

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"When a Government ceases to answer the purposes for which it was created, submission on the part of the people is no longer a question of obligation and duty, but simply a question of prudence."
—H. T. BUCKLE.

"We Deem it Imperative that Immediate Action be Taken..." 618 SCIENTISTS WARN MANKIND

IT will be recalled that in July, 1955, a Statement was issued to the world by nine scientists of international eminence, on the danger which confronts the human race should there be an H-bomb war. (FREEDOM reprints—The Immoral Moralists—1955).

Last week an appeal was made to the British Prime Minister by 618 professional scientists calling for the ending of nuclear weapons tests. Amongst the signatories are 69 Fellows of the Royal Society and 93 Professors of British Universities. A covering letter was also sent to Mr. Macmillan from Bertrand Russell (who was a signatory of the 1955 Statement), in somewhat different terms from the Scientist's appeal.

"Each nuclear bomb test spreads an added burden of radio-active elements over every part of the world. Each added amount of radiation causes damage to the health of human beings all over the world and causes damage to the pool of human germ plasm such as to lead to an increase in the number of seriously defective children that will be born in future generations.

"So long as these weapons are in the hands of only three Powers an agreement for their control is feasible. If testing continues, and the possession of these weapons spreads to additional Governments, the danger of outbreak of a cataclysmic nuclear war through the reckless action of some irresponsible national leader will be greatly increased.

"An international agreement to stop the testing of nuclear bombs now could serve as a first step towards a more general disarmament and the ultimate effective abolition of nuclear weapons, averting the possibility of a nuclear war that would be a catastrophe to all humanity.

"We have in common with our fellow men a deep concern for the welfare of all human beings. As scientists we have knowledge of the dangers involved and therefore a special responsibility to make these dangers known. We deem it imperative that immediate action be taken to effect an international agreement to stop the testing of all nuclear weapons."

In effect the government is called upon to bring about a joint cessation of nuclear tests without necessarily linking this aim to a more general disarmament of conventional weapons. Lord Russell's letter, which is a statement of his own personal feelings, asks that an immediate halt be made to the present series of British nuclear tests at Christmas Island.

Patently Mr. Macmillan cannot state publicly that he disagrees with any of the points made by this considerable body of scientists, though their action at this time may well cause him some embarrassment. The fact that the responsibility for having collected the signatures rests with the organisers of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, a group which the Government no doubt thought could be safely ignored in view of its supposed doubtful left-wing affiliations, cannot now be treated lightly. This is particularly so for the reason that amongst the signatories are contained all shades of political opinion, including several who are avowedly Conservative in politics and a number who, until recently, have been associated with Government service. (It may well be that some are also, if not actively concerned with nuclear armaments research, indirectly participating in activities directed towards "improvements" which could be of use in this field).

The Prime Minister in his reply to Lord Russell, which was of considerable length, has made the following main points. He notes a "significant difference" between the terms of the petition and the letter. He holds that the suspension of

British tests would increase, not lessen, the danger of war, but gives no reason for thinking so.

He states the position of Her Majesty's Government as being the "unilateral declarations of intention to suspend tests are in themselves of little value, and that the suspension of tests should not be considered in isolation from other aspect of disarmament." Here, of course, we point in direct opposition to Russell's letter in the first instance and the appeal itself in the second.

Mr. Macmillan also believes that the British people would not consider it a correct moral stand if Britain were to abandon the United States and leave that country with the sole burden of the nuclear deterrent and protection of the free world against possible aggression. Such is the "admirable moral" excuse for not taking unilateral action.

The fact that the Prime Minister takes it upon himself to express, what he says he believes is the view of the British people is doubly questionable, since two paragraphs earlier in his letter he says that he cannot accept Bertrand Russell's less sweeping view that a "large majority" of the British people want the present series of tests suspended.

"I know of no scientific evidence for the assertion to this effect in your letter", he says. This lack of scientific evidence is not unilateral either but applies equally to Mr. Macmillan.

In reply to the appeal's second paragraph, the Macmillan letter adopts a holier-than-thou attitude in stating that the only real insurance against the danger of nuclear weapons falling into the hands of additional Governments and possibly of "some irresponsible national leader" would be to stop production of fissile material for weapons "as proposed in the disarmament plan endorsed by an overwhelming majority in the United Nations last November".

If we are to accept his previous remarks we can only assume that the rejection of the U.N.'s plan must have come as a welcome relief to

Mr. Macmillan, who obviously considers it essential that further British tests should be carried out before disarmament of any kind should take place. Undoubtedly the British Government is most anxious to acquire a fuller knowledge of nuclear armaments than at present in order to keep up with the other "great powers".

Perhaps the most extraordinary aspect of this latest appeal is that so many highly competent scientists should find themselves at odds with the Medical Research Council. The last report issued by this council (upon whose advice the Government relies for its scientific information as to "the hazards to man of nuclear and allied radiations"), stated that the effect of man-made radiation was estimated to be far less than that of natural radiation and was in fact "negligible"—so long as the rate of explosions did not increase.

If this is true it is difficult to understand what all the fuss is about. But we suggest that a document which uses the words "We
Continued on p. 4

Reflections on the London Bus Strike Basic Issues

FOUR days before the London Bus strike started, the *Manchester Guardian* was maintaining that the strike was not "inevitable", that "by reason it may be settled peaceably. And the reasonable theme is again evoked in the same Leader when it is maintained that "peace can be obtained by promoting reason as well as cash settlements". (Our italics).

Now, we are the first to consider reason as the key to real peace and harmony in human relations. The whole basis of anarchism is reason, and of anarchist propaganda, the encouragement of thought based on reason. But reason can only prevail among men and women who are free and equal. Otherwise it is just a question of the stronger brow-beating, or "persuading" the weaker to accept his arguments, to see reason, his reason.

LAST Monday, the London Transport Executive, issued a statement "to the public of London—The Bus Strike" in the three London evening newspapers, outlining the "principal facts" with which probably Mr. Cousins would not disagree, and concludes "These are the facts, and a strike does not alter facts". That is true but where the Transport Executive are hopelessly wrong is when they say that it is these facts "which have brought it [the strike] about." If that were so why do they proceed to declare that

London Transport Executive believe the strike to be unjustified and unnecessary, but it has proved inevitable because of the Union's determination to obtain an increase for all groups at once, regardless of varying circumstances, on the one hand, and the Executive's refusal to buy a few months' uneasy peace by tear-

ing up the arbitration award, on the other.

That is the issue.

So it is not the facts which have brought the strike about, but the issue between the bus workers' Unions and the London Transport Executive, which is however, a fact as real as any of the facts in the negotiations as outlined in the Executive's statement. In other words a strike has taken place because, on the one hand the Union leaders, for reasons known to them and which presumably they consider to be in the best interests of the Union and/or its members*, refuse to accept an award which leaves out the "country" workers (that is Green-bus, -line staff) while on the other the Executive have their reasons for refusing to accept, even though the Union proposal does not mean finding more money at present. On the isolated facts (and viewed from the respective points of view, the case of both the Union and the Transport Executives are "reasonable"!

Continued on p. 3

*Some commentators attribute questions of "internal politics" to Mr. Cousins' determined stand. Others recognise that he "believes he is fighting for a principle". Others again say that he wants "country" as well as central London busmen to share the award because it will help him to press the claims of provincial transport workers when they make their pay demands.

Danilo Dolci Loses Passport

ROME, APRIL 30.
The Italian Interior Ministry announced to-day that it had withdrawn the passport of Danilo Dolci, aged 36, the writer and social reformer. Dolci, who received a Lenin prize several months ago, has just returned from a journey to Switzerland, France, Germany and Scandinavia to study social systems.

Tito Under a Cloud Again

THE neighbours are a-feudin' again. After a brief reconciliation and friendly visits, Yugoslavia's Tito and the Kremlin's Khrushchev are telling each other where they get off in their interpretation of the Marxist gospels.

At least, that is what appears on the surface, after the publication of the draft programme of the Yugoslav Communist Party and the reply to it in the Moscow journal *Kommunist*. But there is such a discrepancy between the tone of the draft programme and that of Tito's opening speech that, as usual, one has to look a little deeper to see the real reasons for the rift.

In the draft programme, the Yugoslav C.P. rejects the view that 'Communist parties have a monopoly over every aspect of the movement of society towards Socialism, and that Socialism can only find its representatives in them and through them'.

On the other hand, in his speech, according to a *Manchester Guardian* report:

'Marshal Tito's references to recent mistakes in the Yugoslav Communist party which had "impaired its monolithic character and ideological firmness," his condemnation of "the exceedingly liberal attitude to the ideological deviation of certain Communists," and his call for the "elimination of such elements" from the party look very much like the forecast of a purge.

Nearer to Socialism?

There is not necessarily a contradiction here. Tito may be absolutely convinced that in Yugoslavia the Communist Party alone is capable of leading the country towards socialism, but that in other countries socialism can be at least brought nearer through the actions of the social democratic parties—or even by the needs of capitalists to rationalise and nationalise, thus creating state capitalism which can lead to state socialism.

It is this latter point which has brought him into conflict with the Kremlin. The Russian leaders have been claiming sole ownership of the one true path for too long to be prepared to recognise good in any other. But in fact the Yugoslav position is only an attempt at an

ideological justification of a *de facto* position.

Tito is the boss in Yugoslavia and intends to remain so. This means rejecting Kremlin domination as much to-day as in Stalin's time of 1948. To find the strength for this Tito has to remain friendly (though critical) towards the West. The attitudes of the right-wing parties in the West have hardened somewhat against Tito since his reconciliation with the Kremlin, so he has to bend over backwards to remain friendly with the left-wing parties of the West—and those with influence are the social-democrats.

Who is the Boss?

Hence his Marxist-Leninist revisionism to include the Western social democrats among the working-class bodies moving towards socialism—which he is prepared to embrace while dealing ruthlessly with any social-democratic revisionism in his own ranks.

For the Kremlin such tactical considerations do not apply, and the Soviet rulers are annoyed at the Yugoslavs' tampering with the Marxist-Leninist tablets, in such a way as to give encouragement to the social-democrats in the Soviet satellites.

As in 1948 the quarrel between Tito and the Kremlin has no real ideological content. It arises out of the same question: Who is to be boss in Yugoslavia—and how?

Who will Help?

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!
WEEK 18

Deficit on Freedom	£360
Contributions received	£275
DEFICIT	£85

April 25 to May 1

Oldham: M.J.G. 2/-; London: J.S.* 3/-	
Blackburn: W.A. 1/-; Llanelli: L.W. 5/-	
Amsterdam: A.A. van S. £3/2/0; Vancouver: C.R.V. 7/1; Sydney: R.G. £1/11/6; Kirup: An Australian Swagman £1/1/0; London: J.A. 2/6; London: Anon.* 1/10.	
Total	6 16 11
Previously acknowledged	268 12 10

1958 TOTAL TO DATE ... £275 9 9

GIFTS OF BOOKS: Moline: E.R.J.; London: J.L.

*Indicates regular contributor.

Americans Arrest Crew of the "Golden Rule"

(By Cable to War Resisters' International)

LONDON, MAY 2.

A telegram was received this morning informing us that the four-member crew of the vessel appropriately named the *Golden Rule* has been arrested while at sea near Honolulu, Hawaii.

All four men are pacifists, prepared at the risk of their lives to enter the Eniwetok H-Bomb testing area in an effort to prevent the United States Government from continuing the present series of H-tests.

A special law has been passed to make the arrests "legal". The men are scheduled to appear in court on Tuesday, 6th May.

We urge you to cable AT ONCE President Eisenhower, The White House, Washington, D.C., (U.S.A.):

FREE THE GOLDEN RULE!

VIEWPOINT

The Limitations of Anarchism

THE failure of the anarchist movement to make progress is a serious problem. Anarchism appeals to a minority of exceptional people but no more. Yet it has been actively propagated throughout the nineteenth century by some of the bravest and most original thinkers of Europe.

Its failure to spread is made all the stranger by the fact that the anarchists have been proved over and over again to be right. No movement, no philosophy, no theory has ever had such abundant and oft-repeated proof. Over and over again, with the utmost monotony, the rulers have betrayed their followers in exactly the way the anarchists prophesied they would. But in spite of this people go on trusting and believing in authority.

Man is not governed by reason. If he were he would accept the anarchist case, at least to some extent, and seek to do something about it, as soon as he properly understood it. Practically all social evil can be traced back to the exercise of authority by someone.

I assume that what all mankind desires, at heart, is a cessation of war, exploitation, cruelty and oppression. For those who consider these things good or desirable, for the strengthening of character, for progress, or for the benefit of our souls, I have nothing to say. Yet how few can accept the anarchist case! Why is the number so small?

Firstly, because most human beings are conditioned to accept authority from the moment they are born, and this conditioning is continued until death, by every means available to society. There is no need to enlarge on this, nor upon the inadequacy of a small movement, which has scant means of combatting the conditioning process at its disposal. The anarchist movement has not the resources of which society disposes, the wireless, the television, the daily press and the cinema, and in any case it seeks not to impose a new pattern of conditioning but to persuade.

But there is a second reason, which seems to me far more serious. This lies in the nature of man himself. I do not believe, as do the authoritarian oppo-

nents of anarchism, that man is naturally cruel and dominating. I believe that in his natural state he was as harmless as are most apes, when left alone and not hunted or ill-used. The studies made of primitive food-gathering peoples still surviving have shown them to be amiable enough when left alone. The "cavemen" are mythical.

LEGENDS of the Golden Age are almost universal. They represent an age when men were completely in harmony with their surroundings, or very nearly so, as are animals. Such a life was idyllic, not because it was free from hardship and the suffering that is the lot of all that lives but because it was free from a sense of strain and conflict. Men lived according to the principle of Mutual Aid because it was natural for them to do so. They had never thought of doing anything else. Their ability to work together was an evolutionary advantage, which tended to favour their survival.

However, the development of more complex cultures inevitably brought about the breaking of this natural harmony. Probably it had never been complete, since if it had no advance would have been possible at all. Anyway, man now became conscious of himself as something separate, and began to develop fears and anxiety. As his consciousness developed a large part of his fears and desires remained unconscious. He was no longer aware of them, yet they were still there.

Religious-minded people may talk of the Fall of Man, while the more progressive-minded may, like Bakunin, point out that this "fall" was necessary to further development. Whether it was a "good thing" or a "bad thing" is not the question here discussed. Only, once this has taken place, man is no longer another wild animal, he can no longer rely on his instincts, on his nature. He has to choose.

It is from this choice that so many human beings flee. It is from this need to take decisions and bear the responsibility that people take refuge in authoritarian organisations which will tell them what to do. Man also seeks to escape from a sense of isolation which may develop, so he joins some group to which he feels he can belong and which will protect him against his own sense of loneliness. This tendency to "join" is reinforced by the natural instinct for mutual aid and solidarity.

Again, man seeks to recover contact with his unconscious. Modern psychology tries to achieve this, but possibly this was also the aim of many religious

practices which now seem weird and strange to us, because their original purpose had been forgotten or misunderstood.

THE weakness of the anarchist movement seems to me to be that it limits itself to pointing out the evils of authoritarianism and explaining how much better everything would be in a condition of freedom. But freedom is not a condition that can be achieved by simply willing it. Freedom can only come into being when men have found some technique for restoring their original sense of harmony, within themselves, within the group and with their environment. This cannot be done by a reversion to primitive conditions, short of a total destruction of civilisation with H-Bombs, but must be achieved in some way at higher level than primitivism. Moreover it must be achieved in such a way as to permit enough flexibility for changes to take place in society.

Anarchism seems to me right as far as it goes, but having shown us the evil of authoritarianism, and the way a society could be run without it, it does not really tell us how a free society could be brought about. How are people to overcome their sense of isolation, their anxiety and fear? How are they to develop a sense of freedom and responsibility? How are they to achieve at least some sort of working relationship with their unconscious, so that even if they do not understand themselves completely, they do at least know enough to avoid grossly irrational and harmful behaviour? How are they to restore their lost unity with nature.

I do not know the answers to these questions. But if they are known it would be possible to achieve a real revolution in society, such as has not been known before, without a single barricade. On the other hand if the answers to these questions cannot be found the anarchist movement may well remain for always a small group, surrounded by the vaguely sympathetic, the hostile and the completely indifferent. There is the sad history of anarchist and libertarian communities, which always seem to split on the same rocks.

When I contemplate the efforts made by the anarchist movement to get its ideas across I do have a certain feeling of futility. The sort of feeling one gets if one tries to push over the wall of a house. Yet I am sure that the situation is not hopeless. It is only hopeless if one just goes on pushing and pushing in the same old way, with a sort of vague hope that something will come of it after all.

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

The Goals of Public Health

IN an article published in *The Lancet* for March 22nd, Sir Geoffrey Vickers had some interesting comments to make on this subject. Pointing out that history sets the goals of public health, due to the dynamic inertia of public affairs, he remarks that we can influence these goals by deliberate choice no more and no less than we influence the course of history.

A "goal" (he continues), if it is attainable once for all, is never more than a "means" to maintaining relationships which must always be sought anew which one may term "norms".

"We seek to maintain them; when we deviate from them, we seek to return. But they have thresholds beyond which we may not—or think we may not—deviate without disaster, thresholds which in the clearest cases mark points of no return; and these I call limits.

"Physiologically, our needs for food and drink and air fall readily under these descriptions . . . Our psychological and social needs . . . seem to be of the same kind. . . .

"Health is clearly a norm, not a goal . . . Disease is a deviation from this norm and includes a series of limits beyond which irreversible change takes place, the most dramatic being death. This is not the normal meaning of health and disease . . . It is easier to equate the norm with the normal and to count as disease only what falls below this assumed level of normality.

"It is common to-day to describe human striving in terms of tension reduction, and this serves well enough to describe the norm-seeking and limit-avoiding which I regard as the basic governors of our activity. But it is not

always remembered that our norms and limits are to some extent self-set.

" . . . the character and coherence of a society or of an individual personality is largely a function of its governing expectations, the norms and limits which describe its setting as a dynamic system; and that the crucial task of adaption is the adjustment of this inner architecture so as to maintain effective contact with the environment without losing that inner balance of forces whereby the individual or the society hangs together. . . .

"There is much scope for refining those criteria of breakdown which we regard as indices of ill-health, individual or social. Already we use many beyond these basic figures of mortality and morbidity which not long ago would have seemed an adequate measure of public health . . . In reaction against the long centuries in which the criminal, the drunkard, the addict, the pervert were regarded as enemies of society, we tend to-day to assume that they are its victims. Fromm and Kardiner have used such statistics to impugn the health not of the individuals concerned but of the society which destroyed them.

"Clearly [the interpretation of these indices] is more complex than a decision whether they indict the individual or his society; for the interaction between the two is far too subtle and involved to permit any such simple alternative.

" . . . immunity and vulnerability are in some measure characteristics of the individual. In its attack on the infectious and deficiency diseases, medicine is increasingly concerned to build up the inner immunity of the individual, rather than to eliminate the risk from the environment. . . .

BOOK REVIEW

Britain's Children

CHILDREN UNDER FIVE by J. W. B. Douglas and J. M. Blomfield. (*Studies in Society*, edited by Ruth and David Glass). George Allen and Unwin Ltd. 21s.

fairly accurate picture of current conditions.

For the purposes of the survey families are classed by the occupation of the father and the report shows clearly that the children of those in the professional and salaried group have (not unexpectedly) many advantages, other than purely social ones, over children whose fathers are semi- or un-skilled. For example, the proportion of efficient mothers declines steeply with falling social group and the survey shows that maternal care affects such diverse factors as growth, accident rate and bed wetting.

Those who are concerned with or interested in current social conditions or child welfare will find this book a mine of useful information. For example, that there was no running hot water in some 50% of the homes of the group considered and over 40% had no bathroom. 29% of the English children and 34% of the Scottish were sleeping either in the same room or same bed as their parents and a further 4% of English and 6% of Scottish children were sleeping in the same room or bed as a person of the opposite sex over ten years of age.

Modern ideas on any subject are accepted generally by the better educated section of the population first and often take some time to penetrate downwards in the social ladder and the report shows that this applies to views on child welfare, for example, it is seen with regard to attitudes towards circumcision and tonsillectomy, at one time routine operations. An interesting sidelight on the survival of old attitudes is that, amongst semi- and un-skilled manual workers, 21.4% of the mothers give their children laxatives once a week or more.

This book will raise many questions in the reader's mind. It would be interesting, for example, to know if there is any correlation between, say, bed wetting or nervous disorders and room-sharing.

Those who have carried out the work which made this report possible are to be congratulated. We look forward to the follow-up reports when they appear.

A.C.F.C.

PAMPHLET REVIEW:

The C.P. Road to Totalitarianism

THE above heading might be appropriate as a title for the latest propaganda pamphlet to come from King Street. This sixpenny, 30-page pamphlet which contains much truth in it and leaves out much more, has an attractive cover inscribed "The British Road to Socialism". Perhaps we should assume that the authors are sincere—standards of sincerity seem to be so low anyway—but so little attention is paid to the self-evident fact that socialism must be desired to be lived that doubts inevitably arise.

In the introduction we read "A Socialist Britain, with planned production to meet the peoples' needs, would make it possible to realise the practical things that people want—such as a shorter working day with increased wages, retirement at 60 with a pension giving a decent standard of living, and radical solution of the housing problem." Which is all very nice so long as we could be sure that the first action of the worker, upon having his pay increased and hours of work cut, would not be to take on another job as well to get even more money. Considering that (a) there is no attempt to consider the question of true values and (b) the *Daily Worker* has a "Racing" page, another doubt might well be registered.

Page 6, containing the statement "Already countries with a third of the world's population—950 million people

—have taken the Socialist road", is perhaps best ignored.

Further on we are told that "the workers produce wealth far in excess of the wages they are paid" but we are not told why these workers promptly make a sacrifice of their miserable pittance before the Capitalist altar through the medium of the pools, horses, dogs and films. Why do they fail to even drop a hint to the workers that, not content with "exploitation . . . for profit" they co-operate much too willingly with their malefactors? And how, we wonder, are the "working people and their organisations" going to bring about the wonderful revolution envisaged in "The British Road to Socialism" when so many of those organisations, e.g. the British Legion, the churches and the Navy, Army and Air Force auxiliaries, are locked fast in the Establishment's embrace?

Page 10 presents us with two "essential requirements for the advance to Socialism in every Country"—working-class power and Marxism. Stalin doesn't get a mention so we may, perhaps, take it that the morsel of Socialism that Russia enjoys was achieved in spite of him. Pretty obviously, if we "constantly apply the principles of working-class internationalism" there must be no more Stalin-Hitler pacts! This page should be read quickly by libertarians suffering from heart disease because it instances as a principal feature of the C.P. programme the self-determination of all subject peoples!

Well, there's a feast still to come in this attractively covered repulsive booklet. There is a section on Peace which trots out the usual wishful hope that wars can be fought without either side using the most efficient weapons and, also, in considering the "huge armaments" programmes of capitalist countries, completely ignores the fact that it is the "working classes" who make the armaments and form the armies that use them. There is a section on Colonial Freedom and we find ourselves at the halfway stage of the pamphlet with little encouragement to continue except the desire to ascertain whether the second half answers the many questions begged by the first half—which it does not.

ERNIE CROSSWELL.

Continued on p. 3

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

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

New Books . . .

The Treason Cage
Anthony Sampson 21/-
The Circle of Guilt F. Wertham 18/-
Revolution and Reaction 1848-52
G. Bruun 8/6

Second-Hand . . .

Almost an Autobiography
Chapman Cohen
(Inscribed by the author) 10/6
The Crack-up F. Scott Fitzgerald 20/-
Invitation to Moscow
Z. Stypulkowski 4/-
A Small Boy in the Sixties
George Sturt 5/6
Children's Health and Happiness
Margaret Brady 3/-
The Outsider
Colin Wilson 10/-
Portraits from Memory and other
Essays
Bertrand Russell 4/6
Retreat from Glory
R. H. Bruce Lockhart 3/6
Dateline Moscow
Don Dallas 3/6
One Million Delinquents
Benjamin Fine 5/6
History of Trade Unionism
Beatrice & Sydney Webb 12/6
The Idiot Teacher
Gerard Holmes 3/6
The Age of Longing
Arthur Koestler 4/-
And He Did Hide Himself
Ignazio Silone 4/-
The Preacher and the Slave
Wallace Stegner 4/-
The Social Life of Animals
W. C. Allee 4/6
Poems, Essays and Fragments
James Thomson 4/-
The Unvanquished
William Faulkner 4/-
Our Enemy the State
Albert Jay Nock 4/6
Journey through the War-Mind
C. E. M. Joad 3/6

Pamphlet . . .

To-morrow's Children (Campaign
for Nuclear Disarmament) 4d.

Periodicals . . .

University Libertarian, No. 6 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

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 19, No. 19. May 10, 1958

PEOPLE AND IDEAS

AFTER THE TENTH YEAR

Reflections on the Bus Strike Basic Issues

Continued from p. 1

What is not reasonable is that the only way in which the workers can even hope to see their point of view prevail is by strike action. This means withdrawing their labour power. It means putting London's millions to some inconvenience, it is true, but let us not forget either, that their action also deprives these workers and their families of the wherewithal to buy the weekly rations and pay the rent (yes we know, and to pay the instalments on the Telly and the settee and all the other "luxuries" which it is notorious the workers these days can afford†). The Transport Executive, which are, after all, in the position of an employer who, however, has no shareholders to worry about or fears of ever going bankrupt, need take no similar action to impose their wishes: indeed the most drastic action they could take would be to lock-out the workers, in which case once again it is the workers who would suffer financially. The Executive go on drawing their salaries in full whatever happens!

It is surely clear then that strike action or the threat of such action is the only means available to workers to balance, to a limited extent, the scales of industrial injustice. Without it the so-called "machinery of negotiation" would never have come into existence.

It is equally clear that much of the force of the strike weapon is lost when applied to nationalised industries—and in particular to public services. Whereas the private employer cannot allow to see his undertakings at a standstill for more than a limited period (since his overheads go on clocking-up production or no production) without the spectre of the bankruptcy courts looming on the horizon, nationalised industries can afford (with the taxpayers' money) to hold out to the bitter end, assuming that long before this point is reached, the Government, "for reasons of State", does not send in the troops to work the strike-bound industry.

In view of the foregoing, and though at the time of writing the strike is only a day old, we cannot but help feeling that the Transport Executive's "reasons" will prevail. More so when the effect of a 100% stoppage of buses is almost neutralised by a 100% turn-out on the underground and suburban railway services. By staggering office and factory hours, (as it was, the first day verdict was "Not so bad after all"), public inconvenience and financial losses will have been reduced to a bare minimum. Only by the complete paralysis of public transport could the bus workers even begin to hope that their action and their sacrifices would end in victory for them.

To hope that the public will be anything but hostile to their action is asking for too much. When the bus workers cannot even induce their colleagues operating the other public transport services to come out on strike in sympathy, how can they expect the public, which resents every fare increase, and blames the transport workers for bad ser-

Passengers will include some of the richest men in the Western world. Their wealth totals several hundred millions. Why this upsurge of enthusiasm for sea-going? It's the tenth anniversary of the State of Israel and two liners have been chartered for luxury cruises to Israel in May and June.

And a girl who will soon be the envy of all her friends is the Hon. Hilary Zara Morris. She will be going on the cruise as chief hostess. What qualifications are required for such a job? The right social background—Miss Morris is the sister of Lord Morris of Kenwood—and the right kind of personality. Miss Morris is modest about her accomplishments, but admits to a fondness for bridge. She will have other assistants, not yet chosen.

Says Mr. John Freeman, head of the London travel firm organising these cruises: "They must have an impeccable social background. I don't think it will be difficult to find the right girls—and the right men."

—EVENING NEWS.

THE new Zim Line ships *Jerusalem* and *Theodor Herzl* laden with American millionaires attended by the daughters of the Anglo-Jewish aristocracy are a world away from those very differ-

ences and bad manners, to feel and support the justice of their claims? Once again the facts could be stated in black and white, but the issues which divide workers among themselves and the public from the workers, go much deeper, and defy a solution which will satisfy all concerned.

WHEN we said that reason could only prevail among men and women who were free and equal, by equal we did not have in mind a stereotyped mankind, of uniform intelligence and imagination, with identical needs and aspirations. We were in fact thinking of the social and economic environment in which no man feels himself at a disadvantage in relation to his fellow beings; in which his own well-being cannot be threatened by that of others any more than it depends on the misery or humiliation of others. In such a society reason could prevail because what differences existed would be free of petty personal interests and fears of insecurity, and stem from a common interest in the common-wealth.

TO-DAY the contrary is the rule. Besides being divided into two socio-economic classes, the classes are divided within themselves by differentials, and by a hierarchical structure in large concerns which inevitably breeds jealousy and suspicion among the working class within them. There can in the circumstances be no hope in reason as a basis for the solution of social problems, yet the *Manchester Guardian* which believes in peace through reason deplores the fact that society is not even more fragmented and competitive than it already is when it suggests in its leader of last Monday that the Bus Strike

is against the interests of every bus worker in the country, for it is an attempt to perpetuate an out-dated system of wage bargaining which lumps all bus workers into ill-assorted groups, and prevents any real attempt to devise a fair rate for a particular busman's job. The rewards for skill and responsibility have declined severely since the war. The London strike is essentially an effort to down-grade them still farther, and to insist that if everyone cannot have more money, no one can.

What valuable defenders of the capitalist system these liberals are! Not content with the division of society between employer and employee, the privileged and the underdog, they would even extend the struggle into the heart of the working class itself, with drivers and conductors on the No. 11 route vying with those on the No. 29 route on the grounds that theirs was a more onerous route!

Reason? Rubbish!

ent journeys and ships which, by an unspoken agreement, we have now forgotten. The *Struma*, the *Darien*, the *Salvador*, the *Patria*, the overloaded unseaworthy tubs which foundered, which shuttled to and fro with their desperate cargo forbidden to land, which took them back to their deaths. It is only a little over ten years since the *Exodus*, carrying 4,600 survivors of the German camps arrived in Palestinian waters. The immigrants were deported by the British back to D.P. camps in Germany! You may be sure that they have not forgotten and if to-day, somewhere between Dan and Beersheba, we were to ask them what they had to celebrate after these ten years, they would very quickly tell us. They would point to seventy generations of persecution with a culmination which cannot cease to haunt the Western world. And we would sadly point to the culmination of the ten years of Eretz Israel, last month's military parade in demilitarised Jerusalem, where American tanks, French heavy guns, and British electronic artillery demonstrated the strength of the Jewish state.

It is ten years since the Jewish settlers in Palestine could say *We have displaced nobody*, and it is ten years since we could point to the Jewish commonwealth there as an example of a stateless society, a network of voluntary communities and co-operatives embracing the whole field of social and economic life. The nation-state has arrived, and has survived for ten years; a state, as its founders assure us, like any other state, complete with plans for an impressive six-million-dollar parliament building for the Knesset, a structure which, as a correspondent writes, "will fit this small, poor, Oriental country like a fist fits a face".

THE early Socialist-Zionist pioneers did not think in terms of a Jewish state—"a new tiny Balkan state, highly militarised like Sparta of old times, always in feuds with its neighbours", as Ernst Simon puts it, but that was what events, and the rising tide of nationalism, Jewish and Arab, have put in the place of their broader vision of a bridge between East and West. Nothing that has happened since the foundation of the state has served to reconcile Israel and her neighbours; much has happened to increase hostility. In the days of the mandate the fly in the ointment was Britain with her policy of divide and rule. To-day the whole Middle East is embroiled in Cold War politics, which means in practice the wooing by the great powers of the various Arab rulers. (They don't need to bother about Israel because of her territorial, and strategic inferiority, and because she hasn't yet got oil). When British influence was still strong in the Arab countries, the Soviet bloc favoured Israel with an arms deal, later the arms deals went to the Arab

countries, to buy them off from Western manoeuvres like the Baghdad Pact and the Eisenhower Doctrine. To-day the Israelis are persuading themselves that the Sinai campaign and the time of the Anglo-French invasion of Suez was a triumph of 'preventive war' in that it destroyed Nasser's Soviet arms and ended the incursions of the *feyadin*, while giving yet another demonstration of Israel's military prowess, but was it not in fact a disaster from the point of view of any ultimate settlement with the Arabs since it made Israel appear as the tool of British and French imperialism, confirming every assertion of the propagandists of Arab chauvinism? Nor have the massacres of civilians, inseparable from military activities—that at Dir Yassin by the Irgun ten years ago, and that at Kfar Kassim on the Jordanian border on the first day of the Sinai campaign—helped to hasten a reconciliation.

But it will have to come sooner or later. Israel's most implacable enemies will have to recognise, as Brijen Gupta says, that "Granted, the creation of the State of Israel was a mistake. But infanticide is no cure for failure to achieve birth control", and her most devoted friends must recognise that by far the most important task of the next ten years is to rectify the grievances of Israel's Arab citizens and of the hundreds of thousands of refugees around the borders. Dr. Ernst Simon writes in *Liberation*:

"It cannot be said that we Jews are exclusively responsible for the cruel fate of the Arab refugees from Palestine, but it cannot be said either that we are free from all responsibility regarding them. The Arab countries and Israel handled these unhappy people like chess pieces in their political play. They were never regarded as human beings with the right to live their own lives, to work productively, to bring up their children in human conditions and to have their share of the bit of happiness which life on earth has to offer".

This year Israel is crowded with visitors, the same people who twenty years ago denounced the collective settlements as "irreligious, atheistic, subversive—in short, sinks of iniquity, scattered up and down the Holy Land", will be going on conducted tours of them and lauding them as being in some curious way the "achievements of pioneering Israel during its first decade of statehood". There will be a full programme of bellicosity and flagwaving. On June 23rd there will be Paratroops' Day, when "All Israel honours the Sinai heroes of the Paratroop and Parachute Battalions." On July 14th, Maritime Day, when "The Navy plays host to all Israel", and on October 29th, Air Force Day. Sandwiched between them in August, there is to be "A majestic Parade of Peace in Jerusalem". But who is to march in the parade of peace? The old men who have for years consistently sought for union between Jews and Arabs? Of the most distinguished of these one Rav Binyamin, has just died, another, the philosopher Martin Buber was eighty years old last month.

The Goals of Public Health

Continued from p. 2

system. The two must be so related that the individual can remain internally coherent and externally effective. . . .

"Psychiatric literature is full of warnings against allowing our governing expectations to diverge too sharply from the realities of the world in which we live. Socially, it may be even more disastrous of they diverge too little, for it is precisely through our sense of this divergence that we exercise over events whatever initiative we can win. Every adaptive society must have its protestants, for protest is the mainspring of any adaptation that is not purely passive. And since the protester gets more than his share of stress, he needs more than his share of immunity.

"We need, then, a concept of health which will take account both of the individual's ability to live in his society without breakdown and his ability to resist its pressures. We are still so far from this that laymen at all events do not clearly distinguish the immune from the well-adapted or even from the conformist. [The immune] are those who can carry within themselves without injury a more than usually large measure of tension—tension between the norms of individual and social experience, between the 'is' and the 'ought to be', between the present and the future. . . .

Tyrants may shout orders, within us and without; but the voice we obey in the end speaks very quietly in the indicative mood.

THE older generation of Jewish peace-makers has a long and honourable record with such organisations as *Brith Shalom*, *Ihud* and the "League for Jewish-Arab Co-operation and Rapprochement". It is very difficult to tell at this distance, what influence their successors are having. The *Observer* reported last July that:

"A hitherto barely known civic group, the Arab-Jewish League suddenly emerged in Tel Aviv last night with a powerful symposium discussing the possibilities of Arab-Jewish co-existence. Its speakers comprised some of the most outstanding members of Israel's Jewish intelligentsia, matched by equals on the Arab side."

This Jewish-Arab Association, established after the Conference for Peace and Equality in 1956, drew up a five-point programme last Autumn pressing for the removal of the remaining discriminatory restrictions on the Israeli Arabs, for the resettlement of those whose land was sequestered, for more agricultural and educational assistance and so on. The association publishes in English *New Outlook: Middle East Monthly* (P.O.B. 11269 Tel Aviv) in which the economic and social problems of the Middle East, the situation of the Israeli Arabs and the prospects of Federation between Israel and her neighbours are discussed fortnightly by Jewish and Arab contributors. The group publishing this paper include members of several of Israel's fifteen political parties, but their actual influence among the politicians, can be gauged from the fact that Ben-Gurion's government is regarded as a *restraining* influence, any alternative coalition being more likely to launch a 'preventive' war.

Before the Sinai campaign, the *Ihud* placarded the streets with a poster declaring that:

"The scheming of a blinded minority that would have us go to war with our neighbours so as to 'force a peace without concessions on our part' on them, and the relentless pressure that is being exerted to this purpose on the government and on public opinion in the press and at a number of rallies, are fostering the sudden growth of mass war hysteria.

"The promise of all kinds of 'activities' that a 'preventive war' will lead to the peace we want, is vain and unfounded. No matter how 'decisive' our victory, the tens of millions in the Arab world will only hate us the more for it and look forward to their revenge, forcing us to get set for another 'preventive war', then a third one, and then another."

"There is no way out of the involved problems of our relations with our Arab neighbours than statesmanlike initiative, accompanied by genuine willingness to compromise and work for mutual concessions".

But they were no more able to prevent their government's participation in the Suez affair than we were to prevent that of the British government. They were right, but they were ignored. A fortnight ago Mr. Yigal Allon, interviewed on BBC Television declared that at Sinai, Israel had won the war and lost the peace, as though he could have expected any other result.

At the Youth Festival in Moscow last autumn (that strange melange of unpremeditated encounters and unexpected results), an Israeli delegate addressed this appeal to the Arab delegations:

"Not far away from my home in Israel there passes the border line. Beyond the border there is an Arab country. The same rain falls here and there. The same locust invades the corn. From the same water pool the flocks drink.

"Each morning when the sun rises I can see on both sides of the border workers who go to their work, farmers on their fields, children on their way to school. They get up after a night of terror, and they shall go to sleep behind closed gates and barbed wire fences.

"Do not say: It is not in our power to grant them a life of complete peace and security. Do not say: It is not in our might to put a stop to hate, to death on the border.

"Say: Peace will not come to our dwellings and fields if we shall not take the initiative into our hands and bring it to our thresholds.

"Do not say: Words won't change things. Say: There is no peace without human affection, without people coming together, without a talk face to face. Do not say: The time has not come, and we the youth shall decide the fate of our countries. Say: We are the people, this is the place, and this is the time to sow the seed of peace in this field of hate".

The voices in both Israel and the Arab States, which call for friendship and are willing to act for it, are as few as they are in the rest of the world, but the hopes of the next ten years lie with them, rather than with the cheerleaders of national sentiment who are making so much noise to-day. C.W.

A FATE WORSE THAN PROSTITUTION.

About 75 prostitutes to-day squatted in front of Parliament House here in protest against a Government ban on immoral traffic, which comes into force on Thursday. The women, claiming to represent 1,000 New Delhi prostitutes, plan to stay there until they are allowed to submit a petition against the new law personally to Mr. Nehru, the Indian Prime Minister, or to the Home Minister.

Under the law anybody hiring or letting a house for immoral purposes will be liable to a prison term of up to five years and a fine, of 2,000 rupees (about £150). Most Landlords are reported to have already served notice on prostitutes to vacate their premises by Thursday morning.

The petition, signed by "prostitutes and singing girls," said they had to practice prostitution to feed themselves and their "poverty-stricken parents, living in such tracts of the country where either people send their daughters for this purpose or starve to death." The new act, in prohibiting prostitution inside any house would force women to carry out their profession "either on a road or thoroughfare, or not to practice it at all."

The new law might mean many of them going to other parts of India and risking the honour and respect of women at the hands of "sex-starved people, widowers, and the like." They urge the Government not to displace them and to allow them to continue their profession. "We do not mean to protect pimps and touts and those who open brothels and hire girls for their personal ends, but we want a practical solution where it can be possible for us to live," they said.

—Reuter.

†Last Monday's *Manchester Guardian* leader reminds us that "This is not an heroic strike over some great principle, nor is it a desperate struggle by down-trodden men to secure enough to eat", thus making it clear that the Liberals approve of strikes so long as they take place in Russia, India or China.

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

Rotherhithe Pollsters

DEAR FRIENDS,

We have started a new kind of Public Opinion Poll which we had hoped would get people interested in activity concerning the ideas they agreed with.

We hope to put over the idea that people should take responsibility for their own ideas and actions as a contrast to some form of government or authority running their lives for them.

In September 1957, we took a poll, in the Brixton area, on the question:—'Are you satisfied with the club facilities existing in this area?' Owing to the present size of our group (only three people), only a small number of people were questioned. Their replies varied from 'Don't know' to 'Satisfied' and 'Dissatisfied—more clubs for young people (age group under 25) needed.'

Owing to illness in our group and other hazards, our next poll was not taken until March 8th, 1958 in the Rotherhithe area. The questions were: (a) 'Do you think that ordinary people, like you and ourselves, should have more say and take more part in the way our lives are governed?'; (b) (if yes), 'How would you suggest that they should do this?' As before only a small number of people were questioned, but 'Don't know' was again in first position, followed by 'Yes', 'No', 'Not interested', 'Don't understand the question', 'Don't wish to give an opinion'. Of those answering 'Yes' to the first question, the majority answered 'Don't know' to the second question, with other replies being: 'A debating society should be formed, or there should be places where people could debate'. Also that . . . the M.P. might represent the people more if it was not for the fact that the "higher ups" made him toe the line'. Some people replied that they were 'Too old' or 'Too young—not interested', one lady answering the first question by saying that she was a Roman Catholic!

Our reception on both occasions was not hostile, fairly friendly, but there was suspicion, and people were afraid! This fear was very marked, particularly in relation to the second question, where quite a few people stated that 'They did not wish to get into trouble'. People gave us quite a bit of information regarding the clubs in their area on our first poll, one man saying that there were definitely more clubs needed to take the kids off the streets.

618 Scientists

Continued from p. 1

deem it imperative that immediate action be taken . . . cannot be ignored, representing as it does a completely opposite view to that expressed by the M.R.C., a body which is sponsored by the Government.

Further evidence from the Council is to be published and will be seen in a report from the United Nations expected in July. In view of the constant and quite apparent differences of opinion which exist between those scientists who are actually involved, both here and in the United States, on nuclear research and production, and those other scientists who claim that the dangers are far greater, it would at least seem vitally necessary for the Government to allow a completely independent (and preferably international) body of scientists to carry out exhaustive research into these matters before merely rejecting or ignoring the latest appeal. The possible consequences of not doing so are far too serious for the future of humanity.

But to be realistic it must be recognised that whilst we may applaud the action of the scientists (so far as they have gone), it cannot really be expected that the Government will in fact carry out a policy which does not conform to its own interests and ideas. Clearly appeals to Governments are of little use; only when such appeals have the support of the men who are actively engaged on the research, testing and production of nuclear weapons, and the majority of the ordinary people realise the perils of their existence, can there be any prospect of achieving a reasonable certainty for their continued existence.

We are finding the object of our poll group, as stated in the first and second paragraphs, very difficult to achieve, chiefly, we think, because of the fact that people are afraid.

We have also thought about polls on the following questions:

- (a) Did you vote at the last election?
- (b) Do you think that your opinions are taken into account by the party you voted for?

2. What do you think could be done to help road safety in this area?

Also we are thinking about taking polls on the subject of the H-bomb, and atomic weapons for the Germans. In addition we have cooked up, in theory, the idea of a kind of group (that could spread through colleges) dealing with sex

education and anarchism.

We wonder if there is any way of counteracting the fear of people who we contact with our public opinion poll. Perhaps there could be a link with some kind of decentralisation leading to the formation of street committees or community groups, but as to what specific objects these could achieve, we are still unclear.

We may try to extend the basis of the group to include more people interested in more democracy (in the best sense of the word) by writing a letter to the *News Chronicle*.

Meanwhile we are continuing to ask our questions of March 8th in other areas, and we would very much welcome any assistance of any kind, including any ideas on subjects for our polls.

Would those interested in our group please write to:—

ALAN SWIFT,
11 Westlake Road,
Rotherhithe, S.E.16.

The Motor Age

DEAR FRIENDS,

In his discussion of the problems of the Motor Age, C.W. ignores one obvious solution, namely to encourage more people to use public transport, especially the railways, and to provide public transport services of a kind that people would prefer to use rather than to drive about in their own little tin boxes.

The railways are the most efficient and most economical form of transport for carrying heavy traffic, and in an ideal society would be the principal form of transport, and road transport, both public and private, would provide feeder services to the railways.

At the present time, the railway services in Britain are so inefficient, because of many years of neglect, that many people are forced to travel by road who would prefer to travel by rail if the rail services were sufficiently attractive. Under the present system, with the railways losing traffic and the roads hopelessly congested with traffic that should go by rail, the only people who are happy are the magnates of the oil and motor industries.

In a country as densely populated as Britain where it is impossible for the majority to live in the country, we should seek ways of making our cities places fit to live in and not jungles of steel and concrete where the machine is

more important than the man. The countryside must be preserved from the encroachments of the motor car, both as a source of food and as a place for the recreation of the town-dweller. If agricultural land were valued as highly as land in the City of London, people would not be so ready to turn thousands of acres of fertile soil into concrete race-tracks, for in human terms the value of the food produced from the land is far greater than the functioning of the financial corporations that inhabit the City of London.

The motor-car which has enabled people to escape from the cities into the country has destroyed those aspects of the countryside which originally attracted the motorist. It is difficult now to find a formerly peaceful and picturesque village or small market town which has not been made hideous with petrol stations and car parks, and places where once could be found quietness and solitude are now noisy with hundreds of motorists and coach parties.

Unlike our modern tarmac roads, the railways blend much more naturally with the countryside and the passing of an occasional train causes less disturbance than a continuous stream of motor traffic. Not only aesthetically, but socially and economically the railways have brought fewer evils and greater benefits than motor transport.

London, April 26. MARTIN SMITH.

THE MALATESTA CLUB & THE MALATESTA JAZZ CLUB

THE success of the Saturday night traditional jazz sessions at the Malatesta Club, London, has been such that Friday evenings are also to be taken over by the Malatesta Jazz Band. And in order to regularise the position, Friday and Saturday evenings will be run as Malatesta Jazz Club nights—though still under the auspices of the International Anarchist Centre in collaboration with the Malatesta Club. Complicated isn't it?

What it is going to mean to the customers, however, is five shillings a year for membership of the Jazz Club, entitling them to admission through purchase of a cup of coffee at 1/6d., instead of 2/-, which remains the price for their guests. Admission will be restricted to members and guests brought in with them.

The Malatesta Club proper (if that is the right term) is also to reintroduce a membership list. This had lapsed for various reasons for some time, but the club faces the threat of a large rent increase in the near future—perhaps even eviction. Either way funds have to be raised and all those interested in the continued life of the club are urged to lend a hand—not only financially but in the work involved also.

It can be argued that as an anarchist club the Malatesta does not offer very much in the way of facilities for its members—especially those who do not thrill to traditional jazz. It is expected that this will be rectified in the near future when the joint IAC/Malatesta Club committee is hoping to initiate more activities and to make the Club

available to its members on more evenings during the week again.

The new membership fee will be 5/- a year—much less than previously—and will automatically provide membership facilities for the Jazz Club also. The reverse, however, does not apply.

Thanks to increased takings on Saturdays and such economies as the removal of the telephone, the Club is paying its way on current expenses, but without being able to accumulate any reserves. It is thought that in October the rent will be approximately doubled. New activities and a new scale of charges for sub-letting will then become a necessity.

The jazz band is a very healthy organism. It is getting itself a new piano (not before time!), has already got itself a new clarinetist (to whom—welcome!) and has swelled its original ranks by the addition of a bass-slawper (a refugee from skiffle), while every session shows improvement in their playing and usually addition to the volume from the sitters-in.

Whether the Saturday night clientele are potential converts to anarchism is anybody's guess but at least, for the first time, young people are flocking down to the Malatesta!

... and more
New Readers
for Freedom please!

When 'Freedom' Scooped the Press
The Oral Contraceptive

HAVING no world-wide network of correspondents, FREEDOM tends to limp along behind the news in most instances. Where we score, of course, is in our penetrating analysis of events, the originality of our writers and of the conclusions they draw from events, the pungency of our comment and the astounding accuracy of our prophesies. If only we had space for racing tips we could be of even greater service to our readers.

In the field of book reviews and articles of theoretical and general interest—all inspired by the libertarian philosophy—we feel we are second to none. And in the space we make available for discursive articles which we feel of importance, we are far ahead of any weekly journal (though it may take us six

or eight weeks to provide that space!).

Let's face it, however: we rarely present news items ahead of anybody else. But when we do, we do it on the grand scale—extremists as ever.

On January 26, 1957, we gave front page treatment to a despatch from our New York correspondent on the progress in the development of an oral contraceptive. We considered this to be important because the availability of a simple non-mechanical contraceptive could make a tremendous difference to the lives of millions of poor people throughout the world—to their happiness, to their health, and to their standards of living.

Up to that date nothing had appeared in the lay British Press upon this subject. And (to our knowledge) nothing did appear anywhere about it until last month. The *Daily Mail* for April 15, 1958, gave feature-page treatment to the American research and experiments.

This is a gap of fifteen months. FREEDOM has scooped the capitalist Press by fifteen months! Which isn't bad for a little paper with not a single paid correspondent or editor anywhere in the world.

But it just goes to show what could be done if more of our readers regarded themselves as correspondents as well and wrote in on subjects about which they have special knowledge or advance information.

There Must be an End

"WHAT will you do in a few years or so when you are asked to design an atomic bomb on the drawing board?"

"I shall refuse."

"And if you lose your job?"

"Then I shall lose it."

"And on what will you base your refusal?"

"I shall say simply: 'There must be an end'."

This conversation took place in the spring of 1957 between Professor Karl Friedrich von Weizsäcker, at forty-five one of Germany's leading theoretical physicists, and a student. Shortly afterwards von Weizsäcker quoted the conversation word for word in a speech before a student gathering in Bonn. "There must be an end," he said again, "and all of us feel that way." The students gave him an ovation.

It would be an error to suppose that von Weizsäcker is a popular orator or a demagogue. Both his speeches and his lectures, during which he usually walks up and down with bowed head, give rather the effect of a private monologue. Perhaps it is this directness which accounts for the fact that von Weizsäcker has become one of the highest-rated radio personalities in West Germany. His books have gone into editions of five or six figures. His lectures at the University of Hamburg, where, significantly enough, this physicist now holds a chair of philosophy, are always overcrowded.

From an article in
"The Reporter" (U.S.)
by ROBERT JUNGCK.

FREEDOM PRESS

SELECTIONS FROM
'FREEDOM'

Vol. 1, 1951, *Mankind is One*
Vol. 2, 1952, *Postscript to Posterity*
Vol. 3, 1953, *Colonialism on Trial*
Vol. 4, 1954, *Living on a Volcano*
Vol. 5, 1955, *The Immoral Moralists*
Volume 6, 1956, *Oil and Troubled Waters*

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

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

VOLINE:

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

V. RICHARDS:

Lessons of the Spanish Revolution 6s.

RUDOLF ROCKER:

Nationalism and Culture cloth 21s.

MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI:

Neither East nor West
paper 7s. 6d.; cloth 10s. 6d.

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

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

MAY 11.—S. R. Parker on
THE PLACE OF THE INDIVIDUAL
IN SOCIETY

MAY 18.—Tony Weaver on
EDUCATION IN THE KIBBUTZIM
MAY 25.—Closed.

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 Frognal) N.W.3. Nearest tube station: Hampstead (Northern Line).

★ 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 7.30 (prompt)

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