

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"Government is not reason, it is not eloquence—it is force."  
—GEORGE WASHINGTON.

## With a World Depression Round the Corner - IS CAPITALISM WORTH SAVING?

IN last Thursday week's *Manchester Guardian* the Financial editor was explaining that there was a "general lack of interest in the City about the bank-rate" and this made him "think that the authorities may soon find it harmless to bring it down". It was almost as if the Chancellor and the directors of the Bank of England were "tuned in" to the Financial editor as he wrote, for lo and behold on the Thursday the bank rate was reduced from 7 to 6 per cent! And in Friday morning's *Manchester Guardian* the Financial editor unmoved by his prophetic remarks of the previous day dryly and modestly writes: "It was not exactly a surprise that the bank rate was reduced . . . though many City people may have expected the traditional climb down in steps of ½ per cent., and the decision might have been taken on any Thursday in the next few weeks".

It would appear that the point in reducing the bank rate is that it can then at a later date be raised! Sterling, you see, has its good season and its bad season, and in the Spring we must get ready for the Autumn clouds that dampen Sterling's spring buoyancy. As the Financial editor was saying the day before:

Action is becoming fairly urgent because the Bank may need the weapon of a sudden rise in the rate once again next autumn. Some time before mid-summer, when sterling enters its unfavourable season, the rate should have dropped back to 5 per cent. or so. That is like loading a gun for the next time one might want to use it. The difficulty is that too many eyes may be watching for a sign to start moving ahead. Personal purchases, wage claims, and capital expenditure might all be stimulated if a cut in the rate was taken as a green light.

★

BE that as it may, the fact remains that however successfully the financial machine can be trimmed by the raising or lowering of the bank rate, for millions of working people throughout the world the gun has fired as they find themselves joining the dole queues for the first time since the war started nearly 20

years ago. In the United States the number of workless continues to soar. (Only the State Division of Employment has vacancies, and last month there were 1,291 more people working for it than last September . . . dealing with the ever-increasing number of applicants for unemployment insurance). And in this country in spite of the Government's jubilation over the February Trade figures which showed only a small gap between exports and imports, as well as an appreciable increase in dollar exports, no one swallows the bait and thinks that the future is rosy or that the February trick can necessarily be repeated.

The international repercussions to the American trade recession cannot be under-estimated; after all they are clearly visible. There is already a major slump in shipping; the prices of raw materials are dropping (a good thing some will say, but in the financial system under which we live the advantages to the industrial nations are offset by a decrease in demand for their goods by the countries whose purchasing power is directly controlled by the prices their raw materials fetch in world markets); stocks of unsold raw materials and manufactured goods are building up (in spite of the fact that production dropped last year in some industrial countries, notably in the United States by 6%, and is dropping even more this year).

But this is only the beginning, for the world has not yet felt the direct

impact of the American recession. The government is patting itself on the back over the record number of cars exported this year (thanks to the significant American demand for small cars), and will probably be still scratching its head over problems of inflation and when to fire that bank rate gun, when it will be swept off its feet by the wave of American depression! How will the government deal with the new situation?

According to Professor James Meade\* in the first of his two articles which appeared recently in the *Manchester Guardian* the only alternative to an intensification of disinflationary measures "in order to cope with a renewed pressure on our balance of payments" is a policy of reflation, which he has "no hesitation" in ad-

\*Professor of Political Economy at Cambridge, and one-time economic adviser to the Government.

vocating as a means of preventing the growth of unemployment. In which case two questions have to be answered:

By what means are we going to reflate domestic demand? And having done so, how shall we deal with our balance-of-payments problems?

"For the rapid and extensive stimulation of money" he considers it of little use relying upon the old-fashioned remedy of "Public works", for such programmes require considerable preparation and planning in advance and considerable time for their execution. "It is not possible to start them (or when the appropriate moment comes, to stop them) with sufficient speed." As the Professor sees it:

The only promptly effective measure would be a reduction of taxation, leaving the public with larger tax-free incomes to spend.

And he suggests that the simplest way, both legally and actuarially, to operate this would be through the National Insurance contributions which the Treasury has the powers to vary.† by reducing these promptly the money would then "pour out through the weekly pay packet, a large and widespread supplement to the citizen's purchasing power".

(You see reader—or rather, we assume you don't see!—that the problem after all is not that too much money is chasing too few goods, but the reverse: that we are producing too many goods for the money available to buy them and that's why the goods are mounting up, and unless they can dispose of them it's no use producing more, so factories must close down, and mines declared uneconomic, and farmers paid not to cultivate their land. As a result of the unemployment that follows, people will have even less money to spend than they have at present, which means they will buy even less; and that will mean that more factories will close down, and so on. See? Crazy, isn't it?)

As to the second of the Professor's questions "how shall we deal with our balance-of-payments problems" he replies:

In these circumstances there are only two ways in which we could, unaided, meet any strain on our balance of pay-

Continued on p. 3

### NUCLEAR POLITICS Open Season for Peace

TO judge from the veritable smoke-screen of speeches and statements from the better known politicians it might almost be supposed that the absurdly small minority of pacifists and others of similar mind were about to swing public opinion in their direction.

Suddenly it has occurred to Mr. Macmillan that it is necessary for him to attempt a rationalization of his nuclear deterrent policy. According to the Prime Minister it is not the possession of weapons that is immoral, but the use of them, whether conventional or nuclear, for aggressive purposes. "The preservation of peace", he says, "depends on the determination to deter, clearly and unambiguously stated. It also depends on efficient weapons

and efficient means of delivery." Whilst he respects the pacifist view he cannot share it, nor in his view is it likely to be upheld by any Government formed in this country.

Although some held that unilateral disarmament and reliance on America was a practical proposition there could be no moral value in that—it would lead to a diminution of British influence. "A gesture may sometimes be magnificent, but it is seldom a policy."

"I want summit talks," said the Prime Minister. "But I want any talks we have with the Soviet leaders to achieve some real success."

Mr. Duncan Sandys, the Minister of Defence has the right ideas too. "In the long run nothing less than comprehensive disarmament makes sense. "But . . ." (the comprehensive but), "provided that it does not upset the delicate balance of power upon which the peace of the world now rests."

Mr. Gaitskell is a strong supporter of regular "summit" talks—perhaps every six months or so. Since he is at present out of power he can also afford to make one or two realistic comments: "Russia and the West should stop sending each other propaganda letters in which each side puts forward proposals known to be unacceptable to the other."

Remarks like this are the equivalent of a conjuror telling the audience how the trick is done—except that politicians never produce anything out of the hat. The Leader of the Opposition was positively waspish over the Prime Minister's "summit success" speech.

"How are we to know whether there is or is not this prospect of success? Did not this kind of condition provide an easy excuse for those who did not want the talks to be held?" (Giving the game away again.) "Was it not likely that it would never be known before the talks began whether they would be successful?"

The Colonial Secretary, Mr. Lennox-Boyd does not mince his words; he states that there has been "a great deal of wild and hysterical

Continued on p. 4

#### Common Wealth?

For stealing an ear of corn from a field—a flogging.

This is the law now in Southern Rhodesia, where subsidised crops are rotting for want of a buyer.

It is one of a series of minor crimes for which Southern Rhodesian M.P.s this week made flogging the punishment.

The floggings—with a four-foot cane not less than half an inch thick—are ordered under the new Magistrates' Court Amendment Bill.

It makes Southern Rhodesia the only country in the Commonwealth to extend flogging to minor offences not involving violence or indecency.

Sunday Express 9/3/58.

### THE AMERICAN SLUMP

#### New Fall in Production

WASHINGTON, MARCH 17. The Federal Reserve Board announced to-day that its index of industrial production fell three points in February to 130 per cent. of the 1947-9 average—the lowest level since December, 1954.

The index for February was 11 per cent. below the highest level recorded last year. The board said that production of motor-cars, household appliances, machinery, and other durable goods in February was 16 per cent. below the rate a year ago—*Reuter*.

#### Another 200,000 Unemployed

WASHINGTON, MARCH 20. Unofficial estimates are that the people unemployed in the United States now number 200,000 more than the figure of 5,173,000 reached in February.

Normally at this time of year there is a seasonal increase in employment and the Administration had been hoping for this to bring a reduction in unemployment. The rate of unemployment among insured workers has risen by 4 per cent. so far this month. It normally goes down by at least this.

Mr. Robert Goodwin, Director of Un-

employment Security, told a Congressional committee yesterday that the number of unemployed people exhausting their employment benefits would increase sharply in April and May. The rate had been rising since December and would continue to go up for some months.

(MAX FREEDMAN in the *Manchester Guardian*).

#### 14.3% of Workers in Michigan Idle

DETROIT, MARCH 15.

Unemployment in Michigan has increased to 415,000, or 14.3 per cent. of the labour force, the Michigan Employment Security Commission reported to-day.

The new total, described as a provisional estimate, showed an increase of 65,000 since mid-February when the commission said 350,000 were out of work.

The latest figure was the highest since the post-war lay-offs of 1945 and 1946. The commission reported that unemployment insurance claims for the week ended March 6 totalled 316,000 the highest since 1938.

#### MEXICO GRANTS ASYLUM TO REFUGEE

AS readers will have probably read in their daily papers a solution has been found in the case of Joaquin Perez Selles the young Spaniard who was denied asylum in this country by the Home Office on the grounds that his refusal to serve in Franco's armed forces was not a matter of "conscience". Both Bolivia and Mexico have agreed to accept him as a political refugee, and he has opted to go to Mexico.

The four Members of Parliament, including Fenner Brockway, who have done so much to give publicity to the case and to prevent Perez Selles from being handed over by the Home Office to the Spanish authorities, launched an appeal last week to raise funds to cover the cost of sending Perez Selles to Mexico. As FREEDOM had already gone to press when the appeal was launched, we sent £10 to Fenner Brockway for the fund in the name of our readers, confident that they would wish to show their solidarity with this young and determined rebel in his struggle against the régime in Spain.

Send your contribution now to FREEDOM, which will be immediately forwarded to the Committee.



## BOOK REVIEW

## LOVE, FREEDOM AND SOCIETY

*Love, Freedom and Society*, by John Middleton Murry. Jonathan Cape, 18s.

THIS book is described as "An analytical Comparison of D. H. Lawrence and Albert Schweitzer", two men whom one would not normally think of together.

Murry's basic thesis is that love as a positive force in society has its origins in the teachings of Christ. The book is really a study of how two men sought to adjust themselves to the apparent collapse of a culture based on what Murry regards as Christian ideals.

D. H. Lawrence comes best out of it. He rejected the ideal of universal love. He believed that the relationship between men and women was based upon love and hate, which alternate in a bewildering way in his stories. This is not the ideal of Christianity. However it is a good portrait of reality, at least in the present writer's experience. Lawrence had fought his way through to a good relationship with his wife when the cataclysm of the First World War burst over him. As a result he became completely disillusioned with civilisation and in consequence (according to Murry) Christianity. He retreated to the pre-Christian world, and went to commune in spirit with the Celtic gods on the moors of Cornwall.

"And he felt the light of love dying out in his eyes, in his heart, in his soul, and a great healing darkness taking its place, with a sweetness of everlasting aloneness, and a stirring of dark blood-tenderness and a strange soft iron of ruthlessness."

Lawrence's dark gods demanded, and in some of his stories got, blood sacrifice. Murry, who lived near him during his time in Cornwall, is horrified by this, and seeks to show that in the end Lawrence was reconciled to Christianity, and even to Christian communism,

"Kill money, put money out of existence.

It is a perverted instinct, a hidden thought.

Which rots the brain, the blood, the bones, the stones, the soul.

## FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

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

### New Books . . .

he Love Ethics of D. H. Lawrence M. Spilka 21/-  
Homosexuality: a Subjective and Objective Investigation (ed.) Charles Berg 30/-  
Bertrand Russell's Best: Silhouettes in Satire 10/6

### American Paperbacks . . .

Two Sources of Morality and Religion H. Bergson 8/-  
Tales of Good and Evil Nicolai Gogol 8/-  
The Birth of Tragedy and the Genealogy of Morals F. Nietzsche 8/-  
The Lonely Crowd (Abridged by) David Reisman 8/-  
To the Finland Station Edmund Wilson 10/-

### Second-Hand . . .

Life of Tolstoy (2 vols., Large Type) Aylmer Maude 10/-  
Berlin Diary (1941) William L. Shirer 3/-  
Political Education at a Public School Victor Gollancz 2/6  
A Long Day in a Short Life Albert Maltz 4/-  
The Menace of Privilege Henry George, Jr. 3/-  
The Essential Hemingway 7/-  
The Reeling Earth Sarah Gertrude Millin 2/6  
Can We Be Neutral? Allen W. Dulles and Hamilton Fish Armstrong (1936) 2/6  
Half a Million Tramps W. A. Gape 3/6  
Flight to Arras Antoine de Saint Exupéry 3/-  
Dependent America William C. Redfield 3/-  
Darrow for the Defence Irving Stone 4/-

### Periodicals . . .

University Libertarian, No. 5 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

Make up your mind about it: that society must establish itself upon a different principle from the one we've got now.

We must have the courage of mutual trust.

We must have the modesty of simple living.

And the individual must have his house, food and fire all free like a bird."

This is not far from anarchism. But Lawrence right to the end would not acknowledge Christ's inspiration. It is not surprising in view of the fact that our sweet brothers in Christ are always prowling around the beds of dying infidels seeking whom they may devour.

There was an obvious conflict between his vision of a free society and his equally passionately held belief in a hierarchical social order. Murry would no doubt have liked to see the contradiction resolved. It never really was. The question is, does it really have to be? Both the brotherhood of man and the authoritarian society are aspects of reality, which the artist portrays. We hope for and strive to attain to the ideal society based on brotherhood and freedom, but it would be hypocrisy for most of us to maintain that there is not a fair amount of authoritarianism in us, the result of our upbringing, which we find hard to eradicate or even control. A man can yearn for a world of mutual trust, and yet feel a fascination for bloody and barbaric societies, Celtic Cornwall or Aztec Mexico. If he represses this aspect of his character, and tries to be all love for his fellowmen, his love will be of a very sickly character, becoming mawkish and sentimental with a substratum of vicious bullying underneath. If an artist tries to repress an aspect of

himself like this his creativeness will almost certainly suffer.

Now the tragedy of Christian civilisation is exactly that it has endeavoured to do away with hate and cruelty by repressing it. The result has been that a religion of Love, headed by a Prince of Peace, has lovingly tortured and burnt all its opponents it could catch. The pagan religions had many customs of a revolting cruelty, but they rarely reached the depths which Christianity reached in its days of power. There is something wrong with this kind of love, and one does not have to romanticise pagan antiquity as so many have done, the rationalists in one way and Lawrence in another, to recognise that there is value in the pagan ideal of being a good friend to one's friends and a hearty hater towards one's foes.

I would not say that the ideal of universal love, even to one's enemies, is bad, or impossible altogether. It may well be that in future ages men will come to it. But it is better that people should stick to loving when they can, hating when it cannot be helped, and avoiding as far as possible the infliction of suffering even on those we hate. Efforts to "love" in the Christian sense seem so often to lead to smugness, cruelty or a masochistic taking on oneself the burden of guilt.

No wonder Lawrence rejected this. We may not think his sadism a necessary alternative, but he did at least recognise that it was there in him. His experience with the military authorities at the time of his call-up, and later on when he was forced to leave Cornwall, were bad enough in all conscience, though many have suffered worse. His comment is characteristic of that side of him which Murry so deploras:

## What About the Causes?

AT this time when many people, who cannot be called social revolutionaries, are giving their support to the campaign for nuclear disarmament of the West, we are being asked to re-state the anarchist attitude to war on the assumption that the old arguments no longer apply.

We would agree that the thought of war is even more horrifying than it was before the development of up-to-date forms of destruction but so far there is no evidence that the causes of war have suddenly changed. If these are, as we usually put forward, economic and political, the prevention of war is more likely if there were changes in the economic and political systems in the countries which are strong enough to wage it.

Since these changes necessitate a social revolution, the abolition of capitalism and power politics, most people argue that we are unrealistic. We should therefore concentrate, we are told, on programmes which stand some chance of realisation.

Our reply is that while we support the campaign for nuclear disarmament it is more unrealistic to suppose (assuming the campaign will be successful), that this alone will prevent the recurrence of the threat of war. We think it necessary to ceaselessly point out to people in our propaganda the causes of war in an attempt to impress upon them the need to develop constructive attitudes towards the society in which they live.

To-day most people probably agree with the aims of the various groups active against nuclear war. But how many people will have considered very deeply the points we have raised?

If they were all stricken with a universal disease they would be anxious to find a cure, but they would have to be very stupid indeed if they did not try to discover the cause so as to prevent a recurrence of the malady. It is because people generally think of war as a natural part of human society instead of a curable disease that few large-scale attempts are made to understand or prevent it, coupled of

course with the patriotic fervour which is felt in times of actual war and is considered to be an expression of "natural" love for one's country.

At this moment in Britain perhaps more people than ever before are thinking about the possible effects of war. This new awareness probably springs from fear of the results on themselves and their children and it may be that out of it will come some understanding of what war means not only to themselves but to people in remote parts of the world.

The people of Korea died in their thousands not as a result of radiation but of "old-fashioned" war weapons. Perhaps if the present day campaigners had started a little sooner in their worthy cause the Korean tragedy would have been prevented. The Korean war was not an act of aggression or a defensive war waged by the Koreans themselves; it was fought over by two foreign powers extending their political struggle into the military field. But how many people in the West worried about the causes of the Korean war or of the effects?

They believed what they were told by their newspapers and politicians that the war in Korea was to prevent the extension of Communism which was a threat to our democratic way of life.

To-day the Soviet Union is ahead of the West in her nuclear development and is more powerful than ever. We are now told, in order to justify the millions being spent on Western defence, that this is the only way to hold the Soviet Union in check when it is obvious that the more money and energy which the West spends on war "prevention" the more likely is the Soviet Union to do likewise.

Bertrand Russell, in explaining why he is now in favour of nuclear disarmament when ten years ago he favoured bringing pressure to bear upon Russia "and even if necessary, to go so far as to threaten war on the sole issue of internationalising atomic weapons", displays the kind

"And because they had handled his private parts, and looked into them, their eyes should burst and their hands should wither and their hearts should rot. So he cursed them in his blood, with an unremitting curse, as he waited."

I think most of us have felt something like this at one time or another when confronted with the brutality of authority. It was possible for Christ to say, "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do", or Ferrer to forgive his firing squad, "Shoot boys, its not your fault." These men believed in salvation, and near at hand, Christ in Heaven, and Ferrer\* on earth in the social revolution. To those who have no faith in such salvation, either in Heaven or on Earth such courage probably comes less readily.

Albert Schweitzer is one of those numerous people whose works I am always going to read. From what little I know of his ideas he seemed to be a practical humanitarian, with a not very original ethical religion based on the key-phrase "reverence for life." This seemed unexceptional, if not particularly exciting, but Murry analyses this philosophy and it is incredible, reaching in fact the bounds of sanity, if not going beyond them.

Schweitzer considers that it is necessary to find a rational basis for altruism. It is not enough simply to have a "noble feeling" for it. This was the mistake of the men of the eighteenth century. We must be able to arrive at an ethical imperative by a process of reasoning or our

\*Of course he would not live to see it, but he, like so many revolutionaries of his day, could imaginatively identify himself with the men of the future, whose cause he served.

teachings will not succeed in establishing themselves, any more than did the teachings of the men of the Age of Reason.

He finds the solution in the phrase "Reverence for Life". He argues as follows: Nature is nothing but a vast number of competing wills-to-live. I am will-to-live and therefore must respect other wills-to-live. They exist by the same right as I do.

He appears to regard this formula as a terrific discovery. Here we have an ethical imperative that can be reached by anyone capable of elementary reasoning. Or so Schweitzer thinks. But I can hear followers of Max Stirner in the background beginning to mutter something about there being no such thing as "a right". In any case, even if this "right" could be proved one is still faced with the fact that all life is obliged to live at the expense of other life. Even if one has given up meat one still has to live on vegetables, and one cannot help stepping on beetles in the grass. One has to kill germs or animal pests (though the cruelty with which animal pests are frequently killed is not necessary), and this according to the philosophy of Reverence for Life is unethical. Although one cannot help all this killing one remains guilty. Thus from the mere fact of being alive one acquires a load of intolerable guilt.

Schweitzer fringes anarchism, for he maintains that those who exercise the coercive measures of society against criminals or external enemies are behaving unethically, though their unethical behaviour is "unegoistic". But Schweitzer's practice is conservative and orthodox to a degree. Indeed he has gone out of his way to defend colonialism. So his philosophy is unliveable and unloved.

Murry protests against all this. He frankly admits that he kills garden pests and fights germs. Some time ago some Japanese Buddhists held a service for the souls of the germs and microbes killed by medicine. It is the best one can do. One has to kill to live. But Murry goes over to the opposite extreme in his reaction against Schweitzer's doctrine.

"How many of those heroic airmen who fought and won the Battle of Britain, and so saved Christian civilisation in Europe for a breathing space,

Continued on p. 4

## A LITTLE SANITY IN A CRAZY WORLD

A strong recommendation that every baby born in Britain should have a special urine test at 21 days old is made by five specialists, led by Dr. Louis Woolf, at the Hospital for Sick Children, Great Ormond Street, London.

They argue that an estimated 30 babies are born every year with an unsuspected "metabolic" disorder called phenylketonuria, which will almost certainly result in the children becoming mentally deficient unless promptly treated.

Early diagnosis by means of a simple urine test, immediately followed, where positive, by the institution of a very special diet could save these children's sanity.

Babies with this complain have an inherited inability to break down a chemical called phenylalanine, present in almost every food protein. When this substance in the blood rises above a certain level, it exerts a toxic effect on the brain that, continued long enough, causes a permanent defect.

Mental deterioration advances rapidly soon after birth and continues steadily, although it is usually not detected until the age of six months. Often phenylketonurias are also afflicted with a form of epilepsy unusually resistant to drug treatment. These children frequently have ash-grey hair and an exceptional tendency to eczema.

(Sunday Times).

THAT in order to save the sanity of say 30 children a year, members of the medical profession should recommend that every child born should be given this urine test as a matter of routine is, to our minds, one of the encouraging signs in a world which appears more crazy and suicidal. That when a large number of scientists are engaged in perfecting the weapons which if launched could in a matter of hours eliminate most of mankind others can remain quite uninfluenced by the atmosphere created by this death psychosis, and consider that the saving of the minds of 30 babies each year warrants a test for all babies as soon as they are born, is indeed remarkable, and heartening.



## Is Capitalism Worth Saving?

Continued from p. 1

ments which might develop: we could let the exchange rate between the pound and other foreign currencies go or we could impose restrictions on payments to other countries and on imports from other countries. If the situation got really bad, we might well have to do both these things at once. But it is my belief that our first and basic step should be to let the exchange rate go.

Professor Meade, we are told by some who profess to know, is putting forward a policy fraught with danger. We are neither competent to discuss such matters, nor, and what is more to the point, are we particularly interested in seeking solutions to the financial problems of the capitalist system! If it depended on us we should do everything in our power to ensure that the financial crisis was pushed beyond all hope of retrieval.

The steps taken by governments to deal with these financial crises, which it is plain as a pikestaff have nothing to do with "production" or with "living beyond our means", vitally interest us, not because we are anxious to help, but because we know that whatever steps they take will be at the expense of the people as a whole in the interests of a small, privileged class. Nor have we faith in the expertise wisdom or "socialism" of the economists who, after all, would be out of a job the moment they sought to make the "system" operate in the interests of mankind!

THE full employment and "prosperity" enjoyed in some industrial countries during the past 19 years is not a matter of new-look capitalism or a new social consciousness in the employing class. Full employment has been paid for by the 20 millions who died in the orgy of destruction in World War II; by the millions of conscripts who have been removed from the labour market during these past-war years; by the millions employed in sustaining the conscripts and feeding the cold war with weapons which are conveniently "obsolete" before they leave the production lines. Now that the dead have been replaced, the factories rebuilt and re-tooled . . . and the markets saturated, we are back to where we were, albeit at a higher level, so far as standards of living are concerned. We have, as it were, moved from a crystal-set to a Telly-civilisation, from Bedeaux to Automation, from short skirts via long skirts back to short ones, but Capitalism hasn't changed.

NOT even the trades unions have changed; they are clearly going to be as spineless, and accommodating in the present "crisis" as they were in the lean inter-war years. Indeed as we have so often pointed

‡ The *Manchester Guardian* which actually published Prof. Meade's articles, comments in an editorial on "Reflation" that:

His way of avoiding a run on the pound would be to make the pound exchange rate float. This means living dangerously. A change in Government policies has to come in time to be effective: but if it came too early it would probably revive inflation. That is what the Americans are afraid of, and we have at least as much reason to be wary. The worst thing we could do is to go into a world recession with rising costs and prices. As for the floating pound, the present Government would have to eat many solemn words if it abandoned the fixed rate. That might not matter much, but not everybody will share Professor Meade's view that our sterling creditors would accept the change calmly. The present dual exchange rate in which there is a fixed and a flexible element has much to be said for it. The heart of the matter is really now to decide that world trade has entered a real recession. To make the wrong decision on this point would be disastrous.

(Continued from previous issue)

THOUGH traces can be found and followed of still older tracks, the basis of the road system in Britain is the surprisingly complex network built during the Roman occupation in the first four centuries A.D. They were, like the *Autobahnen* of the nineteen-thirties, military roads, and Mr. Buchanan\* comments:

"The military road system must always be the product of a central or occupying power; its use for civil purposes may follow and may be encouraged, but primarily it exists by reason of the drive and initiative of a central authority. The purely civil road system on the other hand is usually a local affair; it comes into existence following a local demand and is the result of a co-operative effort by the inhabitants of the area to improve their lot. In most cases the civil road system can be expected to lag behind the demand for improvements only get done when there is a sudden general realisation that conditions are intolerable. The popular saying that in this country we had nothing resembling a national road system between the departure of the Romans in 410 A.D. and the passing of the Trunk Roads Act in 1936, may be true as a statement of fact, but it tends to overlook the fact that the two systems originated in entirely different ways".

For many centuries after the Romans, road-building was for local purposes

\*Mixed Blessing: *The Motor in Britain*, by C. D. Buchanan. (Leonard Hill Ltd., 30s.).

out they are only militant when there's full employment.

Yet the crises of capitalism should be the occasions for Labour to seek to destroy a system in which production and distribution are geared to the interests of profit and power for a small majority of the community. Instead we see photographs in the American Press of the President surrounded by the Union leaders whom he has called to consultations, and read of workers' unions urging the government to transfer defence contracts to factories formerly engaged on consumer production.

The high rate of unemployment in Detroit has not produced a spark of revolt against the system. But instead, these workers pin their hopes on:

The anxious, practical men [who] are hastening to learn about a new and mysterious flock of subsidiaries known as "ground support gear". The missile itself, they hear, may cost only 10 per cent. of everything that goes into building, transporting, testing, cradling, installing, launching and watching it. The encouraging word has come from Cape Canaveral that in two or three years as much as one billion dollars will be spent on "auxiliary hardware" supplied by five or six thousand companies.

The biggest American trailer company is already well established as a manufacturer of missile-trailers. Chemical companies are building fuel-dispensing machines unknown before the missile age. There are such new specialities as war-head carriers, giant balloon tyres, testing support gear, missile erectors, closed circuit television units, and missile "shakers" for pre-testing atmospheric pressure and oceanic roll. §

FOR the pioneers of workers' organisation better working conditions and rates of pay were the short-term, day-to-day, aspects of a struggle which had as its goal the replacement of the system of exploitation and profit by one of co-operation and production according to need. The struggle was for "emancipation", for human dignity and a fuller life. To-day, when science and technology provide the instruments for the satisfaction of mankind's basic material needs, workers have lost the dignity, and abandoned the principles, which inspired those pioneers.

To-day material security at any cost has become the end, and a job the means; irrespective of whether in doing that job one is forging the weapons of one's ultimate destruction or buttressing the system which in peace and war is the working man's enemy and oppressor.

§Alistair Cooke in the *Manchester Guardian* (19/3/58).

## PEOPLE AND IDEAS

# THE MOTOR AGE - 2. ROADS

only, and as the main network gradually emerged it was simply a linking of local systems. Wheeled traffic dwindled away, travel was largely on foot or by horse and pack animals, requiring little more than a beaten track. By the 14th century regular carriers' carts were running between large towns and the need for hard surfaces and means of maintaining them re-emerged. In 1555 the roads had got into such an appalling state that the first Highways Act was passed. This

"placed the responsibility for maintenance squarely on the parishes, with provision for the appointment of surveyors and regular statute labour from the inhabitants. A long series of enactments and amendments followed in the attempt to make this system work, but to an increasing extent the parishes objected to maintaining roads for the benefit of traffic which merely traversed the area".

A century later the first Turnpike Act was passed, giving powers for the levying of tolls, the toll money being used for maintaining the road. This privately operated scheme was not particularly successful and in 1706 a Turnpike Trust was formed to take it over. By 1730 there were 71 trusts, and Mr. Buchanan tells us that:

"Eventually in the early part of the 19th century, there were no less than 1,100 trusts administering 23,000 miles of roads, drawing a revenue of £1,500,000 annually and employing some 20,000 pikemen. All this, it seems, came from the people themselves without any central encouragement or co-ordination. Where a road was not covered by a Turnpike Trust then it was still the responsibility of the parish, indeed the statutory position of the parish was never changed, and if a Trust failed for any reason then the job of upkeep went back to the parish automatically. The episode of the Turnpike Trusts was surely a most remarkable and largely successful example of government by *laissez-faire* which deserves more detailed study than it has yet been given".

To this period beyond the technical improvements of Telford and Macadam. The Highways Act of 1835 abolished statute labour and introduced the principle of local highway rates. The railway boom of the same period put the Trusts in financial difficulties because they lost the bulk of long-distance traffic, and great indignation was felt at the tolls they continued to exact on local traffic. In the Victorian age the turnpikes were abolished and the main roads vested in County Road Boards. A bewildering succession of legislation followed, and by the dawn of the motor age at the end of the last century, the position was that county councils were responsible for all main roads, and rural, urban and borough councils for the remainder. Central grants covered half the cost of upkeep of main roads, the other half being spread over the county rates.

IN 1903 the Motor Car Act required all cars to be licensed, to carry lights, horns and number plates, and established a Road Fund from the license fees. In 1909 a Road Board was set up (which ten years later became the Ministry of Transport) and a Road Improvements Fund instituted, Lloyd George giving an undertaking that the expenditure would "be covered by and limited to the produce of certain special sources of revenue", in other words that the vehicle and petrol taxes would be spent on the roads.

After the first world war various road-building projects, arterial roads and by-passes were undertaken, largely for the relief of unemployment. If it had not been for the inter-war unemployment, says Mr. Buchanan, "we should not even have had the modest improvements to our highway system that have been granted us". Since the war road-building has been largely a matter of plans, modest or ambitious, being savagely cut by Treasury restrictions, as 'crisis' has followed 'crisis' in the economy. Mr. Buchanan notes sardonically:

"In 1951 a useful, if diminutive substitute for the fairy godmother of unemployment made its appearance, for we read that 'Because of the general economic importance of trunk roads and classified roads from the defence point of view, payments from the Road Fund towards expenditure on the maintenance of these roads during 1951-52 were increased'".

This is the point at which to digress on the sad history of the Road Fund. There are three obvious ways of financing roads: by tolls on users as in the old Turnpike Trusts, the new American turnpikes, the Italian *autostrade* or the Mersey Tunnel; from general local rates and central taxation; or by taxes on vehicles in the form of licences and duty on petrol. In theory, with the Road Fund, the last-mentioned was chosen. But by the mid-twenties the increase in motor traffic coupled with the tardiness of road-building meant that the Fund was accumulating more money than was being spent. In 1926 the Government decided that one-third of the net proceeds on licences was to be retained annually by the Exchequer which also took a lump sum of £7 million out of the Fund. (Petrol duty had already ceased to be earmarked for roads). The Finance Acts of 1934 and 1936 consolidated the Treasury's control. "The liability to credit part of the receipts of vehicle taxation into the Road Fund was repealed, and henceforth the Fund was only to be credited with such sums as the Minister, with the consent of the Treasury, might determine to be required out of moneys provided by parliament". In 1955 the Road Fund was formally abolished. In that year only 23 per cent. of the motor-vehicle tax receipts was spent on the roads. When Winston Churchill as Chancellor made the first

raid on the Fund in 1926 he explained to Parliament:

"I cannot accept the suggestion that motorists are in a different position from the rest of the country; that they have some special right to the whole of any axes imposed upon motor vehicles . . . No contractual obligation in this matter has ever existed, or ought to exist, between the State and any particular body or class of taxpayers".

The fact remains that the taxes on vehicles were instituted to pay for road works (this was the pledge given in 1909 and re-affirmed in 1919 by Sir Austen Chamberlain), and were filched away into general revenue without the major works which the Road Board had set up to carry out, being started. In 1909 it was announced that "a new road constructed by the Road Board will be primarily a road confined to motor traffic, and the speed limit will not apply on such a road". In fact it was not until 1949 that, with the Special Roads Act, such roads were authorised, and not until this month that the first of them was begun.

OF the present Trunk Roads, the country's most important highways, Mr. Buchanan writes:

"If it be accepted as a broad generalisation that they should be at least dual-carriageway roads, then it comes as a considerable shock to learn that at present dual carriageways exist on only about 0.5 per cent. of these roads. If it be accepted that a trunk road is a road for the swift passage of motor traffic then again it comes as a shock to learn that nearly 20 per cent. of the total mileage is subject to a 30 m.p.h. speed limit, which by definition means that for 20 per cent. of their mileage the roads pass through built-up areas where there is not merely hindrance to traffic, but noise, danger and confusion to local interests as well".

So far as through-traffic is concerned, we know the kind of roads which are desirable; opposing streams of traffic must be separated, only fast-moving traffic admitted, without any use at any time by pedestrians or cyclists, all other roads must be carried over or under, points of access must be limited and designed to ensure safe filtration of traffic—with fly-overs, clover-leaves, etc., there must be no frontage development. This is being attempted in the present programme of motor-roads, the first of which, the 53-mile southern section of the London to Yorkshire motorway has just been begun at a cost of over £15 million. This kind of road is bound to be expensive, it uses an enormous amount of land—a total width of 112 feet not counting cuttings, embankments and the 'sterilisation' of surrounding land. In a small and densely populated country like this there are innumerable objections to contend with (as just one instance, this month a petition signed by over 30,000 people protesting against the routing of the Yorkshire motorway through Charnwood Forest was presented to the Minister of Transport), and it is obvious that the majority of trunk roads can never be of this standard. Even if the claims made on economic grounds for express motorways could be substantiated, the truth is, as Mr. Buchanan says, that

"there are few grounds for believing that expressways would achieve any dramatic effect on the knots and tangles of town traffic where the bulk of the accidents take place and where the real nuisance of motor traffic is felt . . . It is the towns that are the generators and attractors of traffic and the amount of through traffic divertible from towns is less than many people think. The 'draw-in' factor explains why many by-passes have had comparatively little effect in easing congestion and nuisance in the towns by-passed. The roads have been of value to the through traffic using them but have been a disappointment to townspeople hoping for substantial relief from traffic chaos".

The problems of town traffic are far more intractable than those of through traffic. It is a problem older than the motor age, and the Road Board in 1911 (reaffirming that the Road Fund should be used for major projects and not merely for relieving congestion caused by local traffic, reached the conclusion that "the substitution of motor traffic for horse-drawn traffic has tended not to increase but rather to decrease congestion". Any improvement was of course soon swallowed up by the vast increase in numbers. Mr. Buchanan also quotes a report of the Ministry of Transport of 1921 which declares that "Roads perform many gratuitous services to the public beyond those for which they are primarily intended . . . and apart from the fact that the mere construction of a highway produces a beneficial effect on the development of adjoining land". This conception of the main road as the speculative builders' opportunity certainly came to fruition in the inter-war years, the dangers of standing vehicles, of children dashing into the road, of all the horrors of 'ribbon development' has still not been foreseen. C.W.

(To be continued)

## 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.

**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.  
*The Education of Free Men* 1s.

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

**RUDOLF ROCKER :**  
*Nationalism and Culture* cloth 21s.

**PETER KROPOTKIN :**  
*The State: Its Historic Role* 1s.  
*The Wage System* 3d.  
*Revolutionary Government* 3d.  
*Organised Vengeance Called Justice* 2d.

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

**GEORGE WOODCOCK :**  
*New Life to the Land* 6d.  
*Railways and Society* 3d.  
*What is Anarchism?* 1d.  
*The Basis of Communal Living* 1s.

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

**ALEX COMFORT :**  
*Delinquency* 6d.

**F. A. RIDLEY :**  
*The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age* 2d.

**TONY GIBSON :**  
*Youth for Freedom* paper 2s.  
*Who will do the Dirty Work?* 2d.

**K. J. KENAFICK :**  
*Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx* paper 6s.

**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.



# A.I.D. Love & the State

IN his letter in FREEDOM of March 8, George Gilfillan of Peebles, with, I fancy, his tongue well and truly in his cheek, reminded us of the State's right to make sure that its citizens are born properly in order for their early demise to be adequately organised.

It is true that I had ignored the State's rights in this instance, in dealing with the problems of the Christian and A.I.D. It is in fact a habit of mine to ignore the State as much as I possibly can, but had I chosen to consider it in this context I would have had to admit that I have never noticed that the State cares very much where its cannon fodder comes from.

In fact I have no doubt that were the normal supply to dry up, the State might very easily organise laboratory production on a large scale. And one of the reasons why A.I.D. is not an offence whilst the equally amoral abortion is, is the State's perpetual need for population.

Illegitimate children probably provide a fairly high proportion of the inmates of institutions. And inmates of institutions probably provide a high proportion of the regular personnel of the armed forces. It is surely those who have never had satisfactory home lives who are most prepared to sell themselves into the State's forces. And since, in time of war, you have to fight to keep out of the Army, and if you are still warm they want you in, I have never been impressed with the thought that the State cares about our origins when it needs us.

Whether we are good enough to gain commissions and enter the class of officers and gentlemen is another matter, but even here I am sure that pedigree could be introduced into A.I.D. if necessary, so that if you can prove that you came out of the right test-tube, it will ensure a commission as certainly as if you went to the right public school.

It was reader Gilfillan's last paragraph, however, which puzzled me. He said:

"So if the State says we mustn't have children by the new three letter system, we'll just have to have them in the old-fashioned four-letter word fashion. No, I wasn't thinking of the one you thought of. Love was the word I had in mind."

Now it may be love and love alone that makes the world go round, or whatever it is claimed to do, but love alone is certainly not enough to make babies. (And for many a young couple a good thing too). I know that George Gilfillan lives in the backwoods, but I was always given to understand that country folk know more about the facts of life than us townies, and therefore I feel sure that although the sentiment he expresses is a correct one (and where would Hollywood be without it?) G.G. knows as well as I do that it is a five letter word that is necessary to produce children.

No, I don't mean 'stork'; I mean 'semen', and even that has to be qualified by a seven letter word ('fertile') to be generative, and then has to be got, by fair means or foul, into the right place at the right time.

The sex act is thought of, romantically, as the highest expression of love between a man and woman, and so it may be in some circumstances, but, I feel sure, pitifully few. Neither will all the love a man's heart is capable of help him to give his loved one a baby if his semen is infertile. Herein lies the tragedy which is being alleviated by A.I.D., and for which the alternatives are as I outlined in my article (FREEDOM 1/3/58): frustration or fornication—assuming that the married partners retain their love and wish to remain together, otherwise there is the third choice, divorce, and after that probably no problem.

From my own point of view, fornication is by far the healthier of the first two alternatives. But they have to be a rather remarkable couple who objectively and practically accept this. I know 'anarchists' who have been unable to, such is the millstone of moral conditioning that weighs us down.

The ideal, of course, I would agree with George Gilfillan to be children born of a love relationship, loved themselves and brought up in an environment of love. That's the ideal. Unhappily so many have to put up with the next best thing—and they choose a test-tube rather than the other.

London, P.S.

## KULTUR—1958

Music is now mainly regarded as part of the public entertainment service. Singers, pianists, fiddlers, and other instrumentalists fly across the world, here, there, everywhere—London to-day, New York the day after, all engaged like commercial travellers selling Tchaikovsky, Beethoven, Brahms, and the other sound lines. A new public attends concerts—in London at any rate—which is more musical than it is gramophonic or televisionary. Music as a means of extending awareness to spiritual and truly aesthetic regions of consciousness—which include the gay as well as the mystical or the deeply expressive—is out of fashion temporarily. Music conceived that way by the composer is generally presented at the present time with the technical surface blindingly polished. There is little time in the concert halls of 1958 for meditation, for absorption in either dream or dance. "Next please!" All the stars in their courses, every week—Belgrade to Brisbane. Musical sputniks.

NEVILLE CARDUS in the *Manchester Guardian* 15/3/58.

## Secret of the Vanguard Rocket's Success

WASHINGTON, MARCH 23.

A St. Christopher medal was placed inside the Vanguard rocket which put a satellite into orbit "for divine guidance." St. Christopher is the patron saint of travellers.

The United States Navy spokesman confirmed that a small medal was bolted to the gyroscopic guidance apparatus of the rocket's second stage after an Episcopal clergyman, the Rev. Charles Kean, criticised the Navy for doing so. Mr. Kean, Rector of Epiphany Church, Washington, said that use of the St. Christopher as a good luck charm was blatantly superstitious, and the action caricatured the Christian faith and affronted many people.

A Navy Spokesman said that no such medal was included in the first two Vanguard rockets, which were failures. The proposal for adding the medal had come from the contractors and a Navy official had approved it.—*British United Press*.

# Love, Freedom and Society

Continued from p. 1

were believers in any form of supernatural Christianity? Not many: but the essence of Christianity was in their hearts."

This of course raises the problem: How can a real Christian, such as the author of this book, love mankind, love his enemies, and yet support war against them in which many of them are certain to be killed? I believe he was at one time an editor of *Peace News*, but if he did not support the war when it happened at any rate he appears to be supporting it in retrospect. I do not believe the airmen in question were Christians, though they would probably have considered themselves such theoretically, they were pagans, and as such were behaving quite consistently.

Kropotkin's ethical system, based on the idea of Mutual Aid, that is to say co-operation within the species, has not the fine sound of Reverence for Life, with its religious undertones, but it is more in accordance with the possible. That all life lives by the destruction of other life is a horrible truth, but nothing at the moment can be done about it, whatever the development of science may hold in store for us in the distant future. If one is able to put up with this horror one can at least better the lot of one's fellowmen, and the animals immediately associated with man. If one takes Schweitzer's philosophy seriously one becomes paralysed by guilt, and the fact that Schweitzer runs a hospital shows that he does not really care all that much about the germs he kills or injures in the process of his humanitarian labours.

Murry's criticism of him is fully justified, but I cannot accept the alternative he has to offer to the teachings of Lawrence and Schweitzer. Briefly, so far as I can understand it, it is this:

Modern civilisation, in the West at least, is founded on Christianity, by which he means, I take it, the teachings of Jesus. Progress and scientific development are manifestations of Christ's doctrine of Love, and so is the Welfare State. But this progress is menaced by Soviet Communism, which has a totally different ideal, and is actually engaged in

thrusting men back. The West must develop an ideology based on Love in order to resist Communism.

Christ is regarded as a tremendous tragic figure. The author's beliefs about him are a little obscure. He does not believe that Christ actually rose from the dead in a literal sense, but only figuratively in the minds of his disciples. This increases the tragedy of his last cry that his god had forsaken him, since this was his last conscious thought. He did not revisit his disciples and then rise to Heaven to enjoy his reward. I think that Murry here becomes a heretic from the Christian point of view, if not a pagan. I think that he over-rates the importance of Christ, a natural enough thing to do in a Christian environment. All the things which Christ taught had already been expressed much better before him by Jewish thinkers, and pagan philosophers of both East and West had taught that war and violence were evil, that all men were brothers, that one should love one's enemies and refrain from retaliating against them.

Murry in fact is a victim of the cult of "gentle Jesus, meek and mild", though in a more intellectualised form. The irony of the situation is that Christ is represented as heaping abuse on the scribes and pharisees, with a violence which outdoes that of Lawrence. To me it seems that such humanitarian idealism as has survived in authoritarian society from ancient to modern times is an inheritance from the early matriarchal civilisations (see Erich Fromm, "The Forgotten Language", chapter VII). The ideal of the brotherhood of man in particular was originally based on the theory that all men were equally children of Earth Mother (see J. McCabe's "Rationalist Encyclopedia", the article on the Lydians). Christ was merely one of a line of teachers who carried on an extremely ancient tradition. By an historical accident he has become the central figure of an extremely powerful authoritarian religion and everyone is brought up under its sway. Consequently his importance is made out to be greater than it really is, even by people who have emancipated themselves from orthodox Christianity.

A religion of Love in an authoritarian society, and Murry is a quite orthodox supporter of authority, could easily lead to a tyranny as terrible as that of Communism, and in fact is not Communism an authoritarian religion of Love? Does it not aim at a society without classes or exploitation in the long run? Cannot the same be said of the Catholic Church, when it ruled Europe in its heyday? It was its love for mankind that led to its persecution of heretics, because it believed that it was saving people's souls from Hell. Power and Love cannot co-exist. Murry says, "Order first, then love. And love itself is bound to take upon itself the responsibility of order. Hence the authoritarianism of the Christian Church." And hence, I would add, the Inquisition, and hence the secular tyranny of Soviet Communism! If love cannot maintain its own order, then let us find some other principle that can. If love can only prevail by the stake and the firing squad, if love is compatible with murdering, with the greatest refinements of cruelty, the loved one, then love is evil. Which is absurd.

## PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 12

Deficit on Freedom £240  
Contributions received £198  
DEFICIT £42

### March 14 to March 20

London: C.W. £5; Fulda: E.A.B. 7/-; London: S.B.\* 3/-; London: W.F.\* 2/3; Leeds: J.H. 1/-; Shirley: A.W.H. 3/6; Falmouth: R.W. 2/6; Preston: R.S.M.\* 3/-; Cleveland: G.A. 10/9; Berkeley: R.E.J. £1/3/0; Hounslow: W.M.E. 6/-; London: M.M. 10/0; Sheffield: H.W.\* 6/6; San Francisco: P.D. 3/-; London: D.S. 1/6; London: H.O.C. 1/-.

Total	9 4 0
Previously acknowledged	189 13 0
	198 17 0
Less (misapplied)	12 0
1958 TOTAL TO DATE	£198 5 0

GIFTS OF BOOKS: London: S.E.P.; London: Mrs. D.

\*Indicates regular contributor.

## Open Season for Peace

Continued from p. 1

agitation about nuclear deterrents... much clamour...

"We don't propose to give way to clamour of that kind. We have made our position clear. In the event of a major conventional attack on Great Britain or her allies we would be forced to use nuclear weapons in retaliation."

Mr. Jo Grimond, the Liberal leader, considers that negotiation with Russia is going to be a long and perhaps frustrating business. "For my part I have little faith in the 'summit'..." "There is a danger of the free world being distracted from its true rôle by endless military debates." Nevertheless in Mr. Grimond's view Britain should make a contribution to the general Western defence programme, and the nuclear deterrent is that the West must have it—but Britain herself should not make any more bombs.

Lord Mancroft, Minister Without Portfolio deplores "the present upsurge of pacifism in this country." "How the Russians must be rubbing

their hands with joy over the junketings of the campaign for nuclear disarmament. To disrupt N.A.T.O. and sow the seeds of suspicion among the Western allies is a cardinal feature of Russian policy."

Is it all a question of nuclear deterrents and summit talks, or is it the balance of power and the preservation of mutual trust in the Anglo-American alliance? Surely it cannot be the moral value inherent in British world influence or the necessity for immediate full-scale retaliation. Since no one can agree perhaps it is none of these things, in which case why are all the important people beating their brains out to express the point of view in which they really believe? It must be open season for peace—or is it only that since there is nothing else to talk about one might as well revert back to a safe, reliable subject containing none of the political dangers associated with colonial policy or old age pensions.

The result of the Torrington by-election may prove to be the turning point.

If a religion of Love leads us to this conclusion it is perhaps better to say simply that one cannot love more than a few of our fellowmen, but that we can refrain from exercising power over them and hurting them, and that that is all we can do. We do not tyrannise because we cannot be free ourselves if we do, we do not hurt because pain is evil and we should not inflict it. But if we are forced in self preservation to lash out, let us not pretend that we really love the person we are hurting, only we are trying to establish "order". We probably hate him for attacking us, we may simply feel sorry for him, but we obviously love ourselves better than he, or we would let him have his way. To say that we are hurting him for his own good is in most cases to add hypocrisy to hypocrisy. Who is to judge whether it is for his good or not? He would not agree with us. Love cannot exist without freedom, where there is no freedom there can be no love.

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

## 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

MARCH 30.—Brains Trust.  
APRIL 6.—No meeting.  
APRIL 13.—Philip Sansom on ANARCHISM & THE CLASS STRUGGLE

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).

Monday, March 31st at 8 p.m. A discussion on Folk Music introduced by John Glaister, with illustration on the guitar.

## ★ 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)

## Trad Jazz at the Malatesta

Every Saturday from 7.30

## THE MALATESTA JAZZ BAND

Admission 2s. includes coffee. MALATESTA CLUB, 32 Percy Street, Tottenham Court Road W.1.

Open to Public Jazz Men welcome Organised by IAC

Every Wednesday at 8 p.m. BONAR THOMPSON speaks

## 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

## TO READERS WITH SOMETHING TO SAY

The lack of a *Letters to the Editors* feature in FREEDOM every week is no fault of ours. If only enough letters were forthcoming we would willingly devote the whole back page to contributions from our readers. We do receive letters for publication which we do not publish, not because we disagree with them but because in most instances they do not add anything to what has already been recently published in our columns. We thoroughly enjoy controversial letters but do not publish contributions which are simply statements of what this or that political party or religious body stands for, on the grounds that we are specifically an "anarchist weekly", and any of our readers interested in these other isms are as free as we are to read their journals.

On the other hand, no one can say that FREEDOM's horizons are limited. The world and mankind are our stage. One has only to glance through the six volumes of FREEDOM SELECTIONS to realise how wide is the range of subjects on which we have had something to say. There are many among our readers who can add to our modest comments and to the subjects dealt with in our columns. For many it's a question of "finding the time", for others a false modesty, which prevent them from contributing to FREEDOM. To the former we again make an earnest appeal to consider FREEDOM not as an unimportant little sheet but as one of the few free voices left in a world in which even ideas are mass-produced. To the latter, forget your modesty; put your ideas on paper as best you can, and if necessary we will try to put them into better shape for publication.