

In this Issue :

- An Ape Views the
Sputniks - p. 2
- Soldiers and
Governments - p. 3
- African Clothing
Workers Strike - p. 4

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"Every existing government owes its beginnings to force and is in its fundamental nature militaristic."

H. G. WELLS.

Vol. 18, No. 48

November 30th, 1957

Threepence

TOWARDS THE TOTAL STATE

GRADUALLY the implications of living in the missile age are being spelt out. With a growing sense of despair one is forced to the melancholy conclusion that there is no lunacy, no waste, too extreme to be unattractive to the practical men at the head of the world's affairs.

Step by inexorable step the nations of the world subvert their own well-being in the planning of patterns of existence which can have no other end but disaster. Not necessarily the disaster of the global destruction for which they organise but certainly the corruption of human society by fear and power to the extent that social progress becomes impossible.

Society cannot be organised on the lines of military preparedness in the missile age in any other way but an increasing totalitarianism. This is the Sputnik lesson that has not been openly admitted by the West, but is nevertheless the real trend which will be operated in the frantic race to catch up.

The Soviet Union has leapt ahead in the field of missile development precisely because the whole of Soviet society is geared to serve the State in a single-minded way. No other allegiances are allowed, no other loyalties weaken the subject's servitude. Even where 'socialist competition' is encouraged; even the ambitions of the bureaucracy; these can only express themselves within the framework of State policy.

Inter-Service Rivalry

The sudden publicising of the inter-Service rivalry in the United States in missile development has spotlighted an aspect of the open society (even to the extent that America can still be so described) where it suffers in comparison with the total State. The U.S. Army, Navy and Air Force each carry on their own research and development programmes of short-, intermediate- and continental-range missiles, and snarl at each other over the Pentagon table as each Force jealously defends its own programme and progress.

By contrast, one can be quite sure that no such division of resources exists in Russia. There the immense resources of the State are concentrated, the best technicians continually being brought together to pool their knowledge and sound off their 'hunches' against each others'. Results: intercontinental ballistic missiles and Sputniks I and II—years ahead of anyone else.

Certain Aims—Certain Means

Lest anyone should be now be reading a sneaking regard for such efficiency between these lines, let us hasten to clarify our position. We are not so starry-eyed about technical progress that we think it justifies everything. We have never equated canals, dams and power stations with socialism, nor thought their creation worth the suffering they entailed.

We must however recognise that if you want certain things, certain ways of organising to get them are more likely to succeed than others. If you want a powerful State, you have to gove the State power. The spread of conscription through the 'free' (sic) world is one simple example. No modern State to-day finds it practicable to rely on voluntary recruitment to fill its military forces. Specious arguments are therefore found to prove that conscription (described by Keir Hardie as 'the badge of the slave' and practised assiduously in all the best totalitarian States) is more 'democratic' than the voluntary principle. The simple fact is that if you want a modern army, navy and air-force you have to organise a regular intake of personnel. Conscription serves two purposes: it provides a consistent number of troops and over the years provides all the men with military training which tends to pin their loyalty to the State and make them useful reserves in time of need.

The Authoritarian Principle

It follows that if you want other functions of the State organised efficiently the same principle as conscription has to be applied. Which

is exactly what bureaucracy and taxation are in respect to the nationalised industries and welfare services. The authoritarian principles of the armed forces and the prison system and police force are extended when the State develops from these traditional institutions into the control of employment, education, health services, industry and so on.

If you want the full resources of your country concentrated on solving some practical problem, the only way the world knows to-day is to let the State take over. Which is why in free enterprise America a 'missile Czar'* was appointed within a week of the appearance of the Sputnik. He is a government man with powers of co-ordination over the nattering Service chiefs and private industry. In all but name a Commissar for the American missile.

The Defeat of Democracy

It is one more step towards statist America. The great citadel of rugged free enterprise adjusts itself to the lesson of the 20th century: if you want to play the game of power politics in competition with totalitarian States, you have to go totalitarian yourself. Total power politics demands the total power apparatus within your society in order to find the strength to operate it externally.

*Note the interesting use of the word 'Czar'. A subtle association with something Russian—but, of course, anti-communist, White Russian!

Selling the Public the Idea that We Need More Technologists

IT is probably the fault of Mass Communications—the assumption (and the hope) that the public cannot formulate an opinion when only presented with the facts, and the idea that in any case it is too apathetic to take notice of anything which is not presented in a dramatic way—that the political, social or economic situations always appear to be either black and bleak or rosy and booming.

What is even more extraordinary in this black and white social picture is the speed with which it can change from black to white or vice versa. James Cameron, in last Friday's *News Chronicle* calls it "The politics of the padded cell". He lays all the blame on the politicians who "emit fabulous bromides" which in the space of 24 hours change the political mood "from revulsion to a high degree of Unity". But surely he must see that "the delirious babbling in high places", as he so well puts it, assumes international importance and becomes something more than merely "delirious babbling" only because it is broadcast to every corner of the earth, commented, speculated on, and give weight by the Press, though journalists, reporters, "well-informed correspondents" and political commentators whose utterances and "considered opinions" in their turn are often adopted by the politicians.

In other words, in the "padded-cell" are not only politicians but journalists as well; the political game is one which not only the politician but a whole host of other people have a vested interest in keeping going. Is it not obvious that most of the things Eisenhower, Khrushchev and Macmillan say to each

It is, paradoxically, the defeat of democracy. To compete with Russia—indeed, to set the pace for her in the first place—on her own economic and technical terms means

accepting her political terms as well. Democracy cannot be defended that way—the game is lost from the start.

Freedom, human relations, happiness; these most certainly cannot be defended this way. But then—which of the world's governments care about that? Or, unhappily, which of the world's peoples?

'What's Wrong with the Party?' asks Michael Foot

What's Right with the Labour Party?

ALL political parties can use a rebel within their own ranks. Sometimes he is merely tolerated, sometimes encouraged, dependant upon the political requirements of the moment. Occasionally the rebel may go beyond the limited boundaries and may even be expelled, for a time. But memories are short and usually the naughty dissenter having convinced the electorate (frankly totalitarian countries have a slightly different procedure) that one member at least is not going to conform to party dictates can then be quietly pulled back into line. This in effect is what happened to Bevan when his noisy opposition to his party's support of German rearmament ended ignobly with the words "I only want to serve the party".

Many sincere and honest people accepted his retreat as a political necessity, and have since witnessed another Bevan reversal at Brighton where, as a *FREEDOM* writer aptly expressed it, he clothed himself in the H-bomb for the sake of humanity. Be that as it may the point

we are trying to make here is that Bevan in his rebellious days served a useful purpose to the Labour Party. The embarrassment which he caused them in some quarters was balanced by the approval which he won from "left wing" sections of Labour, and supporters continue to vote for the Labour Party because they still hope that some form of socialism will emerge from the morass of conservatism in which Labour is so firmly embedded.

Now that Bevan has overtly and conclusively chosen power instead of principles, the Labour Party will have to find another rebel to take his place and rally that section of the Labour movement intelligent enough not to follow Bevan wherever his policies might lead. The middle class vote will not then be lost in this way and the trade unions allied to the Labour Party will help to keep the workers believing that Labour is the working class party.

Who is there among the Labour mediocrities with Bevan's appeal and abilities? There are very few. The rebel who seems to fill the bill just now is Michael Foot, a bright boy who has not the attraction of a working class background but who has a relatively honest political history, and no doubt, respect in some quarters when he opposed Bevan's policies at the recent party congress. It remains to be seen whether he will ever become a popular pin-up like Bevan, but he can try.

In *Tribune* of November 22nd, he asks "What's Wrong with the Labour Party?" and finds enough to fill a whole page, which is only a fraction of the paper we would need to enumerate their defects, but is a good start for someone who believes basically that political democracy is the only way by which an equalitarian society can be achieved. Whether he is sincere in this belief is not for us to decide here.

Although a Labour victory is fairly certain in the next General Election it seems that the present Ministers with all their troubles "look much more alive" than the opposition. Michael Foot writes:

"there are plenty of active Labour Party members throughout the country who share the feelings that their own anger about events—about the Rent Act, about the Pensions Fiddle, about the housing cuts, about the Government's economic policy, about the rapidly worsening international situation—is only faintly reflected in the House of Commons atmosphere."

And we might add, many anarchists too.

Further, the socialist answer to the attempts to prop up the House of Lords should have been clear. But the leader of the Labour Party is reported to be in favour of the scheme and the Labour Lords have given it their approval. Michael Foot concludes if the plan is accepted, "suspicion about politicians—and particularly Labour politicians—will be greatly increased in the country". Our own experience is that suspicions about the Labour Party are already widespread and it only continues to get votes from many people on the negative principle of "the lesser of two evils". At public meetings one hears over and over again a variation of the same view: "They're all the bloody same".

Our criticism of Foot is not opposition to his modest exposé of the Labour Party, but, assuming him honestly to believe a change is possible, in thinking a radical change is likely.

Beria's Harem

OH NO! NOT THAT!

BRITISH UNITED PRESS reports that the editor of the Cairo newspaper, *Al Awam*, Mr. Mahammed Heikal, has revealed a number of interesting and previously unknown details about Laurenti Beria, the former Soviet secret police chief, subsequently sentenced to death and presumably now dead.

According to Mr. Heikal, who has recently returned from a three-week visit to Moscow, the charges against Beria included such un-Marxist and highly deviationist transgressions as being a British spy and keeping a harem of young girls.

The official Soviet version of Beria's trial does not contain any mention of the harem affair (possibly for reasons of delicacy?), but it does say that Beria carried out work in 1919 for a movement controlled by British intelligence. (M.I.6 perhaps?).

It is always fascinating to discover the real reasons for the downfall of such eminent thugs as Beria, and there are a number—but for the keen, observant student of such matters it is noticeable that invariably included among their crimes are sexual irregularities and/or spying for a foreign power.

The exact percentage of Soviet "ex-high-ups" who have been eventually discovered to be criminals has not been ascertained as yet, but it is certainly a considerable one, tending to prove as it

does, the reason why some of the present Soviet leaders look askance at their comrade-leaders, and of course vice-versa.

Inconceivable as it may seem to the uninitiated, the law of averages quite clearly points to the probability that at least half (and probably many more), of the Kremlin top brass are either homosexuals, bigamists or given to rape, or alternatively have been spying for the American or British governments (or both) for the past twenty-five years.

Naturally these deductions are subject to minor adjustments (a few per cent. either way), but the general rule must obviously be said to apply. Some of us will be fractionally surprised that a totalitarian system such as there is in the U.S.S.R. does not throw up intelligence of this kind rather sooner than appears to be the case, but one can only suppose that it is due in part to the fact that the late un-lamented Laurenti Beria covered up the horrible facts about his colleagues-in-crime.

The fact still remains however that at any moment Comrade Khrushchev could be accused of supplying Sputnik information direct to the White House by secret short-wave radio. Or worse still, perhaps he has an illicit association of some sort. It's all too horrible to contemplate.

An Ape Views the Sputniks

MY reaction to the news of the successful launching of the second satellite was a "reactionary" one. "Reactionary" views and methods, deplorable as they may be in many cases, are not necessarily worse, in terms of morals or expediency, than many that are labelled "progressive" or "revolutionary". If we are for that way of life which permits the greatest variety of human beings to live peacefully together and side by side, we should be, not only tolerant, but also kindly disposed, towards that vast number of men and women who, having lived more years than they can reasonably expect to live, attach a more vital meaning to the past than the future, and naturally resent changes which they never wanted, and whose import and motivation they do not fully comprehend. Nor must we foolishly be bound to a theory of indefinite and unqualified progress. Only those advances should meet with our unreserved approval which patently and genuinely make for more human happiness, for deeper or wider sympathy, for ethically purer standards of behaviour.

I am in no way competent to decide whether the launching, the circling, or the eventually fall of man-made satellites, as well as the seriously contemplated sending of rockets to the moon, are likely to have any harmful effect upon our planet or the life it bears; but there is no scientist who can categorically and honestly affirm that they will have none. What is beyond doubt is that the knowledge acquired, and the technological progress achieved, by this and similar ventures, will not be neglected by the powers sponsoring them in their race to increase and perfect the deadly weapons already in their possession. However appreciative I may feel about science as a triumph of man's intelligence and patience, and as an instrument in man's hands to shape his destiny into novel forms, I cannot view but with great misgivings an increase of power over physical nature at a time when governments, and even nations, so hate and fear each other as to harness this power and be ready to use it for purposes of war.

The fact that the first two satellites have been sent up by Russians (or, rather, by a team of scientists in Russia) has been a cause for much exaltation and humiliation of national pride. That is no proof, however, that brains in Russia are of a superior quality than brains in America or anywhere else. It proves

simply that investment in certain scientific projects is greater and less impeded in Russia than anywhere else. What sacrifices the Russian ordinary people have to make, whether they like it or not, to make this investment possible, need not be here insisted upon. But they must not be overlooked; and it is only too plain that, starting as they have started, experiments for the conquest of outer space will depend for their continuance on increasingly greater centralization, on more and more controls, more and more security measures, more and more slavery, both in its cruder and its more subtle forms.

To hear about the latest satellite was for me an unpleasant experience. Blame my "reactionary" mentality for it; but admit also, in all fairness, that, being neither deaf nor illiterate, and being interested in other people, I could not help hearing and talking about it. Satellites will now occupy a place in my thoughts as important as that of the hydrogen bombs. Rejoice at it, and say that my mind has been enriched; what I feel is that it has been invaded.

There is a "freedom of interest" which, like other kinds of freedom, may be proven to be illusory, but which must have some substance nevertheless, since its contrary is experienced as hurt, as a source of anxiety, as a partial paralysis of mutilation. Insofar as they are distinguishable from each other, "freedom of interest" is even more important than "freedom of thought". I take "freedom of thought" to mean being allowed to think what one likes about any given subject, and by "freedom of interest" I mean the ability to choose and cultivate the subjects one would like to think about. You can have freedom of thought without freedom of interest, as for instance when you are left free to decide whether you are going or not to take an active part in war, but you are not free not to think about war when it is raging about you.

Mystics in general, and some philosophers in particular, have endeavoured to think the absolute, and to transmute themselves into absolute thought. While, on the one hand, they may still, in so doing, have been thinking in function of mankind; and while, on the other, every man may in a sense be said to think for all mankind; most of us have an eye, when doing our thinking, on some extended and idealized audience that only serves to purify and magnify the stimuli which we receive from a small living audience of rivals, acquaintances and friends. Because our happiness and self-realization depend so much on the people we live with and talk to, it is so necessary that we should take an interest in what interests them. Unfortunately, our ability to acquire new interests is limited and generally shrinks with age; so that any large shift of interest in the people about us gives us a painful feeling of desertion or outright rejection.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

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

- New Books . . .**
 The Divine and the Decay Bill Hopkins 15/-
 Memoirs of a Catholic Girlhood Mary McCarthy 21/-
 Soldiers and Governments (ed.) Michael Howard 21/-
- Reprints and Penguins . . .**
 Taras Bulba Nicolai Gogol 3/6
 The Same Old Story I. Goncharov 7/6
 The Face of Spain Gerald Brenan 16/-
 Under Western Eyes Joseph Conrad 3/6
 A Guide to English Literature: Blake to Byron Boris Ford 3/6
 Buddenbrooks Thomas Mann 7/6
 Pattern of the Post-War World Gordon Connell-Smith 3/6
 Listen Comrades El Campesino 2/-
 Carl and Anna Leonhard Frank 2/-
- Second-Hand . . .**
 The Bolshevik Myth Alexander Berkman 20/-
 Footsteps of Warfare R. L. Worrall 4/6
 A Generation on Trial Alistair Cooke 5/-
 The Unknown World of the Child André Arthus 3/-
 The Spirit of Place D. H. Lawrence 5/-
 Diagnosis of Man Kenneth Walker 3/6
 If I Were Dictator James Maxton 2/6
 The Right to Live Max Plowman 3/-
 The Bible Handbook G. W. Foote & W. P. Ball 3/-
- Periodicals . . .**
 Dissent, Autumn 1957 3/6
 Organismic Functionalism (Reich Memorial Number) 2/6
 University Libertarian, No. 4 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**

PEOPLE AND IDEAS A Million Private Dreams - 6

"Other-direction is concomitant with a sense of powerlessness in political matters, and this impotence masks itself in many ways, often as hatred or contempt for politics. This in turn is easily rationalised into a desire for a meta-politics, for a perfect and absolute form of government which shall make possible the conflict of wills of actual politics. And the apathy which marks our political life lies as a threat beneath all the life of other-direction. Social approval and the desire for it are not love, nor even friendship, nor even community. The life of leisure, of fun, of narcissism, the right choice among the articles of consumption, of sex as the 'last frontier' of adventure, of bland adjustment—this life is at every moment susceptible to the cackling boredom which lies beneath its surface."

—LIONEL TRILLING.

NO man, said St. Bernard, should commend poverty unless he be poor, and as my pyjamas whirl round in the washing-machine, or as Yehudi Menuhin whirls round on my gramophone, I have no urge to denounce the new society of mass consumption. Nor, when more

Now, it is mostly in view of satellites, of atom and hydrogen bombs, that the educational institutions of East and West are being harnessed, even overhauled, to produce more and more scientists and technicians. No doubt a great deal of their skill and enthusiasm will be spent on works of peace, and it is not to be excluded that their increasing number and importance will eventually compel government decisions less stupid and less disastrous than those dictated by a preponderance of men of letters or law, of generals and financiers. It is disheartening, (nevertheless, for those who devoted themselves, say, to philosophy or the cause of social justice, to find that with a bomb-conditioned and a satellite-haunted education practically no one is going to be interested in their devotion and to understand what philosophy or social justice is all about.

The term "decadence", which we frequently come across in history books, is very misleading, for, if individuals and institutions may decay, a people does not. In every epoch and nation men are equally endowed with a vital energy which is both irrepressible and inexhaustible. It does not become less because it diversifies itself and desert old outlets to be channelled into new ones. When a people decays as a military power, it excels in the arts, in refined living or religious fervour. A people running dry of great poets produces great musicians, another running out of musicians produces money-makers, and so on. Every so-called decadence can be accounted for by a shift of interest. So now many of our best brains are interested in science and satellites, but it does not mean quite, as Ezra Pound put it, that only fourth-rate brains are interested in philosophy—or in poetry for that matter. It means that in a world of scientists, sputnik-gazers and sputnik-gabblers, poets and philosophers will find it difficult to sell their merchandise or even give it away.

Philosophy, poetry, even the cause of social justice, may well become the concern of a very restricted number of people, born too long ago or brought up according to an antiquated world-view, and there may be no eschatological motive to decry their demise. But there is something else which is in danger of disappearing in this age of intercontinental missiles, hydrogen bombs and satellites, in this age of states and super-states. It is the concern for spiritual values, for what makes a good life and a good man, the concern for integrity. Integrity is that faithfulness to oneself that can resist the lure of money and is not cowed by power. Diogenes was looking for it over two thousand years ago, but he had it in himself. Diogenes was looking for Man, the very Man whose disappearance is threatened by the vast and tightly controlled organizations that send sputniks into the sky. Sputniks herald a new era, happy and glorious, etc. But I for one cannot rejoice. Imagine, as is suggested in a book for the popularization of science written at least twenty years ago—imagine our hypothetical apish ancestor sensing and witnessing the emergence of the human species. How sad he must have felt, knowing that his world would not be a world for apes any longer. I feel the same. To those whose heart is with the sputniks and the era which sputniks are ushering in I must look no more than an ape. Indeed my spine is still shaped by attachment to this earth. It is too old to be pulled erect by lustful or bidden staring into outer space.

GIOVANNI BALDELLI.

people saw the BBC television production of Richard Strauss's *Salome* than have ever seen it in the opera house, when more people hear A. J. P. Taylor's lectures on ITV than he will ever teach in a lifetime at Oxford, do I feel inclined to bawl about the lowering of cultural and intellectual standards brought about by mass-communications.

The economy of abundance can readily be seen from one point of view as a necessary concomitant of a free society—freedom of choice for everybody.

But how little choice we actually exercise. Look at John Citizen, streamed and screened into the appropriate channel of the education industry, his occupation is decided for him in adolescence. If in adult life he decides to change it (all that training thrown away!), he is regarded as unstable. (Unless he is at the bottom of the occupational hierarchy, in which case mobility and redundancy are virtues, and if he is selfish enough to try to cling to one job and security, his efforts are denounced as restrictive practices).

On the strength of a few happy evenings at the Palais, John and Mary make a contract with the state and some religious enterprise to live together for life, and are given a licence to copulate. Then comes the search for The Englishman's Home. Assuming that he's one of the lucky ones who escape those furnished rooms (no pets, no babies, walk on tiptoe or the people downstairs will bang on the ceiling), he might get a municipal house or flat and be subject to the kind of indignities that 'G' described recently in *FREEDOM*, or he might mortgage the next twenty-five years of his life to a high-interest money-lender known as a Building Society (though the only thing it ever built was its office-palace in W.C.1.).

HAVING got his semi-detached love-nest (for the society won't lend money on anything else—a house which is old, unusual, unorthodox or 'modern' is not in its eyes a safe investment), John and Mary raise a family. Look at them a few years later. He feels vaguely that he has been caught, poor old breadwinner, struggling home every night in the rush-hour, with all those mouths to feed, Mary devoting all her attention to the kids and taking him for granted, he can't change his job now, aren't even be rude to Mr. Blenkinsop. Mary feels trapped too, lonely single-handed housewife, left out of things, John always grumbling if she buys a new coat, if he notices, putting on his tired businessman act, and what sort of a world are the kids growing up into? Even Maureen and Anthony feel trapped. Why can't Mum and Dad leave us alone?

But there is no need to go on with this harrowing saga, we know it all backwards. The life of quiet desperation is what happens when private dreams are tailored to conformity. "Love boat smashed against mores" as Mayakovsky put it.

The pattern of life that I have caricatured (is it a caricature?) is not really affected by all the attractive gadgets that

make up the consumer society—it is merely raised to a more opulent level by hire purchase and made more widespread by the transformation of the proletariat. And this in turn makes us conscious of the immense importance of those who are pioneering the next step, looking for a different pattern—a wider unit than the nuclear family (a form, as Jacquetta Hawkes said, "making fearful demands on the human beings caught up in it; heavily weighted for loneliness, excessive demands, strain and failure"). I mean some sort of multiple household that gives a wider variety of relationships and a sharing out of domestic routines—for example the group of families who bought cheaply a huge Victorian mansion, divided it into apartments of various sizes and rooms for special purposes, started a nursery school for their children and grew their own produce—no theories about community, they just wanted a more rational and rewarding solution to the immediate and physical problems of living. Or, for instance, people who are experimenting with different relationships between work and home, work and school, work and play.

BUT beyond both the easy condemnation of the consumer society and the easy assumption that as we get used to it we will make more intelligent and discriminating use of it, are doubts and misgivings enough to turn anybody's private dream into a nightmare. How sound are its economic foundations and what control have we over them? How about the hungry millions on the outside, for the gap between Asia's living standards and ours increases as the years go by? How about the dream of being your own boss—has it shrunk to the remote chance of winning on the pools or giving the right answer in a newspaper competition and getting a sweetshop in Frinton? How about The Bomb? How about politics?

An American observer, Arnold Rogow, equates politics in this connection with party politics:

"Both political parties are in the process of discovering that the spirit of People's Capitalism is hostile not only to radical and conservative extremes in politics, but to politics altogether. . . . For Labour Party members, like their Conservative and Liberal counterparts, are equally caught up in the social situation and conditioning of People's Capitalism. As incomes rise they, too, become more allergic to taxes and government spending. As status improves they, too, begin to absorb the point of view of those higher up. As hire purchase extends they too, become more anxious about political and other changes, at least in the ensuing 24 months-in-which-to-pay. Conditioned by advertising to define their lives solely in terms of material splendour, getting ahead and 'togetherness', they, too, are apt to eschew ideology, Socialism, radicalism, politics itself."

And a good thing too, we might say, having no love for politicians. But this kind of political indifference is very far from the "politics of the unpolitical", very far from the autonomy of the free. It is the political attitude which supported Poujadism in France and McCarthysm

Continued on p. 3

CINEMA

A FACE IN THE CROWD

ELIA KAZAN and the actors who perform according to the 'Method' by which they study their rôles' implications and think themselves into their parts have produced some notable films. The most recent *A Face in the Crowd* concerns the building up of a television personality, the attempt to use his widespread popularity to boost a group of near-Fascist politicians and his final downfall. The scene opens in Arkansas—in the background a large decaying colonial-style house and closer to us numbers of old men with lined faces sit around talking and playing draughts in a parody of enjoyment. It is July 4th, an eager young 'roving microphone' girl drives to the prison to give her listeners a new sensational thrill at hearing the voices of the criminals. The hobos in jail refuse to co-operate until the Sheriff agrees to set free an uncouth guitar-playing drunk, if he will perform. As played by Andy Griffith, Lonesome Rhodes combines a surface charm with an underlying unpleasantness. He uses a clever 'ah'm just a simple country boy' line of patter and plenty of folksy stories that appeal to all the old dears in his audience.

Soon he is signed up and a national figure. He judges a drum-major's contest out West that appears as an orgy of bobby-soxers' hero-worship and unhealthy

emotionalism. Of especial interest is his decision to use his power to support a Senator, running for President, in return for a government post. The Senator is groomed and coached into making himself into a one-hundred per-cent, American political star to sell his reactionary policies. Intoxicated by power Lonesome Rhodes over-reaches himself. His former girl-friend in an improbable ending, pulls the switches after his TV programme so that his unguarded comments on his stupid listeners goes out to the millions in their homes. He ends in screaming Hitlerian speech-making while an underling provides canned applause from a mechanical contraption.

The film provides a vivid commentary on television and political power in the modern state. The acting is faultless. My only criticism is that Kazan betrays the same contempt for ordinary people as does the political climber. Even the intellectual TV producer at the country station who sees through Lonesome Rhodes is completely spineless. His moral seems to be in spite of his trick ending the defeatist one that the millions of the empty-headed crowd deserve the corrupt politician they get. Yet the film is compelling and is worth seeing as it deals with the reality of the power struggle. F.T.

More Technologists

Continued from p. 1

induced Sir Winston to pontify for a brief moment. However, even more eloquent than the old bull-dog himself was the silent "little Lemon" as he careered through outer space in his air-conditioned Sputnik II, symbol of the scientific might of Russia but also, as a result of the quite exaggerated publicity given to it in the Press, a "spur" to the West to emulate this achievement of the East. Education henceforth must be geared to the turning out of technologists in their thousands; the days when we were taught to be little Empire builders are past.

It was not surprising therefore that last week's inauguration of the new extensions to the Manchester College of Science and Technology was a national event "graced" (we believe that is the respectful term) by the presence of the Queen's lesser-half, the Duke of Edinburgh. The *Manchester Guardian* (and advertisers) contributed to the occasion with a "Symposium on Technological Education" including an introduction by Dr. Bowden, Principal of the College. We have to confess that the Duke's speech was less chauvinist than the Professor's, who lamented that the foreigners had long ago recognised the importance of training technicians whereas in this country it is only in the last year or two that it has begun "to dawn" on us that "our whole economy could be swamped by other nations who are educating young engineers better than we are". It has long been obvious—declared the Professor—that the English education system is failing to meet the challenge of our times.

This, we would suggest, is one of the most abused clichés of our time! And the professor writes nothing to rehabilitate it. In an article covering nearly half a page of the *Manchester Guardian* he talks "shop" and politics. He makes no mention of human happiness, but clearly technology is for him an end in itself, a religion, no less materialistic than "Communism" is for the Russians. "Technologists—he writes—are the missionaries of our modern age, and their influence on the rest of the world may be more potent than that of atomic bombs or even of satellites". These "missionaries" will save no souls. At most they will save the nation and the system:

One thing at least is clear. Our own position as a nation is tenable only if our manufacturing ability is second to none in the world. What must we do to be saved? Is it too late? Our position is grave, but I believe that we can recover if we mobilise all our resources.

The Duke, as we have already remarked, said the same things but not so blatantly. He does not appear to have mentioned Russia, and he even went out of his way to distinguish between the training and education of scientists and technologists. "Training—he said—applies to the specialist and education to the whole man", and he seemed to have some regard for the whole man in spite of his concern for the specialist as he turned the key (or cut the tape) and declared the extension open. But like the Professor he seemed to agree that

the fact remains that, without properly trained and educated scientists and technologists, industry and agriculture, medicine and nuclear power, defence and rockets would very soon shrivel and disappear. We could probably do quite well without some of these things; but our days as a modern civilised State with a reasonably high standard of living would certainly be numbered. The health, the prosperity, and the defence of this country depend for their development upon the ideas of scientists and upon the

skill of technologists to convert those ideas into practical and useful hardware. This is one of the hard facts of modern life, and the more we can do to ensure that this country has enough properly trained and educated scientists and technologists the sooner we shall get ourselves out of this present state of lagging production, which is a polite way of saying—chronic poverty.

THE Professor writes "Our own position as a nation is tenable only if . . .". The Duke declares "our days as a modern civilised State . . . would certainly be numbered [if] . . .". Perhaps we attribute to them more political understanding and guile than they in fact possess, when we suggest that their words are significant and carefully chosen. The urgent need for technologists to-day is, on the one hand, connected with problems of military techniques, on the other with production in relation to the struggle for world markets.* It can be argued that under the existing system the present standards of living in this country depend on its ability to export manufactured goods. If one uses this argument then equally can it be maintained that "defence" programmes are essential since the struggle for power is one aspect of the same system. But to assume that the material (not to mention the spiritual) well-being of the people as a whole can be equated with the existence, and functioning of, the system, is to stretch the argument too far (though of course this is what the politicians, aided by the Press, have more or less succeeded in doing). And by extension, therefore, the well-being of society depends on an ever-increasing "output" of scientists and technologists from our universities.

WE have on more than one occasion attempted to disprove this thesis (see, for instance, *An Indigestion of Politics*, FREEDOM 19/10/57), and if we do not tire of doing so it is because we are convinced of the need to explode the myths which pass as truths if we are to look forward to some objective thinking and commensurate action among our fellow beings. We repeat, if the material well-being of the world—not even just of this country—depended on more production, we have already all the scientific and technological skill to provide the know-how, and the willing hands to do the work. But this is not practical thinking in a system which is primarily organised for the benefit of a few and only incidentally for the welfare of the many.

Under such a system scientific and technological skill are organised by, and in the service of, high finance (except of course where they are employed on war production and then its *your* money that is being spent for their power struggle). In other words it is finance and not technological potential or human needs that control production. This point was forcibly made by Prof. P. M. S. Blackett in his Presidential Address to this year's meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, on the subject of "Technology and World Advancement". He showed that the gap in wealth between the West and Asia is steadily widening and that

moreover, most new scientific and technical discoveries or developments tend to widen the gap still more just because the already rich countries have the capital to make full use of them but the poor countries have not. Decidedly science is no fairy wand to wave over a poor country to convert it into a rich one.

And on the subject of technical aid he makes these forthright comments:

I am convinced that western pessimism about the possibility of social advance by ex-colonial Asian countries, derived in part from the doctrine of white superiority, is both unjustified in fact and a serious cause of practical error. It has

*The Duke mentions agriculture and medicine. At the same time the Government was announcing a cut of 10% in the number of medical students and the 1951 Census, *Industry Tables*, just issued, shows a falling off of employment, in agriculture of nearly 4%.

SOLDIERS AND GOVERNMENTS

SOLDIERS AND GOVERNMENTS, Nine Studies in Civil-Military Relations, edited by Michael Howard. Eyre and Spottiswoode, 21s.

THIS book consists of a series of lectures by various historians, delivered under the auspices of King's College, London. They deal with the relationships between the military and the civil power in Britain, France, Germany, Russia, Spain, Latin America and the United States. It is by no means intended as an indictment of militarism. Indeed the editor, who also writes the introduction, is described on the dust jacket as "one of the most brilliant of our younger military historians". He quotes approvingly Hobbes' "Covenants without swords are but words", and is clearly no pacifist, yet from these sober pages I derive a picture of the military clique which is far from flattering.

Incidentally, there appears to be a contradiction in the philosophy of the writer, for on the page following the quotation from Hobbes he says,

"The problem of civil-military relationships is one with which, in one form or another, all societies have to deal. In States where no orderly tradition of power and obedience has yet been established—or those where it has been destroyed—military force is the final and sometimes the only arbiter in government. It may indeed be said that societies are orderly and peaceable only in so far as they have solved this double problem, of the subordination of military force to the political government, and of the control of a government in possession of such force by legal restraint and the popular will."

But if it is possible for the civil power to control the military at all Hobbes' dictum falls to the ground, because almost all the swords are in the hands of the soldiers. The police forces of most states could hardly win a straight fight with the army. So if the civil power can control the military it must be by moral force of some sort. So naked force does not necessarily rule the world.

In most countries the army has aspired to control the state. Yet it is curious to see how the soldiers do usually call upon the civilians' help in the end.

led the West to overestimate the need of the have-not countries for technical advice from western experts and to underestimate the need for simple financial help. Admirable as many of the schemes of technical aid have been, particularly those in education, medicine and agriculture, the sending of experts to poor countries without the capital to carry out their plans could be as irritating as to send a trained cook to a family unable to pay the baker. Unless followed up by massive financial aid, some of the West's present aid programme may yet merit the war-time wisecrack of 'offering all aid short of help'. (Our italics).

Finance, the only commodity which is no material part of a loaf of bread, an irrigation dam or an oil refinery, nevertheless decides whether or not these shall be made or constructed. This is the crazy system in the service of which millions of human beings live and die; in the defence of which more millions are killed in war, and because of which a thousand million are to-day living below standards necessary for maintaining health. "Scientists and technologists", declared Professor Blackett, "have a special responsibility in this matter

since it is their genius and their skill which alone can bring the material basis of happiness within the reach of all. As a scientist myself and also partly a technologist, I believe that the uneven division of power and wealth, the wide differences of health and comfort among the nations of mankind, are the sources of discord in the modern world, its major challenge and, unrelieved, its moral doom.

He did well to remind them of their social responsibilities since it is so easy for privileged members of society to accept this uneven distribution of wealth and power. "With nations, as with individuals, the ultimate hypocrisy of the rich is to preach the virtue of poverty to the poor."

But let us not rely only on the men of science. For whilst, as we have seen in history, no social revolution can easily succeed without the participation of the technicians on the side of the people equally a revolution of scientists and technologists is either doomed to failure . . . or spells dictatorship!

BOOK REVIEW

In Britain there was no great gulf between the two powers. Civil and military leaders came from the same social class and had the same interests. Disputes were more about the means of equipping the fighting services, whether to have conscription or not and problems of strategy, than fights for power. The different groups, with their different theories of national defence, were capable of attacking each other with extreme bitterness. Opponents would refuse to shake hands at court levées and write bitter pamphlets and newspaper articles, but they did not hack each other to pieces with swords, as in Japan, or shoot or exile each other, as in Latin America.

Throughout this book one finds childishness and muddle. These "great men" seem so often to have behaved to each other like schoolboys. They are protected by their social status, by the awe in which people hold them. One usually thinks, for example, of the Prussian military caste as formidable. They talked fire-eating rodomontade against democracy, but when faced with a Bismarck of a Hitler they were nowhere. They frightened weak governments, but displayed a curious helplessness when faced with a really ruthless opponent who knew what he wanted. They thought they could use the Nazis, but it was the Nazis who used them in the end.

The military cliques emerge from this book as immature, wrangling, power-hungry, short-sighted and ultimately strangely ineffective. Probably their happiest hunting ground is Latin America. In this still rather remote part of the world a form of society has survived which is becoming extinct elsewhere. This is the society of the robber baron and the war-lord, for although the constitutions of the South American republics are in theory democratic, social relationships in many of them are still feudal, and in many of them too the masses are still illiterate and living in great poverty.

General Rafael de Nogales wrote, in his autobiography "Memoirs of a Soldier of Fortune", that "In Venezuela everyone wants to be the government, because not being the government is hell." It used to be said that in Central America there was two-party government, one party in power and the other in jail.

For the most part the "revolutions" which took place were merely palace revolts, which did not affect the mass of the people. This situation is changing to-day, but the "caudillo" is a form of "political saurian" which is very far from extinction, as some too optimistic writers have prophesied. Nor is it likely that his passing will usher in liberal democracy, it is far more likely that he will be superseded by the bureaucrat of the totalitarian state, who will probably be considerably worse.

Michael Howard, in his introduction, writes, regarding the tradition of liberty, as seen by the liberals be it understood,

A Million Private Dreams - 6

Continued from p. 2

in America. It is the politics of the beetle in Capek's *Insect Play*, looking after his ball of dung, his "little pile". And the vacuum it leaves is very readily filled by those who know how to exploit it.

Edward Hyams, whose definition of the "mental and spiritual country", the "ideal landscape" which constitutes our private dreams, began this fragmentary discussion of social changes, writes in a letter to the *New Statesman* last week, "it seems to me that the interests of the people of Britain, and that of any conceivable government of Britain are now as opposed, though not so obviously opposed, as those of the people of Hungary, the USSR or Spain, and their respective governments". Is it not clear, he asks, that "we are all going to be forced, whether we like it or not, to be citizens of a great power?"

"We have to have politicians; we cannot stop them wanting to be great and powerful men; great and powerful men, whether good or evil, are, in office, the scourge of small and feeble men—us . . . I do not believe that we can any longer pretend that technical progress has anything whatever to contribute to the freedom and happiness of men; but it has everything to contribute to the power and greatness of mankind. Power and greatness have nothing whatever to do with freedom and happiness. Who paid the price for Britain's power and greatness in the 19th century? Tens of millions of miserable factory slaves, countless half-starved farm hands. Who is paying the price for the two Sputniks now circling the earth? Tens of millions of Soviet factory and farm slaves . . . How nice and easy it would all be

"Preparation for war is not completed when the armed forces have been supplied with their immediate needs. It may involve further a fundamental re-organisation of economic life, changing the whole pattern of industry by diverting resources to 'uneconomic' needs and by subsidizing 'uneconomic' production. It might involve, if we were to take the threat of thermonuclear war seriously, a large-scale resettlement of population. It does involve the retention and exercise by the government of powers difficult to reconcile with the English tradition of individual liberty. But it is becoming ever more obvious that that tradition was shaped in days when the problem of defence could be ignored; and in the one particular in which it could not be ignored, the need to man the Navy, the concept of individual liberty received short shrift at the hands of the press-gang. One is sometimes tempted to wonder how much more of this way of life, moulded in more secure days, we may be forced to abandon by the requirements of defence in an atomic age."

The answer may be brief, "All of it." The liberal concept of freedom was a product of a middle-class trading and manufacturing society, with aristocratic elements. But this is passing away. The man of the future is the technician and the bureaucrat, backed up by an efficient police force. To such people talk about "freedom" is simply meaningless, because from their point of view men and women cannot be left free to choose courses which are contrary to scientific knowledge or which lead to lower degrees of efficiency. "Error", as a Catholic theologian remarked blandly, "has not the same rights as truth." There will be huge populations, whose living standards will be threatened, and hence the security of the régime and the social structure, by the slightest error. So there will be no place for individual decision at all, everything will depend on what the appropriate expert says, and this will be even more so in the case of war, where little liberty is allowed at the best of times. Everything will be subordinated to the needs of defence, which will simply become an end in itself.

While reading this book I realised most vividly the truth of the saying, "The great are only great because we are on our knees." The military caste is not composed of men whose character would naturally make them lords over their fellows. They have their fair share of "human weaknesses". What makes them formidable is the implicit trust, respect and obedience they receive from their fellows. If by any social upheaval, such as that in Germany after the First World War, they are suddenly stripped of this respect as of a garment, they appear rather poor creatures.

The power of the great ones of the earth, whether they are technicians, managers, bureaucrats, bandits, caudillos, war-lords or anything you like, lies almost entirely in the obedience people are prepared to give them. Man has surrendered his freedom.

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

if the prospect before us were only Orwell's '1984'! For in that bogey-novel the enemy was someone else; Winston Smith was broken into loving Big Brother, but there would have been others who would have gone on hating his guts and would have had a chance of destroying him, like older tyrants. But in our highly organised, technically brilliant age, we are our own tyrant. For after all, the politicians I have been railing at for their love of power and glory are only projections of ourselves."

IT is in fact we ourselves who limit our capacity for realising our private dreams, by our breach of faith with the "ideal environment" which we once made for ourselves. We have surrendered to the dead weight of inertia and conformity and we wonder why life is not more fulfilling. We have worshipped power and glory and we wonder why we live on the edge of a volcano. We have shrugged off our power over ourselves and we shudder at our utter helplessness.

How do we set about the discovery of autonomy? Is it possible? Can it be done in time? I have no idea. But I believe that it begins with the renunciation of authority over others and the assertion of authority over ourselves, with fragmentation and dispersal of social organisation, with technological decentralisation, with political unreliability and disobedience, with the re-awakening of what is local and voluntary, with recognition that "In this age the mere example of nonconformity, the mere refusal to bend the knee to custom is itself a service." With, that is to say, fidelity to ourselves. C.W.

IMPRACTICAL APARTHEID

African Clothing Workers Strike

WE often point out in these columns that the main reason why *apartheid* is not carried to even greater lengths in South Africa is because it is not an economic proposition. Recent proof of this is evidenced by the present strike of some 12,000 African workers in the garment industry. (Correctly speaking they are not on strike since this is not permitted by law, but they are "staying away from their jobs").

The cause of the "strike" is an order, issued by the South African Minister of Labour, Jan de Klerk (the Prime Minister's brother-in-law), who in his over-enthusiasm to be well thought of as an ardent white supremacist by the voters, overstepped the mark by making a law reserving "for whites only", 30,000-40,000 jobs as machinists, supervisors, cutters, choppers-out and table hands. These represent about half the available jobs in the industry, and the clothing manufacturers say they would have to sack about 40,000 Negroes to comply with the order. Since the manufacturers pay low wages they have no chance of employing white workers to replace the Negroes and in fact there are only about 7,000 whites in this section of the industry at present.

The order has already created sufficient upheaval to bring worried leaders of the Federated Chamber of Industries to Pretoria to protest at the government interference in their business. As a consequence of this de Klerk has postponed enforcement of the order, but this is not enough for the Garment Workers' Union and they are remaining on "strike".

Miss Anna Scheepers, president of the Union, said the mass walk-outs were likely to cause drastic repercussions in the industry: "Once we have proved that job reservations cannot work we are prepared to call on workers to go back. We do not want to penalise the industry."

At Germiston, outside Johannesburg, many Europtan workers were given notice when the production lines slowed down. The strike is affecting Kimberley and Port Elizabeth in the Cape Province as well as the Transvaal.

These events are a sharp reminder to the *apartheid*-mongers that however much they may wish to pursue their vicious policies against the African, and despite the fact that they appear to hold all the cards, the whole South African economy depends for its existence upon the labour power of the race which they seek to render powerless. This is the Nationalist government's dilemma, and at the same time the African's principal weapon with which to fight the incredible injustice which besets him.

The present strike may be taken as a clear indication of the best method for the oppressed African to adopt, but unfortunately it is not quite as simple as it may seem. The factor in this strike which makes the difference is the existence of a conflict between the government and a body of employers whose interests on this occasion are the same as the employed. Ordinarily the conflict is quite differently balanced, effectively between black and white. The Africans are almost completely unorganised (partly by law and partly because most of their organisers are currently on trial for "treason"), and it is almost impossible for them to take direct action of the sort which would be effective unless there is at least the nucleus of a representative organising body.

Spontaneous or instinctive action is most unlikely to occur under the present circumstances (circumstances which constantly get worse), for the African has little or no education, lacks communications and funds, and tends to accept the situation as inevitable and eduring. It must also be remembered that the African in his village does not view *apartheid* as we do, nor does he necessarily have particularly strong feelings against authoritarian governments. The urban African who is actually affected by *apartheid* may have more advanced views but merely be working in the town for a limited period, saving up for the time when he returns to his village to buy a piece of land or a wife.

There is not therefore an *intrinsic* feeling of solidarity against the white government or the white man at all

costs. One day there may well be, perhaps it will be sooner than we expect. Most South Africans who visit or settle down in this country seem to feel that the African will rise up and slaughter (or attempt to slaughter) the whites within the next 20 years. If the Afrikaaner holds the same opinion it is by no means obvious, and in the meantime many precautions are being taken to prevent such a thing.

Perhaps events depend in the end upon the degree of oppression forced upon the African, but it would be far better if it were upon his ability to channel the power which is in his hands into a purposeful course of action. If he can organise in such a way as to exert pressure upon the economy then at least an approach can be made towards his taking up his rightful place in South Africa.

WHAT'S RIGHT WITH THE L.P. ?

Continued from p. 1

Does he really believe that Labour Lords are in effect going to advocate the end of their own political careers. With a General Election so near does he really think that the Labour Party can afford to rant against the "Pensions Fiddle" unless they can make substantial changes themselves. Everyone knows that this is not a matter of individual decisions but what the Treasury Department decides is in the "national interests". Michael Foot must know what is common knowledge that there is never any real change in foreign policy whichever party is in power, in the words of a late (unlamented) Labour Foreign Secretary the policy in foreign affairs under Labour rule will be one of continuity.

Michael Foot is either kidding himself or us if he seriously believes that socialism as he (and we understand it can be brought about by a political party which by its nature cannot act differently on issues which fundamentally affect our lives. He suggests that only if Labour takes the fight outside the walls of Westminster will a real Labour victory be assured. It is significant that we rarely see these days (this writer has never seen) a Labour Party platform on the street corners or in the usual public speaking places. Is it because they are sure of the voters anyway or because they would have to admit that whatever their promises, they cannot make radical changes in society through the parliamentary Labour Party or by the existing constitutional means? By all means let them take the fight outside the walls of Westminster, though the results might shake Michael Foot.

However, even when it has been possible for Labour Ministers to make decisions without consulting permanent civil servants, we can add to the dismal list of despicable decisions. Starting from the banishment of Seretse Khama to the ending of troops into the docks. Did Michael Foot offer to resign as one "sell out" followed another?

We know the answer to that one. He thinks he should stay in the party and reform it. Wake up comrade, you've nothing to lose but your bad conscience.

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!
 Deficit on Freedom £940
 Contributions received £661
 DEFICIT £279
 November 15 to November 21

San Francisco: per Osmar, Part proceeds Social, Nov. 2, £35; London: Anon.* 1/10; London: Anon. 1/9; Chicago: T.B. 7/-; London: Anon.* £1; London J.S.* 3/-; London: G.O. £1; Lakewood: S.M. £5/5/0; Fleetwood: P.J.H. 18/8; Farnham: D.M.B. 5/6.
 *Indicates regular contributor.

Total	44 2 9
Previously acknowledged	617 5 11
1957 TOTAL TO DATE	£661 7 8

Fire Fund
 San Francisco: per Osmar: Nafra: J.M. £1/15/0; San Francisco: J.R. 10/6; Los Gatos: P.P. £1/15/0; Pleasanton: S. £1/15/0; San Francisco: A.G. £1/15/0.
 Total ... 7 10 6
 Previously acknowledged ... 382 19 6
 TOTAL TO DATE ... £390 10 0

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

Power Complexes

DEAR COMRADES,

There is a point to be made with regard to this question of power complexes. If man were naturally a power-seeking animal it is probable that he would have also developed inner checks and inhibitions against his own violence, which in fact he has not done. Konrad Z. Lorenz in the final chapter of his book *King Solomon's Ring*, entitled "Morals and Weapons", describes how some extremely ferocious animals, such as the wolf, have developed inhibitions against destroying each other. In a fight the beaten wolf exposes his neck in a submissive gesture, and the victor cannot strike, although he would like to. On the other hand, gentle creatures, whose weapons are relatively less lethal than the fangs of the wolf, such as the roe-deer and above all the dove, symbol of pacifism, are capable of murdering their own kind most bloodily, if caged together. The reason is that these animals are able to get away from each other if the situation becomes desperate, in their wild state, so no inhibition has been developed.

Since primitive nomads appear peaceful on the whole, yet their descendants are ferocious, one may be justified in supposing this decline to be the consequence of a change from natural to unnatural conditions. The peacefulness of the primitive may well be due to the fact they are living in a "state of nature", and we are not. There have been cases when "benevolent" government officials have tried to persuade primitive hunting bands to settle down to agricultural life, usually without success. The primitives have refused, wisely in all probability, in view of the dark and seething hatreds in peasant communities.

Codes of chivalry have been developed, in an effort to produce by art what natural evolution has not done for man, that is to give him an inhibition against striking a beaten foe. Generally such efforts have failed. Not being naturally a warlike animal, when organised warfare once begins man has no inhibitions against pushing it to the limit.

While it is a mistake to regard man as merely an animal, it is also wrong to neglect his animal origin. Man has evolved as a primitive nomad. Civilisation is relatively recent and impose intolerable burdens in almost all the cultures known to us. I wish I could see signs of the "revolution more fundamental than any that has been known before", of which S. E. Parker speaks, which is to synthesize primitive "innocence" and civilised "experience". Such a revolution to be effective would require the whole-hearted support of nearly the entire population of the globe, not of a few hundred anarchists. I see no hope of such a revolution. What may happen is that a handful of survivors after a hydrogen-bomb war may be forced back to pre-civilised ways of living whether they liked it or not.

S. E. Parker says "... our proof lies in our hearts and can only be shown in our lives". It seems to me that the anarchist has done all that he can do when he himself lives as much like an anarchist as is possible in our society. Revolutionary movements never seem to have a great deal of success. To consider only the anarchist movement: it has only made one revolution, in Spain, and even this was doubtfully anarchic, and in any case failed, the revolutionaries co-operated with the government which later destroyed them; at present the anarchist movement is weaker than it was fifty

years ago, and seems to be making practically no progress at all.

I suggest that this is due to the fact that the anarchist is appealing to civilised men to do something that is physically impossible for most of them, to live anarchistically in a highly unnatural environment. The fact that a handful of exceptional people are able to retain their primitive anarchist spirit in the midst of our society is encouraging, but there are too few of them to form a new society or to change the world. The most they can do is to form groups, clubs, societies and communities, which they do already, in order to enjoy each other's company and help each other to withstand the blows of tyranny and fate. Even a certain amount of propaganda is not a bad thing, so that people who may share our feelings may know that we exist and can come and join themselves to us, but propaganda which aims at converting the world, or enough of it to make a revolution, appears to me to be futile.

If we are romantically inclined we may think of ourselves as the last survivors of the primitive "golden age". I doubt very much that we are the forerunners of a new one.

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

P.S.—If this pessimistic conclusion annoys someone sufficiently for him or her to think of an effective way out of the impasse in which the anarchist movement is, a way which is not simply a statement of good intentions or amiable wishes, I shall be extremely happy.

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

DEC. 1—Axel Hoch on AM I MY BROTHER'S EATER?
 DEC. 8—Bob Green on SOME SHIBBOLETHS OF ANARCHISM.
 DEC. 15—Donovan Pedely on FREEDOM & ORGANISATION
 Questions, Discussion and Admission all free.

HAMPSTEAD LIBERTARIAN GROUP

Fortnightly public discussions are held on alternate Mondays at 7.45 p.m. in the basement of 12, Oak Hill Park (off Froggnal) N.W.3. Nearest tube station: Hampstead (Northern Line).
 Dec. 2:

ANARCHISM AS I SEE IT introduced by Philip Holgate.

★ 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

INTERNATIONAL ANARCHIST CENTRE MEETINGS

Discussion Meetings every Thursday at 8 p.m.

Every Friday and Saturday:

SOCIAL EVENINGS

Saturday Night is Skiffle Night
 Admission and Coffee:
 Members 1/6
 Non-members 2/-

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

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.

E. A. GUTKIND:
The Expanding Environment 8s. 6d.

V. RICHARDS:
Lessons of the Spanish Revolution 6s.

RUDOLF ROCKER:
Nationalism and Culture cloth 21s.

ERRICO MALATESTA:
Anarchy 6d.
Vote—What For? 1d.

PETER KROPOTKIN:
The State: Its Historic Role 1s.
The Wage System 3d.
Revolutionary Government Organised Vengeance Called Justice 3d.

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

M. BAKUNIN:
Marxism, Freedom and the State. cloth 5s.

MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI:
Neither East nor West paper 7s. 6d.; cloth 10s. 6d.

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.

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.

TONY GIBSON:
Youth for Freedom paper 2s.
Food Production and Population 6d.
Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.

ALEX COMFORT:
Delinquency 6d.

★
Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications:
Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute cloth 5s.
Journey Through Utopia cloth 18s. (U.S.A. \$3)

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