

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"Vain hope, to make people happy by politics!"
 —THOMAS CARLYLE.

WE CHALLENGE LORD HAILSHAM

LORD HAILSHAM begins to talk like a *führer* already. The cult of the personality of which we warned you a fortnight ago has taken no time at all to get going and most strenuous worker of all for the cause is Lord Hailsham himself.

Here is what he had to say at Carlisle last Saturday:—

"I regard any criticism of the Queen as I would an attack on my own wife or members of my family. I bitterly resent it.

"I would not have the Queen any way but the way she is. It is almost disrespectful to say this, but the Queen is an unmitigated asset.

She has a staunch note of service and patriotism which is an example to us all. I want to make it quite clear that this is truly personal defiance. I am not trying to cash in on this politically.

"I am speaking not as chairman of the Conservative Party or Lord President of the Council—but as a man who is one of her Majesty's many millions of subjects."

Lord Hailsham referred to "cowardly, detestable critics of the Queen." He added:—

"I would prefer not to mention individuals, but in future I shall give those people the 'treatment'—personal treatment. But what that will be I would not like to speculate."

Lord Hailsham also warned that "from now on, whoever attacks the Conservative Government, the Conservative Party, or the country at home or abroad, whether he is the head of an avowedly Power, or a trade union boss, or anyone else, will be counterattacked as vigorously as possible on every point."

★

Terrifying stuff, isn't it? Now, however, that we have finished shaking in our shoes, we should like to point out that if Lord Hailsham wants to be taken seriously he had better stop acting the fool and start behaving like a responsible human being.

The anarchist never expects people in power to behave responsibly and sees their relationship with the rest of the human race as usually more apparent than real, but Lord Hailsham specifically explained to us that he uttered his grisly warning merely as one of Her Majesty's millions of subjects. Laying aside his Lord President's robes and putting down his chairman's bell, Hailsham steps outside. Shed of his little brief authority we see him for what he is.

May we say—to be kind, and not to be guilty of bad taste—that we are not impressed? Further, to quote a lady whose memory, we are sure, Hailsham holds dear: We are not amused. We simply see a man of some native intelligence behaving like a buffoon for the lowest possible motives. We see a podgy little fellow trying on some rusty old armour left lying around a few centuries ago by ancestors now as dead—and as obsolete—as the dodo. We see a political opportunist trying his damndest to do the very thing he protests he is above doing—the only qualification being that if he is not doing it for political capital he is doing it for *personal* capital.

Lord Hailsham is out to make a name for himself, principally for the gratification of his political ambitions but also hoping that if he can attract enough attention to his own ebullient personality—by whatever clownish methods—less notice will be taken of the general level of mediocrity of the Conservative Party and the ineptitude of the Conservative Government.

Hailsham is foredoomed to failure. Even by its own miserable standards the present Conservative Government's inefficiency is more spectacular than his buffoonery. It

will take more than his diversionary tactics and the soporific value of millions of photographs of the Royal Family to frustrate completely the apparent determination of the Tory administration to antagonise just about everybody.

The faded gentlewomen who work so staunchly for the Party; the middle classes so resentful of the increased purchasing power of the workers; the petty-minded people without the wit or imagination to be other than conventional in every way; all those whose horizons are limited to an ossified social pattern and whose only escape is by identification with privilege, colour and glamour beyond their reach—all these pathetic products of the bourgeois nightmare will thrill to Hailsham's hullabaloo for the same reasons that weak people everywhere seek a symbol of strength under which to hide their weakness.

Perhaps we give Lord Hailsham too much importance. We can only say that if a little more importance had been credited to Hitler in his early days the history of this century might have been different. By dismissing that psychopath as an ignorant rabble-rouser, people who should have known better left the way clear for the emergence of a tyrant. Perhaps the example is too strong to be acceptable in a discussion on Lord Hailsham. But great oaks do from little acorns grow, and the noble Lord is setting out in no uncertain manner to become a Leader.

After all, why should we care about Lord Hailsham's views and what makes him bitterly resentful? The answer is that we don't care—but *Hailsham thinks we should*. And from that the next step is to start *making* us care.

However, at his present stage of development we believe we are more than a match for Lord Hailsham—man to man. We therefore challenge him to public debate anywhere he likes on any motion expressing our opposing views on the institution of monarchy or for that matter any aspect of Conservative policy.

We go further. We challenge him to show how it is cowardly to criticise the Queen in view of the incessant assault of royalist propaganda to which we are subjected with no possibility of adequate answer. The Press misquotes or closes its columns, the BBC cancels programmes at the last minute, politicians bluster and threaten—all to prevent objective discussion of the institution of

monarchy or the adequacy of the Queen to fulfil her function therein. Who then are the cowards?

Let the public hear the arguments. We pay the piper—we have the right to call the tune. If Hailsham is afraid to face straight argument in public, then we know where the cowardice lies.

See 'That Monarchy Business' - page 4

WHITHER ZHUKOV?

BY the time this appears in print the world may know the fate of Marshal Zhukov, until last Saturday Defence Minister of the Soviet Union. As we go to press, however, we know only of his removal from that post—surely the second most important in the country?—and of talk about his developing a cult of (his own) personality and hindering the work of Party officials in the Army.

Whatever may happen on paper, however, the move can only mean Zhukov's downfall. When you are at the dizzy heights of power as Zhukov was there is only one direction in which you can move—down. Unless, of course, the top job is to be grasped.

With Nikita Khrushchev sitting in the top job in the USSR, nobody else is going to get much of a chance. Since Stalin's death Mr. K. has made steady progress in the direction of filling the old dictator's boots, by a similar process, if by not quite such drastic methods.

Khrushchev, like a perfectly trained long distance runner, has come up from behind (who had heard of him in 1953?) and overtaken the leaders who had made all the running, to reach first place and leave them all panting behind. But the analogy with a sporting event ceases there, for Khrushchev's tactic has been to use his comrades to get rid of each other—each step bringing him nearer to the top.

He used Malenkov and Molotov to get rid of Beria; he used Bulganin and Zhukov to get rid of Malenkov and Molotov. Having gradually eased out Bulganin he presumably feels he is strong enough to deal with Zhukov alone. For Khrushchev looks like being very much alone. The life of the suspicious recluse which Stalin lived would not appear to fit globe-trotting, vodka-swilling Nikita, but the man who sits alone in power cannot be other than lonely and suspicious.

Just what Zhukov's crimes, or faults are, we do not yet know. He was alleged to have high regard for his old ally, Eisenhower, but it might not be too easy to translate that into spying for the West. As a soldier he might, paradoxically enough, have a greater sense of responsibility towards his men than power-hungry Khrushchev, and he might have criticised the latter's sabre-rattling boasts of recent weeks.

Stalin sent him into the wilderness after the war because he was too popular. Perhaps Khrushchev felt the same. Whatever it is, the circumstances of Zhukov's dismissal indicate once again the incessant struggle for power in the Kremlin—and Khrushchev's determination to be the supreme dictator. Just as Stalin had to purge the Army in 1937, so Khrushchev, for similar reasons, feels he has to do so in 1957.

Who said Stalinism was dead?

Krupp will not Forget Reality

IT will be remembered that Alfred Krupp was sentenced to twelve years' imprisonment at the end of the war, and was released after serving half his sentence. He was also paid compensation for property and other assets which had been seized by the Allies; this amounted to £55 million. At this time he agreed to sell coal and steel interests worth £80 million by 1958, so that never again would the mightiest arsenal in the world be used as a weapon of German destructiveness! All that has been sold to date is two small mines.

Now it is reported, to the surprise of no one, that Chancellor Adenauer is to inform Britain, France and the United States that it has proved impossible for Krupp to dispose of Firma Fried Krupp. The main reasons which Adenauer will give are as follows: 1. It is not in Germany's interests that the company should be split up; 2. No organisation can afford to buy such large slices of Krupps; 3. There is no legal method by which Krupp can be forced to sell.

It is of course quite safe to say that the first reason is the only one which really counts; something could be organised if this is what was wanted, but Krupps have served the German economy very well in the last decade, and will continue to do so. There has been a deliberate policy not to sell, but to keep the enormous industrial empire in one piece, a policy in which Aden-

auer and Krupp have been equally interested. No German financial groups has dared (euphemistically it has sometimes been reported that no group wished to *take advantage*) of the company's obligation to the Western powers.

There is now practically no question of this obligation being fulfilled, and it is quite certain that Krupps will continue to expand, as the whole West German economy is expanding, to a greater degree than ever before. For when it comes to big business the Christian Democrats have no objections to co-operating with ex-Nazis (Krupp joined the Nazis in 1938), and although Krupps do not make armaments at the moment, they make everything else.

Alfried Krupp has said that if he were pressed to make armaments once more, by either the German Government or NATO, he supposes that "under certain conditions we would. We must not forget reality."

We venture to suggest that NATO will in due course *insist* that Krupps should make armaments again, and not just because of the "Russian threat", but for the simple reason that Germany's economic recovery is a constant thorn in the side of the rest of Europe, and it is becoming essential for Germany to "bear the same burden of re-armament" (Eden) so as not to have an unfair advantage over Britain in world markets.

Reflections on 'Good' Government & James Cameron's Sour Moments

Everybody Satisfied at Ipswich

THE leaders of the three political parties involved in the recent bye-election at Ipswich have all expressed themselves as being satisfied with the trends revealed by the result in which ex-liberal Mr. Dingle Foot retained the seat for the Labour Party. Mr. Gaitskell described it as "A most satisfactory result. It seems to be a case of 'Dingle bells, Dingle bells, Dingle all the way'." Lord Hailsham at a press conference last Saturday, saw the result as

"a modest encouragement and a strong challenge" to the party. The percentage figures showed a small but significant improvement in the Conservative poll, and showed that "the rot has been stopped."

For the Liberals, Mr. Jo Grimond declared: "This is a really excellent result and a wonderful tribute to Miss Sykes. . . . But although we have done very well, it is not good enough yet."

No one will deny that politicians have an easy ability to find just the right phrase to gloss over the home truths and keep up the morale of

their loyal supporters. Mr. Gaitskell, being on the winning side at Ipswich could well afford to be facetious. Lord Hailsham could only hope that a negative ("the rot has been stopped") could be interpreted as a positive, and be used to ginger up the Party: that the *modest encouragement* which could be derived from the fact that they had stopped rotting should serve as a *strong challenge* to the party. Mr. Grimond however flushed with pride over a liberal "revival" at Gloucester and now Ipswich cannot afford complacency in the Party: in politics there is many a slip 'twixt prestige and power; and no self-respecting politician cares overmuch about prestige so long as he has power. And the liberals have a long way to go before they taste the fruits of power!

★

WHATEVER they may say publicly, have the political party leaders very much to crow about in private over the Ipswich result? In spite of national interest in this bye-election, as well as a number of

burning political and economic topics to arouse the electorate (assuming the big guns of the parties who were dragged down to Ipswich for the campaign, misfired), only 58,600 people voted out of an electoral register of 78,000. Thus more people *did not vote* (20,000) than voted for the Tory candidate (19,161) or the Liberal (12,587). And in spite of the fact that on this occasion the electors were given more "choice", by the intervention of the Liberal candidate, 2,400 fewer votes were cast than for the two candidates at the 1955 General Election.

Whereas the Labour Party could claim that in 1955 its candidate's majority of 3,582 was a true majority (if one overlooks the 17,000 people who did not vote), the increased majority of 7,737 at the recent bye-election was only a majority over the Tory poll. In fact the Tory and Liberal candidates between them polled nearly 5,000 votes more than the successful Dingle Foot, who in spite of his increased majority actually polled 5,400 votes less than his predecessor at the 1955

Continued on p. 3

RETURN TO CHINA

THERE has been such a dearth of information forthcoming from the "New China" of recent years that James Bertram's book *Return to China** is worth reading, if for no other reason than for information and as a record of a non-Communist Westerner's account of what he saw and felt in China during a brief journey across the country with a party of fellow New Zealanders; albeit under the guidance of representatives of the Chinese Government.

The author is a journalist who, as the dust cover points out, is no stranger to China, for "he had the opportunity of studying Chinese society and politics... before and during the Second World War". He has been, "journalist, prisoner-of-war in Japanese hands, diplomat and cultural envoy". This is an encouraging start, for he already knows a great deal about China—before Communism—and therefore may be presumed to understand something of their mode of thought and outlook.

The Chinese, by definition, have always been regarded by the West as a mysterious people—still waters running deep—this does not come through in the book, in fact the author almost takes pains to suggest that it is not really so. His heart (as he admits) beats for China and the Chinese, and although he appears to bend-over-backwards to be objective, not to be taken in by subtle propaganda, to get to the actual reality, the impression is gained nevertheless that to some extent he fails in his objectivity. This is only a general impression, other readers may not find it so, it was gained perhaps because James Bertram is so anxious that the West should accept China because *China is so anxious to accept the West*. This is his view, but it may not be accurate.

Naturally we join with him in his criticism of the American attitude of non-recognition of Peking and the absurdity of Washington's insistence that Chiang Kai-shek represents China; but

*Heinemann, 25s. 0d.

he states: "Another China exists: sooner or later we must come to terms with it." The words themselves seem to be reasonable enough but of course the implication is that if only America will behave sensibly then Peking will naturally co-operate. Past dealings with communist countries do not encourage this view, and despite Bertram's implied plea (throughout his book) that China is better than the rest, it is hard to believe in such a thesis. Our hearts may beat for China also, but our heads are of necessity suspicious of the Chinese Government. Anarchist cynicism has been gained in the merciless school of a non-partisan reading of past events.

The author is fond of making comparisons of the new régime in China with the old and patently corrupt Kuomintang government. For example he compares the floods which occurred in the Yangtze valley in 1954 and states how successfully they were overcome, and then recalls the floods of 1931 which, due to hopeless administration created complete havoc and disaster. But it is not clear by what means and to what extent the 1954 floods were dealt with.

Concentration camps undoubtedly still exist in China, but no one was anxious to talk about them; they exist it seems for "reactionaries" and other recalcitrant elements. Large work-camps also exist—but when they are surrounded by barbed wire and armed men in uniform, there is an obvious conclusion. "Hundreds, perhaps thousands, of men at work on a railway spur". Bertram asked if they were political prisoners but received no reply.

The book is a curious amalgam of opposites. At one point it is suggested (with illustrations) that there is a lack of freedom of expression for authors and artists; later on it is hinted that by and large freedom of expression is not really limited. Writing of collectivisation of farms and rural co-operatives it is commented that it is hard to believe in their success without a degree of coercion (as indeed it is, for the latter is said to be "almost universal" and the former "well over fifty per cent."), but the author is convinced that his first impression is the correct one: "Yet, to any traveller who uses his eyes, the evidence is overwhelming that Chinese farmers to-day are working communally, and that they seem to be enjoying it."

To try and summarise Bertram's impression of the New China is almost an

A Page of BOOK REVIEWS

impossibility for he hardly seems to know himself. He wants to believe that things are going well, he professes liberal humanism and obviously dislikes Communism. He makes a good case for China being a vast improvement on Russia; a better general approach, more awareness of human values, less orthodoxy, a greater ability to put the ideology across with success. He obviously has a considerable admiration for China's leaders, Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai in particular, and is convinced of their good intentions. One cannot help doubting his assessment, especially of leaders; there is a strong possibility that he tends to find what he hopes to find.

One last opposite; another member of his party, Charles Hilgendorf, returned with this point of view: "... the most striking thing about present-day China was that it really is Communist. There is a complete dictatorship, intensive and all pervading propaganda, secret police and spies, standardisation of thought, armed soldiers seldom out of sight and mass executions."

Whatever it is that is seen would appear to be in the eye of the beholder. F.N.

FREEDOM PRESS

SELECTIONS FROM 'FREEDOM'

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*
Volume 6, 1956, *Oil and Troubled Waters*

each volume paper 7s. 6d.
cloth 10s. 6d.

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

VOLINE :

Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed) cloth 12s. 6d.
The Unknown Revolution (Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21) cloth 12s. 6d.

V. RICHARDS :

Lessons of the Spanish Revolution 6s.

E. A. GUTKIND :

The Expanding Environment 8s. 6d.

JOHN HEWETSON :

Ill-Health, Poverty and the State cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.

ERRICO MALATESTA :

Anarchy 6d.
Vote—What For? 1d.

M. BAKUNIN :

Marxism, Freedom and the State. cloth 5s.

GEORGE WOODCOCK :

New Life to the Land 6d.
Homes orhovels? 6d.
Railways and Society 3d.
What is Anarchism? 1d.
The Basis of Communal Living 1s.

MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI :

Neither East nor West paper 7s. 6d.; cloth 10s. 6d.
Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute cloth 5s.
Journey Through Utopia cloth 18s. (U.S.A. \$3)

HERBERT READ :

Art and the Evolution of Man 4s.
Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism 3s. 6d.
Poetry and Anarchism cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d.
The Philosophy of Anarchism boards 2s. 6d., paper 1s.
The Education of Free Men 1s. 2d.



F. A. RIDLEY :

The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age 2d.

K. J. KENAFICK :

Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx paper 6s.

27, Red Lion Street, London, W.C.1.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

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

New Books . . .

Why I am Not a Christian Bertrand Russell 18/-
Child of the Revolution Wolfgang Leonhard 25/-
Image and Idea Philip Rahv 16/-
Hungarian Tragedy Peter Fryer 5/-
Spring in October K. Syrop 18/-

Reprints and Cheap Editions . . .

A Hero of our Time M. Lermontov 6/6
Dubrovsky A. S. Pushkin 2/6
Tales M. S. Schredrin 5/-
Three Short Novels Ivan S. Turgenev 5/6
News from Nowhere William Morris 4/6
The Sun Also Rises (Fiesta) Ernest Hemingway 2/6
Julie de Carnelhan and Chance Acquaintances Colette 2/6
Memory: Facts and Fallacies J. M. L. Hunter 3/6
The Philanderer Stanley Kauffman 3/6
Swann's Way Marcel Proust 6/-
Lawrence of Arabia Richard Aldington 3/6
The Magicians J. B. Priestley 2/-
And Quiet Flows the Don Mikhail Sholokhov 3/6

Second-Hand . . .

Extracts from Adam's Diary Mark Twain 3/6
Eve's Diary Mark Twain 3/6
New Light on Tolstol (ed.) René Fülöp Müller 6/-
The Secret Army T. Bor-Komorowsky 17/6
Destiny of a Revolution Victor Serge 6/6
Freedom and Catholic Power Paul Blanshard 12/6
Austria and After Franz Borkenau 4/-
People of the Deer Farley Mowat 4/6
The Yogi and the Commissar Arthur Koestler 3/6
Adam and Eve John Middleton Murry 4/-
Biology of War G. F. Nicolai 4/-

Periodicals . . .

University Libertarian, Autumn, 1957 1/-

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

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

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

The Bessie Braddock Story

WE hope that potential readers of Millie Toole's biography* on Bessie Braddock, M.P., will not be discouraged by the picture of the subject on the dust jacket looking for all the world like a triumphant pugilist.

The first part of this book contains a fascinating if horrifying account of Liverpool in the early part of the 20th century, of the spirit which animated the people who fought hard to improve the appalling living conditions which existed at that time. The minute band of present-day revolutionaries cannot but look back in envy at the enthusiasm for social change so lacking in our own time. There

*Robert Hale Ltd., 18s.

Derisive Counterblast

THE UNIVERSITY LIBERTARIAN, No. 4, Autumn 1957. 1s. (by post 1s. 2d. from 13 Bannerman Avenue, Prestwich, Manchester, or from Freedom Bookshop).

THE woman next door to us has four lodgers, science students attending the University of London. Being a warm-hearted creature, she made them one night a trifle, which incorporated a quantity of Harvey's Bristol Cream Sherry as flavouring. After sniffing it and toying with it with their spoons, they all told her that they could not eat it. Not because it was unappetising, or because they preferred Sherry in liquid form, or because they preferred *Tio Pepe*, but because, they explained, they were all teetotallers.

The *Daily Telegraph* recently remarked that the fate of the Russian people seemed to be to develop from peasants to spacemen without ever tasting the joys that this earth can offer, and our neighbour's lodgers seem similarly fated to make the transition from boorish Baptist Sunday-Schoolboys to atomic physicists without ever savouring the joys of Sherry trifle or *zuppa inglese* as gastronomes call it.

To save them from so one-sided a development—that of the intellect at the expense of the faculty for enjoying life, is one of the functions of that derisive counterblast to conformism, *The University Libertarian*. Another, more important one, is to start them questioning the foundations of the set-up in which they are going to spend their working lives. *Cui Bono?* is the question it raises, and for us non-University types, this may be translated as *For Whose Good?*

The new issue, enlarged to twenty closely-packed pages, contains, by coincidence, an article by a member of each of what the editor describes as "the two most powerful authoritarian forces in the world to-day". In the first of these a Catholic, Edward J. Egan, discusses the theme of 'Freedom and Authority in the Church', and in the second, a Communist, G. Kendall discusses the impact on him of last year's

were foolish fights as well on issues which seem absurd to us; Orangemen and Catholics fought out their bloody differences in conditions of extreme poverty;

"A typical slum road 200 years long held fourteen courts, each court containing 12 houses, each house holding at least four families, a family per room regardless of sex. The desire to be decent was waylaid daily by drunkenness, brutality, sluttishness and prostitution. The sanitary inspector walked in without knocking... The Nightman swooped down in the midnight dark on an overcrowding inspection, making sure that the sexes were properly segregated. He had the right of entry, and his torch scoured the black room that slept all members of a family, over pillows, under the bed in cupboards where children were often concealed on a shelf. He made a rapid calculation that allowed room for incest. As the Nightman's knock resounded down the street children were bundled into courtyard closets, and many a boy who knew he was in the way at home joined other boys from crammed houses and lived on bits of bread begged at the docks." Anarchists, it is claimed, christened Victoria "Queen of Slaughter and Empress of Famine". But in spite of famine, amidst the filthy slums, the building of Liverpool Cathedral commenced. This prompted a stonemason taking part in the building to write a letter which was enclosed in a container and built in with the bricks, and which contained the words: "Within a stone's throw from here, human beings are housed in slums not fit for swine". There were many other crimes to protest against, not least the events which led up to Bloody Sunday.

The incessant poverty and police action culminated in a march of 40,000 men, women and children to St. George's Hall on Sunday, August 11th, 1911. This resulted in five police charges on the crowd and a "display of violence that horrified those who saw it" (*Manchester Guardian*). A Pathé camera filmed the "whole of the one-sided battle" which significantly "stayed in the can except for private showing to leaders of the Labour party".

Three years later Britain was at war. The years of suffering which preceded it did not prevent men from answering the call to arms. Maybe there wasn't much enthusiasm for fighting but hunger can cause men to act at times in a stupid as well as a wise way.

By the end of the war the streets of Liverpool were again filled with unemployed. Support for the Soviet Union was growing. Ma Bamber, Bessie Braddock's mother, who emerges as a more remarkable character than her daughter, became a founder member of the Communist Party. But she was without political ambition and found that being a party member interfered with her other work. She was primarily interested in improving conditions for the poor. She worked in a printer's shop, but neither this nor her family stopped her public speaking or helping people who needed it.

Bessie Braddock's early training was tough. Public meetings were not the apathetic affairs they are to-day, and the police much less amiable. Hunger was an everyday experience and only those who shared the same conditions were

likely to make much headway with the poor of Liverpool. It was her identification with the people she lived among which years later sent Bessie Braddock into Parliament where "the letters M.P. behind her name were to mean in the end the mellowing of Bessie" (Millie Toole).

The second half of this book follows the tedious path of a politician's rise to power. The occasional outbursts of the "old Bessie" leave little impression. She joined the Communist Party in 1924 with her husband Jack Braddock. They left a few years later ostensibly because they could not stomach the "instructions". But one suspects that the Labour Party offered the best means for furthering political ambitions. Bessie Braddock claims that they had already left the C.P. when the Labour Party ruled that a person could not be a communist and a member of the Labour Party. In later years we find that Bessie takes instructions from her Party when it suits her!

In 1930 she put up as a candidate in St. Anne's ward for a seat in the City Council. It is to her credit that she won the seat without resorting to tactics which would ensure her the 85% Catholic vote. But what of the later Bessie Braddock after she gained the majority vote which put her into Parliament? Conditions in Liverpool were vastly improved, poverty was no longer a pressing issue. What better platform to adopt to keep Catholic sympathy than the anti-Communist one? Envy of Bevan's popularity may well have played a part in her attack on the Bevanite group because it is clear that she could never abide competition.

In collaboration with Herbert Morrison and Arthur Deakin she wrote two articles in the *Daily Herald* exposing Communist tactics in the trade unions, and their infiltration into divisional constituency parties. She wrote: "Study carefully the past words and actions of any suspect candidate for your local delegation. If you have any reason to believe that here is a Communist trouble maker, make sure he or she does not get the job." She had learned well from the tactics used by the Communists themselves, and travelled a long way from the days when she was considered a trouble maker. Next came an attack on unofficial strikes. Did Bessie think with Deakin behind her she might go further up the hierarchy of the Labour Party?

In spite of Transport House her support is not great in the Constituency Labour Party. But time may well change that, it is the business of politicians to learn how to be popular with the right people at the right time. M.

ANARCHISTS will be interested to know that Malatesta found shelter in Jock Braddock's lodgings in Liverpool, and it was Bessie who used to take him out walking at night for a breath of air. He was later smuggled aboard a boat at Liverpool. When he landed in Italy the Government did not make a move against him for fear of precipitating a general strike.

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 18, No. 44. November 2, 1957

Reflections on 'Good' Government

Continued from p. 1

elections! So much for the significance of electoral "majorities".

The Conservatives' position is quite clear. Between 1955 and 1957 they have lost just under 10,000 votes in Ipswich. The "modest encouragement" Lord Hailsham derives from these figures can only be explained by assuming that the Tory managers were expecting even bigger losses.

The validity or wishful thinking of the Liberals' restrained optimism is more difficult to assess from the figures, since it is impossible to ascertain whether their votes came from people protesting against the Big Two or from people who really believed that the Liberal Party had something to offer the others hadn't got. Actually their vote is less spectacular than might appear at first sight if one takes into account that at the 1950 Elections they put up a candidate whose share of the poll was 13.3 per cent., compared with 21.5 at the recent bye-election. It is not unreasonable to suppose that the Liberals recaptured most of their 1950 votes, which in the absence of a Liberal candidate, had in subsequent elections gone to the other Parties, plus an extra 4,500. This is, in fact, the measure of their present success. Did it come from disgruntled Tory and Labour voters, or have they succeeded in awakening interest in some of the 17,000 non-voters at the 1955 General Election?

WE need hardly say that from the viewpoint of anarchists, every election, every vote cast, is a defeat! Even the abstentions are a hollow victory! After all how many of the 20,000 non-voters in Ipswich last week abstained not because they were fed-up with the Tories and Labourites and had no faith in the Liberals; not because they were too "lazy" to go and put their cross on the ballot paper; not because they couldn't be bothered or "spare the time", to think about "politics"—but because they were opposed to authority, to the existing financial, economic and social system in which they are shoved around, ordered about, intimidated and coerced by an international army of know-alls who have the impudence to assert that only they know best what is good for you and 2,000 million fellow creatures besides?

Fed-upness with particular governments, lack of faith in this or that political party are not enough. These sentiments lead either to the emergence of inspired leaders (dictators) or to a lifetime of hope (that at some stage "good men" will fill the offices of government) and disillusionment (once they have). One such example of this, what we would call, political defeatism, was provided in last Friday's *News Chronicle*, in a feature by that lively and intelligent journalist James Cameron. He devotes half his article to exposing the Turkish General Elections, a third to the governmental crisis in France where the absence of government does not prevent the real government in France, that of the civil servants, from functioning. He sums up this survey by remarking that:

It is possible that the Americans, too, have rarely had a poorer Administration. The Soviet Union has nothing to write home about.

In fact there was probably no period for many years when the whole world was so badly governed in so many ways.

WHERE do these reflections lead Mr. Cameron? It is clear from his concern that the world is suffering from "bad government" that he has a yardstick of "good government" which enables him to distinguish between governments. One might therefore expect him to give us either examples—or define—good government. He does neither. Instead he goes on to say that:

The effect of all this is to attract me greatly, in my sourer moments, to the appealing theory of Anarchism, which produces the simple argument that Governments are intrinsically no good anyway, and that no man should properly be ruled by anyone.

To be sure it presents difficulties, the chief of which is finding a society populated exclusively by perfect people. On present showing the race does not appear to be making any significant advance on those lines.

Let us not mock the French for having no leader. Who has?

Now why should Mr. Cameron be attracted "greatly" to "the appealing theory of Anarchism" only in his "sourer" and not in his more optimistic moments? The answer, we suggest regretfully (and would welcome correction), is that it is because in his "optimistic" moments Mr. Cameron believes in "good" government, in an elite of perfect people in a world of imperfect ones. He is attracted "greatly" to Anarchism when he discovers that he has been let down left, right and centre by the Guardians of mankind, but even then in his flights of fancy he is suddenly brought down to earth by the reflection that the anarchist argument that "no man should be ruled by anyone" is possible only in "a society populated exclusively by perfect people". But, dear Mr. Cameron, the opposite is the case! The anarchist objections to Government are just the ones you use against the feasibility of anarchism. We are opposed to the organisation of society from above, to leaders (we distinguish between leadership by example and those armchair "leaders" who bolster up their lack of personal integrity with the machinery of Law and Force) and to privileged élites, just because we believe in the imperfection of human beings.

Anarchism, as we experience it, is a positive philosophy of life. On the one hand it encourages the free development of the human personality, on the other it gives us a consciousness and understanding of the power that is in each of us an individuals; which awareness is the surest defence against those who would use their power to rule over us.

Mr. Cameron and so many other "sympathique" people who look upon us anarchists as starry-eyed dreamers, to be viewed through telescopes in the rarified (or is it non-existent?) atmosphere of outer-space, have got us all wrong! We alone deny to any man, or group of men, the right, Divine or by reason of superior intellect, to rule over us, just because we do not believe in the perfectibility of Man. We would add that we believe neither in or in the need for perfect human beings to bring about a free and "happy" society*. If anything Man's consciousness of freedom as such has been developed as a result of the domination of the many by the few. In seeking freedom, therefore, we do so with the awareness that Man is not perfect; and we seek it by neutralising the power of those who look upon themselves as rulers by some mystique of hereditary, political or intellectual Right. Not by making the victims and the oppressors perfect, but by the development of awareness and understanding—yes, and rebelliousness—among the former.

Mr. Cameron, and other well-mean-

*Don't ask us to define "happy"! Even happiness has its ups and downs.

SCIENCE COMMENTS

POLITICIANS looking for more territory to occupy and more mineral resources to exploit have been known to cast avaricious eyes towards the arctic and antarctic regions. Someone wanted to explode an H-bomb there to melt the ice until it was pointed out that this might cause flooding of low-lying densely populated land. Now some scientists have calculated that this is happening anyway, more slowly perhaps but quick enough to flood coastal cities and ports in less than 50 years. The culprits are the invidious factory chimneys of our industrial towns and the exhaust pipes of our motor vehicles. The fumes these produce, are increasing the amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere which is in turn absorbing more of the heat given off by the earth and oceans. It is estimated that twenty per cent more carbon dioxide will be added to the atmosphere during the next hundred years, and the resulting rise in temperature could be enough to melt sufficient ice to raise the level of the oceans five feet by the end of the century.

The housewife doubtful whether her butcher is supplying Argentine beef, New Zealand lamb or the home killed meat she may prefer, will get dubious satisfaction from learning that scientific officers of the L.C.C. can now pick out English lamb from its New Zealand counterpart by its greater radio-activity. We must of course reassure her that the levels of radio-activity are far below those having any significance for health.

Levels of permissible radiation dosage are still a subject of controversy and tend to decrease with every official pronouncement of the Medical Research Council. A recent H.M. Stationery Office

publication "Code of Practice for the protection of persons exposed to ionizing radiations" sets the maximum permissible dose at 0.3 r. units per week for up to 30 years, otherwise a weekly dose of 0.1 r. units. This is to be compared with the earliest officially recommended standard of a tolerance dose of one r. per week. Who can doubt that the permissible dose will be further reduced in the future? Already second thoughts by the M.R.C. on permissible doses is reducing the extent to which radio-isotopes may be used for medical diagnosis.

While we are perhaps at the moment concerned with nursing ourselves or others through what has become known as Asian 'flu, the public health authorities are concerned with the possibility of a more serious outbreak during the winter should the type A virus responsible for the present outbreak mutate and lose its present mild character. Attention is mainly turned to the production of a vaccine against the virus but Professor McLeod suggested another approach recently in the *Lancet*. The bacterium *Haemophilus influenza* originally thought to be the cause of influenza and now much neglected may actually, in combination with the virus, be responsible for the more serious outbreaks such as the Spanish 'flu epidemic of 1918-19.

A pilot experiment by the Rockefeller Institute in 1918 using a vaccine against *Haemophilus influenza* was much more successful than any virus vaccine has ever been in preventing influenza.

When most scientific research is financed and partly controlled by the State it is useful to have an organisation like the Nuffield Foundation which can counteract the influence of orthodoxy by

financing promising projects that may be unpopular with the experts who advise the politicians. Most interesting of the recent awards was the one of £10,000 for research by Professor Eysenck on the medical use of hypnosis. Professor Eysenck did some fascinating work on hypnosis about fifteen years ago that he was not able to finish.

Other worthwhile projects that are being supported include: the development of small farms and the rehabilitation of disabled farm workers; the use of television in diagnostic surgery; an investigation of social relationships in the new towns particularly among young people; and the very important problem of the effect of selection on the genetic structure of populations. This is being tackled by a combined investigation of the incidence of duodenal ulcers in man and of mimicry in butterflies.

A popular myth that it is worse to be ill in a teaching hospital than a non-teaching hospital has recently been exploded. In spite of "practising students and experimenting doctors" one has a better chance of coming out of a teaching hospital alive after such serious conditions as appendicitis with peritonitis, perforated peptic ulcer, and diabetic coma. This would appear to be due to the much better staff-patient ratio in these hospitals than in the rest. This is possible because they are allowed to have a much higher expenditure per patient treated than the other hospitals. Those who urge economies in the health service might find it in their own future interest to urge instead that money should be available to raise the standards of all hospitals up to those of the teaching hospitals.

Bios.

PEOPLE AND IDEAS

A Million Private Dreams - 2

IT is not surprising that the family is at the centre of most people's private dreams. For as one of the contributors to *The Human Sum** writes:

"The family is the great incubator of happiness and unhappiness. Within it men and women achieve the best fulfilment of their emotional lives, or wreck them, condemning themselves to tragedy and makeshift. Within it children are given either an armour of confidence enabling them to go safely through all the normal hazards of growing up, or left unprotected and even scarred, carrying damaged emotional tissue that all their lives may wreck their happiness as though they were the carriers of unseen physical disease."

The Human Sum is a collection of essays sponsored by the Family Planning Association to commemorate its twenty-fifth anniversary. Their subjects range from the search for the perfect contraceptive to the world population problem. Mrs. Mary Stocks in her account of the history of family planning pays tribute to the pioneers of the dissemination of contraceptive knowledge in this country, many of whom worked in the face of the hostility of the state, the church and all 'right-minded' people. She points out that the trial of Charles Bradlaugh and Annie Besant coincided with the early years of the decline of the birth-rate at the upper end of the social scale. Contraception remained one of the secrets of the well-to-do until "the great silence was shattered in a spectacular manner by a spectacular person", by, in fact, the publication in 1918 of Marie Stopes's *Married Love*. With the proceeds of this book, Dr. Stopes founded her clinic in St. Pancras in 1921, and the story is one of sporadic growth until the foundation in 1930 of the National Birth Control Council by the scattered groups of enthusiasts who had been responsible for the organisation of the clinics. The Council changed its name in 1938 to the Family Planning Association since right from the start it had been called upon

*THE HUMAN SUM, edited by C. H. Rolph. Heinemann, 18s.

ing people like himself, instead, hope, in spite of first-hand experience, to find good, incorruptible men in an imperfect world who will be prepared to shoulder the problems of mankind for the good of mankind. They are the dreamers, the utopians, not the anarchists who have long ago accepted the wisdom of Plato's dictum that "good men refuse to govern"!

to give advice not only to people who wanted to know how not to have babies, but from those who wanted to know why they had been unable to produce any. The FPA's two hundred or so voluntary clinics perform in fact a multiple function, advising both on contraception and on sub-fertility, and training doctors and medical students. Mrs. Stocks emphasises that it has still "enormous work to do", but "the conspiracy of silence which for so long has hampered public discussion and the process of enlightenment is dissolving before our eyes. . . . To few pioneers of social reform is it given to observe so considerable a swing of public opinion and administrative practice in the brief span of their own active lives."

How much work is still to be done is shown in two of the essays. The late James Lansdale Hodson contributes an account of the extent and the horrors of back-street abortions, and Edward Blishen writes of his experiences as a teacher in a 'bad' district. The fact ought to be faced, he writes, "that much really savage suffering occurs in mid-twentieth-century England because unwanted or half-wanted children are produced by parents who, in very many cases, simply do not know how to choose for themselves a suitable family pattern; who, many of them, do not even know how to set a manageable limit to their families. Their view of sex rests on a handful of untender words. Their view of family responsibility is less clear than perhaps it has been to any social group in history."

A quite different picture is presented by Michael Young and Peter Wilmott in their essay on "The Changed Families of East London". They find changes unequivocally for the better. The birth-rate statistics reflect the emancipation of women from imprisonment to childbearing, and "there has been a substantial fall in the incidence of broken homes, almost entirely as a result of the reduction of the death-rate, whose importance quite dwarfs the divorces and separations". More shared responsibility between parents, shortened hours of work, improved housing, or at least the decline in overcrowding, have resulted in a new partnership. "We do not want to overdo it—these changes have not worked a miracle", but:

"The tyrant has gone. In place of the old comes . . . a new kind of companionship, between man and wife, reflecting the rise in status of the young wife and of the children which is the great transformation of our time". The one dominant change which they pick out as both symptom and cause is that of the birth-rate. Dr. J. M. Macintosh on the other hand, writing of

"Changing Attitudes Within the Family" finds a hundred influences at work. "People often imagine that such vital matters as family life and home-making must necessarily be related to some deep philosophies in human relations; but the causes of change are often relatively trivial—standards of personal cleanliness, hair styles, lighter clothing, leisure pursuits and so on".

CERTAINLY, when the discussion switches to a world scale, the birth-rate becomes the dominant factor. There are four recognisable stages in the growth of populations. In the first, death-rates are so high that if birth-rates were not so high, so few children would reach maturity that the population would die out, and in fact it increases very slowly. In the second stage the birth-rate is still high, but the death-rate has fallen sharply, and the population expands 'explosively'. In the third stage, the birth-rate too falls and the rate of increase slows down. In the fourth stage, both birth-rate and death-rate become stabilised at a low figure, and, as Julian Huxley says in his contribution, "thereafter the population will grow only slowly unless it is spurred by some new development, such as access to new food sources or a change in ideas and values". He points out that in the Western world the reduction in the death-rate came slowly and was accompanied by factors which reduced the birth-rate—rising standards of living and industrialisation (which made children no longer an economic asset). But in the under-developed countries, which are almost all in the stage of explosive expansion, death control has been introduced at a startling speed. He gives as an example Ceylon:

"In England malaria took three centuries to disappear; in Ceylon it was virtually wiped out in less than half a decade, thanks to DDT and a well-organised campaign. As a result of this and other health measures, the death rate in Ceylon was reduced from 22 to 12 per thousand in seven years—a fall which took exactly 10 times as long in England. But the Ceylon birth rate has not even begun to drop, and so the population is growing at the rate of 2.7 per cent. per annum—about twice the highest rate ever experienced in Britain. If this rate of growth continues, the population of Ceylon will be doubled in 30 years. . . . When we recall that rates of expansion of this order (two to three per cent.) are at work among more than half the world's 2.5 billion inhabitants, we cannot but feel alarmed".

Continued on p.

That Monarchy Business

WITH trepidation we venture to discuss a subject this week which has been put out of bounds by Lord Hailsham. His Lordship, in his new strong man role, has promised that he is going to reserve very special measures of his own personal hostility for any one who dares criticise the institution of royalty or any member of the Royal Family, because he will not have the Queen different than she is. We assume that his resentment against inherited titles (although he does not extend it to inherited wealth), only applies to those which frustrate political ambitions.

Obviously in Lord Hailsham's view, the principles of free speech do not extend to sacred institutions protected by their nature from unfavourable comment. But we leave the theologians to dispute with him the divine rights of Kings and Queens and pass on to consider the practical position of monarchy in human affairs.

As we see it the function of monarchy to-day is to act as a unifying force, and within certain limits this is what it does. It has been argued that the Church at the height of its powers achieved unity, but finally collapsed. So did secular Rome. The tentacles of the Roman Empire stretched far and, according to some historians, during the settled periods of Roman rule there was a spirit of unity and a universal identification which lasted for decades. It has been suggested that it was the centralised nature of these two institutions which eventually led to their downfall. But another important contribution is that they wielded

real power and could therefore be held responsible for economic, political and social conditions, and were inevitably the subject of wrath and attack from the people they ruled as well as their invaders.

The monarchy in 20th century Britain differs fundamentally in that it has no power in the sense that it can alter social conditions, but it offers something of great importance to those who actually do have power. The present-day monarch, either by accident or design, embodies the spirit of being of the people but above them. (The middle class values which she represents were discussed by T.G. in FREEDOM some time ago). In addition the appeal of patriotism and a "national" Queen is strong (a matter which can be better explained by a psychiatrist).

It is easier for the populace to worship one of "their own kind" than to feel a sense of brotherhood with a Chinese peasant or a Russian docker.

It follows that no political party discusses in its manifestoes the possibility of a society without the monarchy. Even if they wanted to it would be political lunacy. The monarchy has been well and truly sold to the public, and it looks as if it will be in existence long after most of us are reigning in hell.

What is equally alarming is the attitude of many otherwise intelligent people over the present controversy on the monarchy. We have heard the view expressed that while it is playing to the rules of democracy to criticise the institution it is unjust to attack the Queen herself

when she is not able to reply. We can only suggest that a modern monarch (we are assured she is) should be able to exercise her democratic right of free speech and tell her critics to go to hell. Or, heed the criticism and start thinking up her own speeches, which are bad enough to justify the few mild attacks made by people who are not opposed to the institution as such.

We do not envy the Queen her present job but neither do we think it calls for special powers except a sense of duty imposed by a particular system and accepted. We do not know whether she feels divinely inspired to carry on where her ancestors left off. Our only contact with her is over the radio or on the news reels where we see her as rather a plain young woman carrying out various boring tasks without much evidence of animation.

We have no way of ascertaining her charm since we are never invited to garden parties at the Palace, and her oratory compares unfavourably with our favourite anarchist speakers at Hyde Park.

As anarchists we object to subsidising the Royal Family and their lackeys, and we feel that as long as they are kept by public subsidy without mandate from the people, those members of the public who care to criticise have every right to do so.

We are not inspired by royalty, but must confess to an acute sense of depression over the knowledge that so many people are worked up to a British frenzy in defence of an institution which adds little to human dignity, freedom or understanding.

People and Ideas

A Million Private Dreams-2

Continued from p. 3

However fallacious Malthus's arguments were 150 years ago, the fact remains that "there is a fundamental difference between the increase of population, which is based on a geometrical or compound-interest growth-mechanism, and the increase of food-production, which is not". Huxley thinks that those who believe that the situation will stabilise itself through industrialisation, the opening of new land to cultivation, and improved techniques of food production, are over optimistic (he does not discuss the effect of a profit economy on the limitation of food crops), because population is always catching up with and outstripping increases in production. "The fact is that an annual increase of 34 million mouths to be fed needs more food than can possibly go on being added to production year after year". Moreover there is the huge deficiency to make good, since according to the latest W.H.O. estimates, at least two-thirds of the world's people are undernourished.

Dr. Huxley's points are underlined by Bertrand Russell in his contribution on *Population Pressure and War*, concluding that:

"I could wish to see it generally recognised in the West, as it is coming to be recognised in the East, that the problem of over-population could probably be painlessly solved by the devotion to birth control of one-hundredth or even one-thousandth of the sum at present devoted to armament. The most urgent practical need is research into some method of birth control which could be easily and cheaply adopted by even very poor populations".

★

THIS leads us straight from the global question to the technical one, the search for The Pill. In his very interesting essay on *The Dilemma of Medical Science*, Dr. A. S. Parkes describes the present state of research and defines the ideal contraceptive:

"Evidently it should not depend on local action contemporaneous with coitus, and preferably should involve only occasional dosage by mouth. Moreover, it should be effective retrospectively over a short period and prospectively over a known period, and it should be simple enough to be generally avail-

able and easily usable by people intelligent enough to understand the possible consequences of coitus and to know whether they do or do not wish to become parents. Finally, of course, it should have no other effects than the prevention of conception."

Mr. Rolph comments in his introduction that "This, it can hardly be doubted, will one day become available for the control of human fertility, universally, among the most backward as well as the most advanced communities in the human race; and its tremendous implications must, in the soberer thoughts of any person with social compassion, dwarf any other consideration that this book can provoke". He himself contributes a discussion of *The Family as a Legal Notion*, emphasising that "the bride and her groom are not the only parties to the marriage; they share their joy with the State". He reminds us that the law relating to marriage is "the child of the Church; the legal position being to some extent, accordingly, the product of holy asceticism" and that it is also the product of the subjugation of women and the "double standard of morals that irks every thoughtful woman to-day". He concludes that:

"The relationship between The Law and The Family remains one of the great question-marks of the future... I would like to see the law playing a smaller, not a greater, conscious part in the life of the family. The law is at best a great blundering, blunt instrument; it fills as best it can the dangerous gaps in the social fabric that education fails to fill. And educationists have not even yet, I think, given enough attention to the appalling process of unlearning that we must all go through as we come upon those aspects of civilisation that our mentors have felt it necessary to conceal from our infant minds".

★

IN her interpretation of the theme Miss Jacquetta Hawkes emphasises that during the course of the last 500,000 years, almost every conceivable pattern for the family has emerged and had some success. "Every age is inclined to regard its own family arrangement as immutable and evidently right", and of all its possible forms the one now accepted by Western man in industrial societies, "the little biographical family unit of parents and children, each living

in its own small box, belonging to no living community and perhaps even ignorant of the names of its neighbours... is probably the hardest to maintain:

"It is a form making fearful demands on the human beings caught up in it; heavily weighted for loneliness, excessive demands, strain and failure. It may ideally be the best and highest form, but it has always proved impossible for the greater number of people. It has been maintained by various evasions, generally involving a high degree either of convention (the Latin form) or hypocrisy (preferred by the Anglo-Saxons). Victorian moralists openly accepted the necessity of extensive prostitution for the maintenance of 'holy matrimony'."

Miss Hawkes like the other contributors to this book sees contraception as a great extension of human freedom. "In the present century we have come nearer than ever before to being able to exercise choice in that most fundamental of all our undertakings—the creation of new life and the form of our families." She remarks that the form of the family "has been very much more open, both among primitive peoples and in earlier civilisations, than the form adopted by the Christian West".

Might it not be that the new freedom can lead, beyond the standard family in its little box, to new patterns of "open" family life that relate more closely to the infinite diversity of human needs and dreams?

C.W.

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!

WEEK 42	
Deficit on Freedom	£860
Contributions received	£595
DEFICIT	£265
October 18 to October 24	

London: S.B.* 2/6; London: Anon.* 1/5;
London: J.S.* 3/-; London: P.F.* 1/-; London:
Hyde Park Sympathisers 1/-; Shirley:
A.W.H. 16/6; London: D.S.M. 9d.; Edmon-
ton, Alberta: W.G. 3/6; Leicester: E.N.B.A.
1/-; Charlton: J.B. 2/6.

*Indicates regular contributor.

Total ...	3 11 2
Previously acknowledged ...	592 3 0
1957 TOTAL TO DATE ...	£595 14 2
Fire Fund	
TOTAL TO DATE ...	£382 3 3

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

Anarchism and/or the Family

DEAR COMRADES,

It was with a view to solving the dilemma that D.K. poses in "Anarchism and/or the family" in 19/10/57 issue of FREEDOM, that the *Communitas Group* was formed. The experiment was terminated owing to lack of support, it seems that the revolutionist shuns the formation of a more balanced biological and social life, and the family anarchist is loathe to leave the modicum of security that he has known for the uncertainties of social experimentation.

The tendency for the life of a revolutionist to be unproductive and uncreative, and divorced from the ordinary necessities of life is particularly foreign to the theories of anarchism that sees man as an essentially social animal. Essentially I would say the anarchist dislikes the situation in which he desires a social and co-operative existence but feels obliged to oppose the activities of the majority of his fellows. Those that enjoy the role may tend to be nihilistic rather than anarchistic.

The family is of course one of the most important stabilising factors in a

ACTIVITY OR INERTIA

WHILE agreeing with almost all that P.H. wrote on "The Tender Trap", I feel that it is a greater danger to be inactive, which implies passively accepting the *status quo*, than to join in progressive movements.

Anarchists make little impact and are singularly ineffective when they confine their activities to propaganda in their own closed circles. It is of course essential to keep reiterating the classic case against the state in the hope that events in the world will make its relevance apparent to a wider public. Meanwhile it does not seem very helpful to contract out of society in the interests of revolutionary purity. Either you attempt to lead an anarchist life by forming or joining a community or else you throw in your weight with the groups that are striving to make a freer life here and now.

This latter course is beset with pitfalls or traps but better to risk them than inertia. The activities that could be undertaken are various. Personally I consider the H-Bomb such an outrage that some protest should be made. The various kinds of racial prejudice and discrimination and capital punishment are also amongst the more nauseating aspects of the anti-social states here and abroad, and should not go unchallenged.

This list could be increased according to personal interests. Freedom in sexual and educational matters should come high on it. Also a few more hearty laughs directed at bell-ringing peers, polo-playing princes and horsey queens might sweep away outmoded institutions.

While avoiding the political circus we could still exert some pressure, might influence others in a libertarian direction and should escape the frustration of powerlessness in shaping our own futures that characterises this welfare state of humbug and hypocrisy.

Telcombe Cliffs, Sussex.

F.T.

ANARCHISTS ON TELEVISION

To the Editors, FREEDOM.

On October 16th the Malatesta Club was closed early, and Bonar Thompson's meeting adjourned to a local pub to see "Out of Step". Personally I found it an interesting and stimulating programme. True, no very clear case for anarchism was put; true, the interviewer, the programme planners and the tame economist were unfair in their hostility. But some part of the case was put, the personalities of Rita and Alan came over in all their gentle reasonableness, and the hostility of everybody was plain enough not to look like neutrality.

Public attention was drawn to anarchism as it is, and not too unfavourably. I am not one who believes that any publicity is good publicity; but I think this programme, while no hard-selling commercial, was good publicity on the whole.

D.R.,
Sec. B.T.S.

While on the subject of publicity, may I mention another good programme, to appear at the Malatesta Club itself on November 20th (see announcements column)?

possessive and authoritarian society and its inhibiting influence on revolutionary action is used to the utmost. Within its hot-house atmosphere love is a delicate flower, that tends to be stifled by the creeper of possessiveness. It is necessary to replace the family as the basis of our social organisation. The recognition of the need for security, love and social acceptance are essential in a sane society.

In seeking to create a wider, more organic basis of social organisation with the human material that is nurtured in the existing environment one is faced with emotional difficulties. Many tend to join such a group to retreat from the problems that beset them and from mixed and unexpected motives. If we as anarchists are able to complete our revolution in relationships I am sure that the dilemma that faces us would be nearer solution.

Fraternally,

Uucfield, Oct. 23.

ALAN ALBON.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

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

LECTURE - DISCUSSIONS

NOV. 3—Giovanni Baldelli on
ANARCHIST ACTION.
NOV. 10—Arthur Uloth on
THE ANARCHIST UTOPIA
NOV. 17—Francis Tonks on
VOLUNTARY WORK CAMPS
NOV. 24—F. A. Ridley on
GUY FAWKES—THE MAN AND
HIS TIMES
DEC. 1—Axel Hoch on
AM I MY BROTHER'S EATER?
DEC. 8—Bob Green on
SOME SHIBBOLETHS OF
ANARCHISM.

Questions, Discussion and Admission all free.

★ Malatesta Club ★

SWARAJ HOUSE,
32 PERCY STREET,
TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD, LONDON, W.1.

ACTIVITIES

Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.
London Anarchist Group Meetings
(see Announcements Column)

Every Wednesday at 8 p.m.

BONAR THOMPSON speaks
NOV. 6—By request—a dramatic recital.
NOV. 13—The glories of Socialism, etc.
NOV. 20—"THE WORK OF BONAR THOMPSON" ON TAPE RECORDINGS. A new selection from D.C.'s collection of Thompson records. Guaranteed brilliant.

INTERNATIONAL ANARCHIST CENTRE MEETINGS

Discussion Meetings
every Thursday at 8 p.m.
NOV. 7—Discussion led by
Philip Holgate on
EDUCATION

Every Friday and Saturday:
SOCIAL EVENINGS

Saturday Night is Skiffle Night
Saturday, November 2:
THE ATLANTA SKIFFLE GROUP
from 8 p.m. till you drop.
Admission and Coffee: 1/6

FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

Postal Subscription Rates:
12 months 19/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)
6 months 9/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)
3 months 5/- (U.S.A. \$0.75)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies
12 months 29/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)
6 months 14/6 (U.S.A. \$2.25)

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

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