer

who ruled that he had shown no prejudice, or that the evidence did not warrant a new trial. Legal experts such as Professor (now Federal Judge) Frankfurter, poets such as Edna St. Vincent Millay, and many other prominent men and women from the arts, the professions, and the sciences, were among those who protested the innocence of Sacco and Vanzetti or demanded a new trial. Even two such disparate individuals as Robert Benchley, the humorist, and Mussolini, the dictator, became involved. But nothing could prevail against the determination of the authorities and good citizens of Massachusetts to do justice by denying justice.

In showing us how to die, Sacco and Vanzetti taught us how to live. The lesson to be drawn from their deaths, however, is not merely that of an exercise in martyrology. Vanzetti wrote that the vengeance he desired was "the realization of freedom, the great deliverance which would beneficiate all my friends as well as all my enemies . . . " Sharing with him, and his beloved friend Sacco, the libertarian ideal, we can best remember them by working for this "great deliverance", the realization of freedom in ourselves and in our relations with our fellows. If mankind ever come to understand that justice cannot be obtained from laws; that the governed man is not the free man; and that we cannot be brothers until we are also "rebels and lovers"—then the violence inflicted by man upon man will cease, and the spirit in which Sacco and Vanzetti died will enter into the lives of those who will be living in freedom and in brotherhood.

S. E. PARKER.

*The Yorkshire Evening Post, August 3,

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

(Open 10 a.m.-6.30 p.m., 5 p.m. Sats:) New Books . . . What is Theatre? E. Bentley 25/-A Father and his Fate Ivy Compton-Burnett 13/6 Gwyn Thomas 13/6 Gazooka Remainder . . . Adversary in the House (On Eugene Debs) Irving Stone 4/6 Reprint . . . Chants of Labour (song book with music) ed. by Edward Carpenter 2/6 Second-Hand . . . Ethel Mannin 4/-Red Rose Incidents of the French Revolution G. Lenotre 4/in Brittany A Little Treasury of Modern Poetry ed. Oscar Williams 4/-The Social Contract Jean-Jacques Rousseau 3/-The Monk and the Hangman's Daughter De Castro & Ambrose Bierce 3/6 No Painted Plumage T. F. Powys 3/-The Labour Party in Perspective C. R. (Lord) Attlee (Limp) 2/6 Waiting for Nothing Tom Kromer 3/6 The Lost Bay Manes Sperber 4/-

Americans Abroad

Man's Worldly Goods

Why Another World War?

Essays on Contemporary Events

Periodicals . . . American Rationalist, July 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

Berkman,

Leo Huberman 2/6

C. G. Jung 3/6

Goldman, Miller, etc. 8/-

George Gilbert Armstrong 3/6

found! Postage free on all items Obtainable from

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

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

Continued **ALGERIA**

Shops and cafés, factories and workshops 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 connived at the situation by its silence.

COVERNMENTS 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-

Freedom on Being Against the Atom Bomb-4

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 be 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 muzzle 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 pro-Algerian Frenchmen too.

used for whitwashed 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 neturons 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. 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

found themselves "banned from the mails", a recent feature of the American Post Office's censorship has been the occasional destruction of periodicals

Continued from p. 2

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 State 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.

Postscript: Since the above was wirtten, 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

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.

Lastly I would consider the emotional needs of scients 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 bom-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

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 lead 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 desires 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 civilized 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 malariastricken 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

It is necessary to revise our ideas about sickness, physical and mental, and to realize that the prescent 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 meglapolitan 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.

(To be continued)

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

Anarchist Summer School Lectures

BEYOND THE WAGE SYSTEM

(Continued from previous issue)

TF statutory regulations of employment, trade union action and joint consultation have served only to make the wage system more palatable, what of the forces of socialism? The socialist movement at its inception had as one of its central objects the abolition of the wage system and its replacement by a system of co-operative labour. To-day, except among certain fringe sects of the socialist movement, nothing is heard of this object which is regarded by bright young intellectuals such as Tony Crosland as no more than an out-moded shibboleth. The real effect of socialist measures has turned out to be very much the one predicted by Bernard Shaw 60 years ago in a remarkable but little known essay on "The Illusions of Socialism". In this essay Shaw contrasts the enthusiastic utopians with the down-to-earth realistic Fabians like himself and he concludes: "Out of the illusion of 'the abolition of the wage system', we shall get steady wages for everybody and finally discredit all other sources of income as disreputable. By the illusion of the downfall of Capitalism we shall turn whole nations into Joint Stock Companies; and our determination to annihilate the bourgeoisie will end in making every workman a bourgeois gentil-homme."

It is important to understand why socialism, as commonly understood, should have this effect. The 'New Socialism' which postulates the continuance of capitalist enterprise or which seeks merely State purchase or acquisition of shares in private firms quite clearly involves no radical change in the wage system. But neither does the oldfashioned socialism proceeding by means of nationalising industries. All that happens under nationalisation is that the State or some corporate agent of the State, such as a public corporation, becomes the employer. The logic of State Socialism is not the elevation of all workers to the status of employers-in the sense that the traditional functions of the capitalist are taken over by the workers-but the reduction of all men to the status of employees. Complete State Socialism involves the universalisation-or nationalisation if you likeof the wage system. State Socialism is not the usurper of capitalism but its legitimate heir. It rationalises capitalism and completes the tendencies inherent in capitalism. The total alienation of the worker from the means of production is achieved. Where it operates, as under Communist régimes where all independent protective workers' organisa-

tions are eliminated, it makes possible an exploitation of the workers unparalleled by private capitalism in its hey-day. Of course, under State Socialism the capitalist class is eliminated: no group receives profits from ownership of the means of production. But a new ruling class of organisers emerges, whose control of the State's instruments of coercion ensure that they receive preferential rewards, both in money and in kind. They too are technically wage-earners in our sense, but a very special set of wageearners who take over the entrepreneurial functions of the capitalists in return for 'differentials' often greater than those obtained by the old owners.

The fundamental error of orthodox socialism, whether Marxist or Fabian, is the belief that the socialisation of the means of production is not only the necessary but also the sufficient condition for the transformation of capitalism into a co-operative system. It is now clear, as it has been clear to a minority of radicals all along, that it makes very little difference to the worker whether the enterprise in which he works is owned by an abstraction—the people or by private shareholders. In both cases, control is in the hands of a bureaucracy; in the one a Government bureaucracy, in the other a private bureaucracy. The things that matter to the worker are the actual and realistic conditions of his work, the relation of the worker to his work, and his relation to his fellowworkers and the direction of the enterprise.

The only alternative to the wage system compatible with a libertarian society is the organisation of work on the basis of free co-operation. A system of free co-operation in work presupposes that there are not two classes of peopleemployers and employed-but rather that each member of the enterprise is regarded as an equal and responsible partner. As an equal and responsible partner and worker is not subject to the commands of an external authority. If within the co-operative group it is found necessary to delegate to certain individuals the right to give orders to others, then the persons wielding this authority derive their authority from the group and are responsible to the group as a whole. In such a system capital is treated as a servant: labour employs capital and not capital, labour. No set of persons uses other persons as a means to its own ends: each person is regarded as an individual end in himself. The worker is not alienated from his work

since, jointly with his fellow-workers, he is a responsible agent who participates in the decision-making process of the group. I believe that under such a system, even if all work could not be made attractive, it would at least become meaningful in a way in which most of the work performed in our society is not.

Under a co-operative system of work there are no wage-earners, just as there are no wage-earners in a private partnership in which all the partners participate actively and no outsiders are employed. The co-operative system is essentially a system of self-employment: any remuneration received by members do not constitute wages but disbursements made according to the disposition of the whole group. I would insist at this point that the essence of the co-operative system of work is self-employment because, in his chapter on The Wage System in The Conquest of Bread, Kropotkin seems to me to confuse the issue. In criticising collectivism, he writes as though the receipt of any form of remuneration whether in money or in labour notes is a mark of the wage system. He thus comes close to siding with those reactionary critics who forty years ago ridiculed the guild socialist distinction be-

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 33

£660

£440

£220

On Being Against the Atom Bonb

Deficit on Freedom Contributions received DEFICIT

August 9 to August 16

Hoddesdon: A.R. 10/-; London: E.P.* £1; London: Anon. 1/3; London: J.S.* 3/-; Chatswood: G.M. £2; Chatswood: R.G. £1. G.M. £2; Coleman's Hatch: D.M. £1/2/6. Total ...

Previously acknowledged ... 435 14 9 1957 TOTAL TO DATE ... £440 16 6

GIFTS OF BOOKS: Munich: A. A-R: London: C.W.; Hong Kong: M.S. *Indicates regular contributor.

Fire Fund

Chatswood: G.M. £2; Chatswood: R.G. £ Total Previously acknowledged ... 365 3 3

TOTAL TO DATE ... £368 3 3

tween wages and pay. If the receipt of any remuneration for work done is a form of wages then we should have to include the housing and rations of slaves as wages, which makes nonsense of the distinction between slavery and the wagesystem. The wage system may be a new form of slavery but it is wage-slavery not slavery per se. Similarly, on Kropotkin's argument, we should have to call the profits received by the selfemployed capitalist wages and thus annihilate the distinction between employer and employed. I go all the way with Kropotkin in his communist criticisms of individual remuneration: it is impossible to determine precisely the value of any one person's contribution to cooperative labour and, even if it were possible, the moral argument against differentials, other than on the basis of individual needs, would still stand. There is a sound moral argument against differentials and it becomes increasingly important now that we are developing into a society where technically even the managerial controllers of industry are wage-earners and the powers of ownership, whether by private capitalists or the State, are severely restricted. But, unless we distinguish between the arguments for communism and the arguments against the wage system we are likely to dismiss out of hand a number of significant experiments which have either gone beyond the wage system or have modified it radically in the direction of a free co-operative system.

Perhaps the most interesting of these are the 70 or so Communities of Work which have been started in France since the war, of which the most famous is Boimondau at Valence, a community of some 150 families engaged in the business of making watch-glasses. In this country, the oldest experiments in this field are the 40 or so Co-operative Copartnerships engaged mainly in the clothing, printing and boot and shoe trades. These Co-operative Co-partnerships, although part of the wider Co-operative Movement, are to be distinguished sharply from the retail and wholesale cooperatives. The latter are essentially consumer-controlled organisations which have in effect abandoned the original objectives of the Co-operative pioneers, such as Robert Owen and William Thompson. The consumer co-operative movement is a genuine alternative to capitalism; it is a form of collectivism and superior to State collectivism in that it is a voluntary movement. But, like State collectivism, it does not involve the

abolition of the wage system: retail.cooperative employees remain employees,... albeit employees of the consumer shareholding members. The Co-operative Copartnerships, on the other hand, do aspire to the abolition of the wage system. They grew out of the numerousattempts in the 19th century to set up self-governing workshops owned and controlled by the workers themselves. In their present form they are not based on the principle of pure workers' control. Besides the worker-members, there are corporate members in the shape of other co-operative societies and a few trade unions and, in addition, individual nonworkers, usually former workers or their relatives. In practice however it is the worker-members who control these societies. Each member has one vote and together they elect a management committee to direct the enterprise, subject to decisions of regular general meetings.

Some of these co-operative co-partnerships, although not all, may not be the last word in economic efficiency, although the fact that they have survived at all. in a hostile and competitive environment is in itself creditable. Of greater significance is the fact that they have succeeded in humanising work. The general atmosphere of fellowship among the working co-partners, symbolised by the complete absence in their history of strikes or lock-outs, stands in marked contrast to the atmosphere prevailing in most other factories, whether privately or State-owned. G.N.O.

(To be continued)

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

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

EVERY SUNDAY IN AUGUST OPEN DISCUSSIONS

Questions, Discussion and Admission all free. **OPEN AIR MEETINGS**

Weather Permitting HYDE PARK Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

GLASGOW

OPEN AIR MEETINGS Maxwell Street Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.

* Malatesta Club *

SWARAJ HOUSE, 32 PERCY STREET, TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD, LONDON, W.I. (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

LIBERTARIAN FORUM 813 Broadway, (Between 11th and 12th Sts.)

New York City. Friday Evenings at 8.30

August 30.—Sam Weiner: ETHICS IN THE AMERICAN LABOUR MOVEMENT. September 6.-Richard de Haan:

THE DEVELOPMENT OF XIX CENTURY RADICAL PHILOSOPH-ERS. September 13.—Russell Blackwell:

INDIVIDUAL AND COMMUNITY RESPONSIBILITY IN TO-DAY'S AMERICA.

MONTHLY SOCIAL SUPPER Saturday, August 17 at 7.30 p.m. VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTION

FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

Postal Subscription Rates: 12 months 19/- (U.S.A. \$3.00) 6 months 9/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50) 3 months 5/- (U.S.A. \$0.75) Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies 12 months 29/- (U.S.A. \$4.50) 6 months 14/6 (U.S.A. \$2.25) Cheques, P.O.'s and Money Orders should be made out to FREEDOM PRESS, crossed a/c Payee, and addressed to the publishers FREEDOM PRESS 27 Red Lion Street London, W.C.I. England

Tel.: Chancery 8364

A SUGGESTION THE AWKWARD QUESTION

HOW many readers, I wonder, were dren. as moved as I was by C.W.'s article, 'The Awkward Question', last week? His present series on People and Ideas is so consistently of a high standard that it takes a particularly telling piece of writing to stand out-but I think that 'The Awkward Question' is outstanding and is far too good to be used only in the one issue of FREEDOM and then to reappear a year later in the 1957 volume of Selections. It should reach every adult who has in any way any responsibility for the upbringing or welfare of chil-

Now Ready!

SELECTIONS FROM "FREEDOM"

Volume 6, 1956 OIL AND TROUBLED WATERS

312 pages paper 7/6, Cloth 10/6*

VOLUMES 1-5

Vol. 1, 1951, Mankind is One Vol. 2, 1952, Postscript to Posterity Vol. 3, 1953, Colonialism on Trial Vol. 4, 1954, Living on a Volcano

Vol. 5, 1955, The Immoral Moralists each volume paper 7s. 6d. cloth 10s. 6d.

The paper edition of the Selections is available to readers of FRBEDOM at 5/- a copy

FIVE SHILLINGS

each volume

(The complete set is offered at the Special Price of £1 post free)

ORDER NOW

be reached.

This of course means everybody, but there are some with special resopnsibilities for the fate of children and I feel that it is not beyond our resources to reach them all with reprints of C.W.'s article if we make an effort. Copies should be sent to every teacher in the country, to every official in every education authority, every remand home, borstal, youth club, scout and guide troop, cadet corps, to every Member of Parliament, and every parent that can

This, in an attempt to make them feel some shame, some responsibility, for what the grown-ups who run the world have done, are doing, and will do to their children.

Last week a couple killed their children and then gassed themselves because, it was alleged, they were afraid of war. This seems to me to be not the best solution, to say the least. Better I should have thought, to give one's time while alive to attempts to create a more positive attitude among adults-and children themselves-to reduce the ability of states to make war.

I think C.W.'s article might do some good in this direction, if it can be distributed in the way I have described. Are there any comrades willing to take on the work of financing and distributing reprinted leaflets? I am prepared to give the time necessary to produce-at cost (max. 15s. per 1000) any quantity that others will distribute.

Distribution will entail raising the cost of the leaflets and envelopes and postage and the work of compiling lists of addresses of the most suitable recipients and then sending them off. Individuals or groups should not find it difficult to handle fair quantities.

But I'm not prepared to produce any if they are simply going to gather dust in Freedom Bookshop. What offers?

Yours fraternally, London. PHILIP SANSOM.

I am in complete agreement with the editorial article already referred to when a suspicion was voiced of nine tenths of those people campaigning for "Banning the Bombs". After all, just what are most people agitating for? For banning not the bombs but the testing of bombs. Has anyone been heard to engage in direct action in influencing scientists to stop work on the bombs? No, they

Continued from p. 3

want them for their national safety. Has anyone suggested dismantling the bombs already stockpiled for miliary use? What, after all the expense of putting them all together? Have any but lonely voices protested against inhabitants of Pacific Islands being de-Magna-Cartaed while the atomic pall is hung over their fields and lagoons? Well, we give them compensation. Land being rendered uninhabitable for decades by its molten rock? What is the worm that is eating into peoples consciences? Why alone the testing that such a stew is brew-

The answer is simple. Radio-active contamination of the atmosphere. Remove this feature of the bomb and 90 per cent. (I would add on quite a few more digits) of your public protestants will vanish as exhaustively as the nuclei whose fission they at present bewail.

As recalled in that editorial piece, and it should be framed on every wall, the happy-go-lucky, non-thinking bomb-banners have tolerated with casual nonconcern every weapon of war so far devised, and for an excellent reason: only cats are really against vivisection. Should it have been necessary to drop a few block busters here and there, nobody foretelling where the next "Block-buster Bomb test" might happen, before the weapon was considered fit to help us war against the enemy, what an outcry there would then have been to ban the B-bomb tests!

Before this decade the weapons in our arsenal were designed safely on paper and tested harmlessly in open country and wild-bird reserves. They didn't hit you, as now, in testing, our latest weapons do. A new element (in fact several new elements) entered the scene. The public, prodded by different groups to suit their ends, reacted in a manner that should have made any independently

thinking person suspicious that the world was not, as some were putting forth the view, becoming pacifist. "Look at the outcry against the atom bomb". Alright look at it. Analysed the outcry can be seen to be a neurotic overreation to selfharm, rationalised by an over-estimation of the danger of radio-active contamin-

Behind every neurotic fear it is said lies a realistic one. But the neurotic person is giving himself at best poor service by dealing alone with the fear he is aware of.

What are the chief dangers of the atom bomb? Not so much dangers of testing but the dangers of its existence at all Dangerous atomic tests are a thing of the present. It is probably certain that very soon the bomb will become a "conventional" weapon, and join that class of missiles which sportsmen at war may avail themselves of. When this happens the 90 (or more) per cent, will take up the offer of the government to sign on for a week's training course and the first lecture will touch briefly upon the topic, how good the bombs are now compared with 1957.

The danger of the bomb is that it increases the danger of war, both of war occurring and of war being more destructive even than it has been before.

FREEDOM is correct in suggesting that as soon as we have a "clean" bomb public opposition will melt away; that furthermore the deterrent of radioactivity bouncing back on your home base will have been removed for a bombowning government.

A most compelling danger that exists as a consequence of the existence of the bombs is the possibility that we have now reached the time when the private fantasies of a politician can become reality without it being previously necessary for him to overcome the inertia of the public. Public opinion except in a superficial capacity may soon become superfluous to a politician. The Bomb maketh dictators for us all.

A final article may be of some help to myself and to other readers in trying to think out what can be done to meet the