

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"Self government is better than good government."
 Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.

There'll Always be a Crisis

SOMETHING went wrong in the Middle East. As a crisis the recent shemuzzle has certainly not been up to standard. It lasted in the headlines little more than a week and has now pretty well petered out altogether.

Not only that, but it has resulted in a practically unheard-of occurrence: the unanimous passing of a resolution by the United Nations 81-nation Assembly!

Now when the United (sic) Nations agree about something within a few weeks of being brought to the brink it is clear that Middle East crises are not what they were. A new factor must have emerged, and this indeed is the case, the factor being agreement between enough small nations (hitherto divided) to prevent either of the big power blocs which use UN for their sounding-boards from getting the necessary majorities for their policies.

Unprecedented

The United Nations was all lined up for a continued slanging-match, with a Soviet resolution condemning the Anglo-U.S. actions in Lebanon and Jordan and an Anglo-U.S. resolution justifying them. The unprecedented event was the emergence of the *Countries concerned*, the countries over which any war would be fought, with a determination to have a say in what was going on. Incidentally, when we say 'countries' we mean, of course, the accredited representatives of those states at the United Nations. The *people of Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq, Egypt, etc.*, still have no more say in these decisions than do the people of Britain.

But the phenomenon of the recent meeting of the U.N. was that a group of small nations emerged—ten Arab States—in agreement at last and showed that when small states refused to line up with one

or the other of the big powers but gang up among themselves, they can use the United Nations as a sounding-board too.

The Arab States had started the assembly with violent denunciations of each other, but then they emerged expressing principles of: 'mutual respect for each others' territorial integrity and sovereignty, of non-aggression, of strict non-interference in each other's internal affairs.'

The Wrong Result

This meant no more denunciations of being 'lackeys of Western Imperialism' or 'Communist stooges', which have been flying through the Arab air for so long. All this, added to the prompt American recognition of the new régime in Iraq (however illegal and bloody the means by which it was established!) and the announced Anglo-U.S. declaration of their firm intention to withdraw from Jordan and Lebanon 'as soon as stability is established', adds up to the Middle East cauldron going off the boil once again.

The effect, therefore, of the determined, prompt, firm, etc. actions by the British and Americans in Jordan and Lebanon has been just about the reverse of what they could have hoped: they have jerked the Arab states into a realisation of how they are playing with fire by flirting with the big powers and of how they can take a hand in their own affairs if they unite instead of squabbling among themselves. Such unity most certainly cannot serve the interests of the British and Americans—nor of the Russians. If the Arabs realise how they have just been pawns in the game of the big powers they can get down to the business of getting control of the wealth of their own countries and using that to achieve improvements instead of getting entangled in deals with East and West which simply put that wealth in hock for years to come.

So the Middle East simmers down. But not to worry; there is still plenty of scope for crises there, for little Israel must not be left out of our calculations. One secondary result of any unification of the Arab States is an increased danger to Israel—for whom, two years ago, the West were so concerned. Now Ben Gurion must watch with growing apprehension.

Continued on p. 4

Nehru's Confession

DURING the Indian Parliament's two-day debate on the food situation, Mr. Nehru is reported as having confessed that he only realised the seriousness of the food situation and the need to concentrate on food production about two years ago, and that previously he had taken an optimistic view of the position. How anyone in his senses could ever be optimistic about the food situation in India, or for one moment ignore its over-riding importance for most of India's 400 million inhabitants, is more than we can understand. Only a politician blinded to everything but the power struggle, national and international, could for one moment take his mind off the basic problem of India: food. Mr. Nehru apparently only got round to realising how serious India's food problem was "about two years ago", so busy has he been playing the rôle of Joker in the international game of poker, and of Messiah to Asia's teeming, and politically up-and-coming, millions.

We have perhaps exaggerated the significance of Mr. Nehru's "confession". We shall be told that it is impossible for someone like Nehru, so closely identified with the struggles of the Indian people for their independence, to have lost sight of their problems and aspirations in the space of a few years, just when he was in a position to do something to ease the heavy burden which is life in India. But surely the facts speak for themselves; and the facts are that the food situation in India is becoming more serious each year, and it would seem that power politics is a subject much closer to the hearts of Parliament than food for the people. The *Manchester Guardian's* New Delhi correspondent suggests that

Those who watched the debate on foreign affairs early this week and that on the food situation which immediately followed must have felt surprised that for the first the House was full and the press and visitors' galleries were overcrowded, while not even a fraction of this attendance could be had when the more vital question of the food situation was discussed.

In view of Mr. Nehru's immense prestige and his dominating rôle in Indian affairs, he must accept responsibility for this "surprising" situation. If, as the *M.G.* correspondent points out, "it is now felt that the only way of making the country

realise the urgency of the food problem is for Mr. Nehru himself to assume charge" one is justified in concluding that Mr. Nehru has so far been spending a lot of time making "the country" politically conscious in the worst sense of the word, that is in encouraging the idea that India's future can be secured only when she is accepted as one of the Big Powers* at the expense of finding solutions to the elementary day to day problems of a country whose population last year increased by some five million, and will next year pass the 400 million mark.

It may sound fantastic, and many people will not believe that politicians can subordinate such basic human needs to the pursuit of purely political objectives. Yet has this not been the case in Russia and Spain, for instance, where the glaring problems of misery and poverty of the overwhelming majority of the people, far from being given first priority, have often been accentuated by political policies aimed at strengthening the authority of the régime internally or its influence in the international political jungle? Why then should one assume that the worsening food situation in India is simply an unfortunate oversight on the part of Nehru, which he will now hasten to put right?

★

TO the relatively well-fed, mechanised, gadget-minded and Television-conscious people of Western Europe and America we may sound like anachronistic tub-thumpers when we declare: "We must have food, we must have clothing, we must have shelter, these things we must have before we have the railways, the postal services or the aeroplanes". Actually these are not our words but of an Indian, Jayaprakash Narayan† who is living in India's present, and whose words might well be echoed throughout the East, in most of the Middle East.

Continued on p. 3

*Some of our pacifists and socialists see in Nehru the mediator between the Big Two, Russia and America, a view which conveniently leaves out of account Nehru the politician, who, to our minds, is obviously exploiting the power stalemate between the two rival Powers in order to build-up India as a Third great Power—sometimes euphemistically referred to as the Third Force!

†Towards a Fuller Democracy in the *Radical Humanist* (Calcutta, June 15, 22, 1958).

Racialism in British Territory

THE Ku Klux Klan mentality of the Southern States and South Africa is also to be found in British controlled Southern Rhodesia where the law governing black and white sexual relationships is designed to keep the white race pure, although there is another element of irrationality contained in it which expresses a standard of morality which applies to women but not men.

It is forbidden by law for a white woman to sleep with a black man. Actual marriage between black and white is practically made impossible although such marriages have occurred, but the white woman who is foolish enough to love a black man is made an outcast by her pure white sisters. Recently a white woman was rushed to a hospital for treatment and her husband was refused permission to visit her with their children because he was black. The woman, who was critically ill, had to be moved to another hospital.

The Immorality Act which makes it illegal for a black man to sleep with a white woman does not forbid a white man sleeping with a black woman. Colour apart, this double standard is generally accepted throughout Christian culture, although rarely openly stated. The

man who sleeps around while maintaining the good family life at home is thought of as "quite a boy", and in fact in many circles if a man cannot tell a spicy story about his clandestine sex life he is considered rather dull and probably not normal. If a woman takes for herself the same freedom and openly discusses it she is considered not much better than a whore.

The pathetic case of a 51-year-old headmistress of a girls' finishing school in Salisbury, S.R. (imagine the indignant mothers and the vicarious thrill they are getting from this case) who collapsed in Court after evidence was given by an African found in her room, would probably not have been made public if she had been a man. But because of her sex and colour (and age) her working and social life will be ruined by a single act which is no doubt the result of a frustrated life 'finishing' the silly daughters of pompous colonial parents.

This case won't make international headlines but it can be added to the many individual tragedies which occur in our society as a result of the stupidity of those who make the laws and the majority of people who adhere to them.

EDITORIAL DISHONESTY

WE often wonder when reviewing the press if editorial writers believe what they say or if they are really cynical servants of the newspaper proprietors. Certainly very few newspapers give the impression of independent or considered commentary, and on matters of "national importance" none are free from patriotic sentimentality to some degree.

Among the chief dispensers of slush and hypocrisy are the *Daily* and *Sunday Express* whose editorial commentaries are usually on the mental level of *Boys' Own Paper*. The *Evening Standard*, another Beaverbrook publication, is generally regarded as being on a slightly higher level, but it only succeeds in being less brash by comparison. Editorially, it expresses the same kind of "double-think" and downright dishonesty typical of other newspapers devoted to the "western democratic ideal".

Its editorial of August 20th is an example of the kind of reasoning

we have come to expect from patriotic apologists. Under the heading of "Cyprus Tragedy" (and how much do they really care about the tragedy of Cyprus?) we are informed that yet "another opportunity to bring peace to Cyprus has been wilfully wasted". Innocent readers might have thought after reading this sentence that the British Government was being attacked for wilfully going ahead with its plans for the island against the wishes of the majority of its people. But in fact part of the blame is being placed on the decision of the Greek Government's Prime Minister, who intends appealing to the United Nations on the grounds that the right of self-determination "cannot be refused to a European people still living under full colonial status". How dare these Greeks put themselves in the same category as us!

Who else is to blame for obstructing the smooth occupation policies of the British bully? According to the *Evening Standard*, Mr. Karamanlis "must know that one reason why the people of Cyprus do not have self-government is because of the policy of successive Greek ministries". We are not told what these policies are, but having laid the blame on the Greeks and prejudiced the reader the way is clear for one of those rare honest passages which creep into the newspapers, and which reveal so much more than the carefully chosen words aimed at blaming "the other side" without being too specific. The Editor writes:

"Britain cannot at present contemplate abandoning sovereignty over the island; its bases are essential to this country's defence system."

But, he continues: "It is not Britain's policies but the action of these extremists which stands in the way of more freedom for the people of Cyprus. It is the terrorists who are the tyrants."

We wonder if the ordinary citizen in Cyprus subject to the indignities imposed by the British agree with *The Evening Standard* that the tyrants are the terrorists. Or the prisoners hounded and caged in the hot sun while awaiting interrogation and torture, British style of course?

DEATH OF A FANATIC

WHAT does one say when a fanatical racist leader dies but that the world will be that much better without him? To express our feelings thus may be considered in bad taste, but it would be hypocritical to say otherwise. Unfortunately, in South Africa, Strydom will be replaced by a man committed to the same policies of hate and discrimination, and therefore no political change is likely for the millions of Africans who for years have been held in slavery by a small minority of whites. In fact it has been suggested that the Nationalist Party is expected to increase its support.

Many white South Africans who pay lip service to the ideals of democracy and freedom but take no risks which might involve them with the police, would rather see the Nationalists in power than that the country be controlled by a black majority. Because if and when this ever happens the white South African may well be deprived of his high standard

of living, his servants and privileges.

When black Africa explodes, the possession of a white skin will be enough to invite hatred, and this is understandable enough.

The Editor of *Africa South* (Apr.-June 1958) writing about the district of Windermere, inhabited by 15,000 Africans, which is to be destroyed on orders from the Minister for Native Affairs, takes the share of guilt for this destruction and expresses a view which could be applied in any situation where people are being inhumanly treated and to those of us who stand by and do nothing to stop it. He writes:

"If there is any meaning at all in being a man, then we are guilty, all of us, of the massacre of Windermere, since we will watch it happen, and watching it happen will do nothing to stop it... For what is done is done because we let it be done. Surely it is we, even we, who by our silence and our quiet bodies are destroying the shackles of Windermere and the living and not yet living that they guard."

THE L.A.G. SUMMER SCHOOL LECTURES ON 'WAR & PEACE'

THE DESTINY OF THE HUMAN MALE

The second lecture which we publish from the London Anarchist Summer School, discussing under the general heading of 'War and Peace' is by Giovanni Baldelli.

IN answer to the question "Why war?", put to him by Einstein on behalf of the International Institution of Intellectual Co-operation in 1933, Sigmund Freud remarked that, psycho-analytically interpreted, the very fact that war is universally condemned acts as a cover to a sneaking admiration for it and an urge to participate in it. According to Freud, man has within him an innate lust for hatred and destruction, to which all behaviour that is aggressive, destructive, critical, cynical and punishing, is to be ascribed. The great majority of psychoanalysts disagree with him on this point, but they generally base their disagreement on less deep layers of the subconscious than those Freud referred to, and tentatively explored. Their explanations of war, and those derived from other fields than psycho-analysis, are superficial—the more so the more they are prompted by the desire to find an urgent solution to some impending conflict. Freud's explanation, on the other hand, falls wide of the mark, because the depths he reaches in his analysis must logically be postulated as being the same for every species in the animal kingdom, while none of them, with the possible exception of ants and termites, exhibits that pattern of organized and systematic aggression which we call "war".

Since no nation or civilization fails to register war in its annals, we may take it as a characteristic of historical man. Since his historical man then issues from his pre-historic ancestor, a study of the latter, as far as it is possible, may help to frame a concept by which to account for the presence and rôle of war in the destiny of man. So that the word "destiny" be not too vague, let it be defined as a limitation of potentialities set for each organism by the rhythms, tropes and drives particular to each species, by the genes presiding to its form and development, and finally by its sex.

Now, apart from a few scattered and negligible exceptions, war appears throughout history as an activity pre-eminently, if not exclusively, indulged

by the male representatives of the race. Some anthropologists, furthermore, maintain that agriculture was first founded and developed by women, while hunting appears to have been everywhere exercised and organized by men. War can easily be conceived as an extension of hunting, not differing from it in kind, whether we consider its motivation or its objectives, its techniques or the temper and passions it calls into play. On these grounds it is reasonable to believe that in concentrating our attention on maleness we are on the right path towards understanding what is that something in human nature which makes for war.

Although many have warned that all attempts to reconstruct the conditions and modes of earliest human societies would be highly arbitrary and futile, yet our need to understand things by reducing them to their essentials and beginnings constantly encourage these attempts, and the results of some of them are at once more credible and more enlightening than others. The most convincing of them all is to me the one suggested by Freud in "Totem and Taboo". There he presents an adult male, master of one or more females, and not taking much notice of his offsprings until those of his sex show signs of wanting to share with him the possession of the females. To escape the wrath of their father, the young males are shown to run away, gang together, and pluck up enough courage to attack and kill him in what may be regarded as the first instance of war.

Exclusion from the family group would be sufficient to provide our pre-historic ancestor with a feeling of "Geworvenheit", perhaps less complex, but not less intense, than the one we experience to-day—a galling feeling of not being wanted, not easy to soothe. Still in a pre-historic context, and assuming sexual satisfaction to be the aim, the female would be pretty sure to get it with little exertion on her part, while a male would have to use violence, be it to kill his father, to get other males out of the way, to hold down a reluctant mate or keep another too promiscuously inclined. To the purposes of the species one male may suffice to fecundate many females, so the life of the male is correspondingly cheaper than the female's. Though our pre-historic ancestor lacked the acumen to perceive this fact, he suffered from its operation nonetheless, and many a human male, like many male mammals to-day, must have been faced with the alternative of fighting other males or being left with his sexual needs unsatisfied.

Fighting occurs in many animal species, but very rarely does it result in death. Close observation shows that in no case is death intended. Actual fighting occurs on a relatively small scale, compared with threatening gestures and ceremonies, which are the regular solution to a competitive situation. It is not his animal heritage therefore that makes man internecine, but what is most peculiar to him, namely his power to learn from experience and to understand himself in situations extending further than any described at any given moment by his immediate needs. At some time, and in such situations as we have mentioned, man must have understood that in order to get what he wanted he had to fight, and that fighting is a gamble between killing and being killed. In consciously taking the risk of being killed, he showed himself able to put reasons to live before life, and when he found his fighting rewarded with success, when he got what he wanted and more than he wanted through violence and murder, he learned to read his destiny in terms of daring.

I am not informed of females of any species regularly fighting one another for the possession of a male. The female's world is not competitive. When females fight, it is mostly for the protection of their young, and care of the young is so engrossing and seemingly gratifying, that it leaves them with no inclination for aggressive behaviour. Gestation, and the feeding and training of offsprings, are long and exacting tasks, but the masculinised woman of to-day who rebels against them because they are a token of the tyranny of the species over the individual, does not realize perhaps how her best interests and the species' will are intimately linked.

Let the will of the species have its way, let life be organized round the facts of generation and child-rearing, and the resulting culture is matriarchal, it divinities are female, its interests are peaceful, its temper unadventurous. Male cultures, in which violence and aggression are organized and institutionalized rigorously confine the female to activities

connected with generation and child-rearing, and not the least reason for the shape they take is the male's determination to avoid female domination, to prove his superiority, and to move in a world modelled on his existential peculiarities.

The gist of these ideas, though with no reference to biology, are to be found in Hegel's "Phenomenology of the Spirit", a book worth reading in spite of the monstrosity of its language, partly due to its English translation. What Hegel calls "the Spirit" is essentially spirit in the sense of courage, of guts. His message, if I understand it aright, is that guts, and not God, not determinism of any kind, decide who will be master and who will be slave, who will live his life according to his wishes, and who will live his as someone else will bid. By daring to kill, and by risking to be killed rather than submit to an alien will, a man decides his future and that of his kind. He makes history thereby; and in making history, in "leaving scars on the earth" (to use Malraux's phrase), he procures himself his highest satisfactions, enjoys a sense of fulfilment, and is aware of an integration of self with destiny, which nothing else can give him in the same full measure.

(To be continued)

BOOK REVIEW

Imperfect Monarchy

THE much ado about nothing much and nobody of true worth, but of unfortunate importance, in the sober symposium "Is the Monarchy Perfect?" by Lord Altrincham and Others (John Calder, 12s. 6d.) is damp-squibbish. It is nevertheless sufficiently eloquent of facts, figures and fancies to indicate that the monarchy is an obsolete irrational hoax only a people mediocre and afraid of their ancestors' shadows would countenance.

The purpose of these essays is to pursue logic no further than to plead for retrenchment and reform. Their rather more than less respectfully-addressed criticisms of Elizabeth II and her Court seek to improve a convenient political institution which, in the racing parlance common in royal circles, might be described as by Religion out of Ruritania. They form little more than the nucleus of some frank and full history of a particular institution which might supplement the general studies of the social anthropologist.

The rudest remarks in this volume are reserved for the critics of the critics. From Lord Altrincham's faultless description of the Archbishop of Canterbury as neither saint nor conscientious scholar, but a courtly schoolmaster, this

angry young lord descends to denouncing, with some justice, "those elements in the community which are incapable of original thought and can only bark or bite or slaver like Pavlov's dog." Becoming in turn altogether too serious Lord Altrincham is taken in so completely by an obviously faked communication from eight Teddy Boys that he prints this effusion in full, with the parenthetic comment that the original spelling and punctuation are retained.

He is, however, sufficiently sensible to recognise as purely coincidental the delivery of a Buckingham Palace message conveying the Queen's thanks to the League of Empire Loyalists, for their loyalty, on the day one of this League's adherents was fined for a breach of the Queen's peace by slapping Lord Altrincham's face.

The best of these eight (Altrincham appears twice) variety turns with a common motif is the famous *Saturday Evening Post* article by Malcolm Muggeridge, "No Bicycle for Queen Elizabeth": but when one might have expected the former editor of *Punch* wittily to have laughed the Queen right out of Court, he stages a back-peddalling act to complete an informative ride through the royal domain by halting at full circle, balancing expertly to support the monarchy he so ably criticises.

A much closer student of royalty than any of the contributors to this volume stated the paradox of British monarchy far more perfectly in "The Heart Has Its Reasons", the autobiography of the Duchess of Windsor, which has not everywhere been accorded the serious study it deserves.

A footnote to "Is the Monarchy Perfect?" states blankly that its intended Chapter IV has been omitted. Could this be the one in which Lord Altrincham advocated that royal brides be sought in some Asian or African country? Perish the thought. Some cad will be suggesting next a Cypriot bride for one of our royal princes, with Archbishop Makarios assisting Archbishop Fisher at the nuptial ceremony.

SAM WALSH.

Fast was Slow

THE NAKED GOD by Howard Fast. Bodley Head, 10s. 6d.

HOWARD FAST was a member of the American Communist Party for thirteen years and left it officially in 1957. He is the author of a number of novels, including *Freedom Road*, *The Passion of Sacco and Vanzetti* and *Spartacus*, and some plays; as a writer of some distinction he was a considerable asset to the Communist Party, and as such was used (or exploited) by that organisation in a way which has by now become common knowledge to all of us. His name was used to decorate all manner of organisations, conferences and appeals throughout America and he spoke at meetings and contributed articles to every communist and fellow-travelling journal. In fact his life was dedicated to "the cause" as so many others before him.

The Naked God is his denunciation and recantation of the Communist Party and of the thirteen years he spent in it. He follows the example set by other Communists and sympathisers in the book *The God that Failed*, in which six writers (Koestler, Silone, Gide, Wright, Fischer and Spender) wrote of their experiences in, and why they left, the Communist Party. Unfortunately Howard Fast has not brought it off so well, for it is not possible to tell whether his embittered attitude springs mainly from disillusionment with the Party and what it stands for or because of the way it treated him personally. He spends a great deal of his book castigating the American leadership for not recognising his true talent as a writer, his arch enemy being the general secretary, Eugene Dennis: "He (Dennis), had no questions to ask me. He merely dismissed me with an impatient wave of his hand, as he would brush dirt aside." And later, "But why?" he asks of another Communist, "must men lead this movement without heart or curiosity or any acknowledgement of others?"

Fast's final reason for leaving the Party is given as being the publication in America of Krushchev's 'secret' report to the Twentieth Congress of the Soviet Communist Party:

"It (the report) is a strange and awful document, perhaps without parallel in history; and one must face the fact that it itemizes a record of barbarism and paranoic bloodlust that will be a lasting and shameful memory to civilized man." Here, by implication, he is saying that until this report he had not realised the real and ghastly nature of Communist Party methods in the USSR; and yet before he had even joined (in 1943) most of 'the others' had already left. The history of the Soviet Union was there for him to see, before McCarthyism, before 'Communism' became a traitorous word in the United States, and after the 1939 pact with Hitler, after Spain and after the murder of the Kulaks. It is not enough for Fast to say that he considered all unfavourable propaganda about Russia to be lies—of news which was not obviously fact there remained such an enormous bulk that a proportion of it had to be true.

The book differs from others of its

kind, notably those by Arthur Koestler, in that it deals more specifically (and less biographically than Koestler's) with the effect of the Communist Party upon the writer as such. The author quite rightly deplores the totalitarianism of the Soviet system, and its lesser repercussions in the US, and he gives many examples of its murderous work and deprivation of freedom in all forms, but his analyses are far from penetrating and leave the impression that he is by no means free from the thought stagnation which is such a feature of those who have been trained to 'think politically' and 'associate themselves' with that 'indispensable key to all questions'—Marxism.

In his book he rationalizes his actions to this extent:

"... I can say, looking back now, that I think I did right in those years in refusing to allow myself to be expelled from the Party. If I had allowed it to come to that, as so many others did, I would have lost all power to influence the hundreds of thousands the world over who to-day see themselves in much the same position as myself." (our italics).

Perhaps if he had 'allowed himself' to be expelled the 'hundreds of thousands' (?) would not have lent their support to the organisation of which they knew he, Howard Fast, was a member! Since his claim is that he influenced so many he should surely now feel that it would have been better to influence them to his present position than rather than now.

And what of Mr. Fast's new rôle in the US? Having supported one false god does he now propose to support the opposition? You will not be surprised to hear that he is well on the way to doing so:

"It is because I have found freedom, and they have not. Not because the United States of America is a perfect democracy—its history of imperfection has filled many a book and will continue to do so—but because it is a land where the individual, in his work and in his rights, is recognized and defended. Sometimes better, sometimes worse—but always defended."

In another year or two he will probably be word-perfect on this kind of thing, for he will have forgotten almost completely, Sacco and Vanzetti and the Rosenbergs. For ourselves we prefer to quote another ex-communist, Stephen Spender, on the same subject:

"... I have always been aware that no criticism of the Communists removes the arguments against capitalism. The effect of these years of painful experiences has only been to reveal to me that both sides are forces producing oppression, injustice, destruction of liberties, enormous evils. It is to be said for capitalism that since it has long been established it can afford the luxury of freedom in the arts and in debate amongst political parties; but at the same time capitalism as we see it to-day in America, the greatest capitalist country, seems to offer no alternative to war, exploitation and destruction of the world's resources." (our italics).

H.F.W.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP
OPEN DAILY

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

New Books & Reprints . . .

- The Sundial Shirley Jackson 15/-
In Youth is Pleasure
Denton Welch 15/-
Men Against the Desert
Ritchie Calder 18/-
Cheap Editions . . .
French Girls are Vicious
James T. Farrell 2/6
Kingsblood Royal Sinclair Lewis 3/6
Second-Hand . . .
A History of Labour
Gilbert Stone 7/6
The French Revolution
Louis Madelin 6/-
From the Danube to the Yalu
Mark Clark 7/6
Ideals and Illusions
L. Susan Stebbing 4/6
Generals in Grey Suits
Joseph E. Dubois 5/-
Industrial and Commercial
History of England
James E. Thorold Rogers 7/6
Women and the Revolution
Ethel Mannin 6/-
The Military Strength of the
Powers Max Werner (1939) 2/6
The Case of Comrade Tulayev
Victor Serge 5/-
Above All Liberties Alec Craig 4/-
Oil! Upton Sinclair 3/-
A Programme for Progress
John Strachey 2/6
The Economic Problems of the
Peace Walter Padley 2/-
Austrian Requiem
Kurt von Schuschnigg 3/-
Farewell France Oscar Paul 3/-
Production for the People
Frank Verulam 2/6

Pamphlets . . .

The British Road to Stalinism
I.R.I.S. 2/6

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 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*
Vol. 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

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

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

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

RUDOLF ROCKER:
Nationalism and Culture cloth 21s.

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

MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI:
paper 7s. 6d., cloth 10s. 6d.

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

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

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

★

Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial
Committee publications:
*Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949:
A Tribute* cloth 5s.
*Neither East nor West
Journey Through Utopia*
cloth 18s. (U.S.A. \$3)

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

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 19, No. 35. August 30, 1958.

Nehru's Confession

Continued from p. 1

Africa and large parts of Central and South America. In those parts of the world, in the words of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation, "consumption still remains below the very inadequate pre-war levels" (our italics). We have quoted this F.A.O. statement on more than one occasion and we make no apologies for quoting it again and again for we have found in conversation that people here still take it for granted that standards of living are rising throughout the world, that production and productivity inevitably increase each year, and there is also a blind faith in industrialisation as the cure-all, and the great hope for the under-developed countries.

The F.A.O. statement was made in 1955, and among other alarming revelations contained in it was the one that for the first time since the war world food output "has failed to show an appreciable rise on previous years". So far as India is concerned production of food grains was 5,000,000 tons less than in 1954 and the acreage under cultivation had decreased in three years by 3 million acres. This trend has continued. Last week in the debate on the food situation in India the following figures were given:

In 1956-7 cereal production was 57.25 million tons and the population was 392 millions, whereas for 1957-8 production fell by 6.7 million tons while the population increased by five millions to 397 millions.

Last year 3.58 million tons of food grains was imported to provide a per capita consumption of 13.2oz. a day with a calorific value of 1,320. This year, even to provide the same rate of consumption as last year, it will be necessary to import not less than seven million tons. Already during the current year 1.86 million tons have been imported, and how the balance of over five million tons can be obtained is a major problem.

It is a simple truth that if standards of living are rising then production of food as well as of steel, motor cars, refrigerators and Television sets must also rise. It must rise if only to maintain existing standards of a world population which multiplies at an alarming rate (in the next twenty-five years there will be more than a 1,000 million extra mouths to feed!). To increase standards even by a few calories a day it must rise by further very substantial amounts. And at present this is not happening so far as food production is concerned. It is not happening because in some cases land is being taken out of production as part of a country's "economic" policy (the United States, for instance), or because the land is being abandoned by labourers migrating to the new industrial towns (India, Latin America, etc.), or because potential food-growing land is left undeveloped since "capital" can be more profitably invested in industrial development (all countries!).

Nehru's Five-Year plans are committed to the building up of heavy industries for India—at the expense of agriculture. In the first Five-Year plan investment in agriculture amounted to only 33 per cent. of total outlay. On the Second plan it is considerably less: only 21 per cent. But as Narayan puts it "The people must be fed before we have steel mills, before we have anything else". But it is clear that when India will figure in the statistics of world steel production, far from being a wealthier or healthier nation, her people will be poorer and more hungry than ever. Yes, some will

be better fed as a result of earning higher wages in the steel factories than they earned in their village. But they will be literally taking the food out of the mouths of others, since their increased purchasing power will be the result of an increase in steel stocks and not of food. But they will be wanting to buy food and not steel ingots! Someone, as a result will be obliged to eat less.

★
FOOD production to adequately meet human needs is, in the last analysis, a question of responsibility. The question is whose. For the anarchist there is no doubt, but for those who continue to believe that what we need is more government, more planning from the top, these simple, wise reflections by Jayaprakash Narayan in his talk *Towards a Fuller Democracy* must, surely, if these people are honest in their social intentions, give rise to some serious re-thinking.

I should also like to plead for the re-organisation of our economic and political life on the basis of what may be called vertical decentralisation. To-day, the State performs so many functions. The original function of the state was to look after the five per cent. of the people who are non-conformists, who are law-breakers, to look after law and order. Now the conception has developed into a Welfare State, a socialist State, or a total State. There is no reason to believe that only the State can run railways, that only the State can run post offices, that only the State can run life insurance, steel mills, etc. True, they should not be run for private profit because that conflicts immediately with the fundamental idea that I have placed before you. But can't they be run by other agencies, by the people, and at the same time be independent of the State? Why can't we have autonomous bodies running our railways? Instead of one autonomous body, why can't we have six or ten? Cannot the people throw up new and different kinds of organisations to manage

their business? Things have to be administered, there is no doubt. But why the Government alone should administer these? Why is it necessary for the Government to run the educational system or the health system? Why can't the people do it? After all, where does the money come from? Money comes from people. Where do the officers, experts, teachers and doctors come from? Is there a factory in Delhi which manufactures doctors and teachers? They all come from the people. Then why must we go to one centre and have everything run from that centre? I am not pleading for the preservation of the village as it is. *The village as it is must go. But the village must be preserved in one sense—in the sense that it is a small community; it must be developed not only as an agrarian community but, as I said, agro-industrial community and these primary communities should not be very large.* We are all products of culture, but we are also products of nature.

Perhaps Kropotkin and the anarchists, who have said all this and much more for the past seventy years are not so behind the times or so divorced from reality after all. There is still a chance that the world may yet come to its senses and recognise that the simple truths are more profound, more valid and more human than all the complicated economic theories wrapped in scientific jargon which are only a smoke-screen to hide the bitter fact that the capitalist methods of production and distribution in spite of their spectacular statistical achievements have failed in the all-important task of eliminating hunger from the face of the world.

Every country in the world to-day boasts of its airlines which link the far corners of the globe. Soon they will all have their steel works and their missile bases. They have their brand new armies, their parliaments and their wigged Justice, all in the best European tradition. They have done everything except eliminate misery and hunger in a world of potential plenty.

Ourselves

IT is the first time this year that we have drawn our readers' special attention to the state of our Deficit, and we are doing so because with only four months to the end of the year we have not yet reached the half-way mark towards the £1,040 we need to cover the printing deficit on FREEDOM. To catch up we must raise an average of £200 a month during the coming four months.

Year in year out the voluntary labour that goes into the writing and production of FREEDOM has been given and will continue to be given so long as it is possible to meet our financial commitments. All our overheads have been steadily increasing. Our rent has gone up, so have the rates, electricity and postages. Only our wages bill remains unchanged—since we pay none!

Freedom Press Group publishes FREEDOM every week; our bookshop is open six days a week from early morning until 6.30 p.m. and its windows provide among other things, a permanent reminder to the passing public of the existence of anarchist literature; our office comrades maintain contact with comrades throughout the world and a mail order book service which has earned them the compliments of many "satisfied customers". Incidentally, yet another activity of these comrades is the building up of a valuable anarchist library, which in a more prosperous future we hope will form the basis of an anarchist library and reading room.

To do all this costs £1,040 a year more than we receive from the sale of our literature. We cannot as a group finance this deficit from our own pockets but we give our time and look to sympathetic comrades and friends to provide the money!

According to statistics the average worker in Britain earns £10 a week. Are there 400 readers prepared to work one day a year for FREEDOM? or 800 a half-day? If there are we shall soon raise that £800. If not,

we shall be obliged to close down. Who will start the ball rolling?

★
IN this issue we announce the publication of Volume 7 of Selections from FREEDOM. It contains over 100 articles that have appeared in our Journal during 1957 and covers a wide range of subjects still topical as well as providing a valuable source of reference in years to come.

So far these volumes have not covered the cost of production, largely due to the disappointing response from our readers who even if they do not need them for themselves could for an outlay of only five shillings (U.S.\$1.00) introduce their friends and fellow workers to anarchist thought and comment in a concentrated form! That these volumes are a valuable addition to our literature we have no doubt. Already a number of libraries throughout the world have placed standing orders for each volume as it is published, and many readers have written to say what a valuable source of facts and information they are. But we are still not selling enough copies to ensure the continued publication of this annual volume.

As a special inducement to new readers we are offering complete sets of the seven volumes for only thirty shillings (U.S. \$6.00) post free.

Now Ready!
Year One - Sputnik Era
Selections from Freedom
As with earlier volumes, to FREEDOM readers ordering their copies direct from F.P. the price of the paper edition is only FIVE SHILLINGS post free (U.S. \$1.00) Volumes 1-6 are still available at 5s. per volume (paper) and 10s. 6d. cloth.
Volume 7
1957
266 pages paper 7/6, cloth 10/6
Order Now!

Why we Can't Collaborate with Communists

THE Anarchists are often accused of being sectarian and standoffish because they refuse to collaborate with other 'working-class', 'anti-capitalist' parties or groups.

The sources from which such criticism come are always political. They are thus concerned with the business of seeking power and therefore are anxious to use anybody who can be useful as a means to that end. When anarchists decline to be used in that way, we are described as being anti-working class—for your good left wing politico always claims to represent the interests of the working class—if not positively pro-capitalist.

What these political chancers forget is that the anarchists of the world suffer under governments of every political hue, and that if we ally ourselves in any one country with an opposition group, because of common hatred for the government of that country, we may be allying ourselves with the supporters of a government elsewhere. A government which persecutes our comrades there!

This is precisely the case with the Communists. In the sacred cause of working class unity we are urged to 'close the ranks' against the war-mongering capitalists. On the great issue of 'Peace' and the banning of the (British and American) H-bomb

we are told to forget hair-splitting differences and unite with all progressive forces to prevent the final holocaust. [Incidentally this means uniting with people who have voted for various parties which have all approved of the H-Bomb, and in the case of the Communists in this country with people whose Party leadership refused to allow a resolution to go from Party Congress to Moscow appealing to Krushchev to give a lead in unilaterally stopping nuclear tests!]

Now apart from all the good reasons we have for distrusting the Communists in this country—how could we face our comrades from Russia and Eastern Europe, from North Korea or China, if we collaborated here with the supporters of their governments? In Communist countries Anarchists are ruthlessly suppressed, exactly as they are in Fascist countries, and nobody suggests we should collaborate with the fascists because they are opposed to international capitalism. Why then with the Communists because in the West they appear to have certain negative aspects of policy which coincide with ours?

These factors can be conveniently forgotten by those with no international ties or concepts of principled behaviour as a basis of progress. But they cannot be forgotten or ignored by Anarchists.

The Bulgarian Anarchist Movement

The above thoughts were inspired by notes taken during the reading of reports from Bulgarian groups at the International Anarchist Congress. Two reports were presented to Congress (from the movements in exile in Paris and in Switzerland) and each of them stressed the importance of the Anarchists never having any common front with the Communists, nor any collaboration whatsoever.

The movement emerged after the war in Bulgaria with many groups throughout the country, but after the Communist coup in 1948 open activity has been impossible. Over 600 Anarchist militants have been arrested and all contact is maintained now through personal links alone, since the political police are everywhere and have dossiers on everybody.

Under these circumstances it is extremely difficult for the movement to extend its activities. Such care has to be taken that often comrades working in the same factory do not know each other. Because of this the known movement of trusted comrades tends to grow older and there is little possibility of bringing young people into their activity. Added to this there is also the tendency for parents to want to shelter their children from anything which may bring them into trouble with the political police.

In this situation our Bulgarian comrades were faced with the choice of remaining in the country and either giving up all pretence of being anarchists and remaining silent in the face of police terror, or embarking on the dangerous and doubtfully effective work of an underground movement, or leaving Bulgaria to go into exile and carry on open propaganda elsewhere.

Many comrades choose the latter course and went to France, to Switzerland, to Greece and to Yugoslavia—though here, in spite of the break with Stalin in 1948, conditions were practically the same as in Bulgaria and some left again.

In the 'democratic' countries, however, it was not easy for our comrades to settle down and find work and since the initial exodus from Bulgaria to more or less neighbouring European countries, they have now dispersed as far as Australia, Canada, Mexico, USA and Brazil.

Contact is still maintained with many of these comrades, but naturally their usefulness to the movement suffers through this dispersal though against that has to be balanced the fact that for the first time for many years they are free from political persecution.

Much valuable work is done by the emigré movement, however, in the matter of solidarity. Organised chiefly through the group in Paris, funds are raised for a variety of purposes. All the families of comrades in prison are regularly helped, as are emigrés coming out of Bulgaria, until they can get on their own feet. This is carried on as well as the collection of funds for propaganda purposes: the holding of meetings and lectures (which are afterwards printed), the production of booklets and of an internal bulletin for circulation among the militants.

Inside Bulgaria the dictatorship continues and is detested by the population in general. At the time of the death of Stalin the police apparatus went into action making widespread arrests, not only of known or suspected rebels but of anybody who showed pleasure by laughing or getting drunk to celebrate the death of the old tyrant.

The economy is deteriorating and unemployment is spreading. Poverty is acute and all workers are having to work harder and harder to maintain their wages. This is leading to the spread of crime and stealing is becoming widespread.

While all these conditions make things very hard for the anarchist movement and for the population in general, still it is possible for the anarchist mentality to grow as the situation makes the relevance of our ideas clearer. Disillusionment with the concept of the 'workers' State' makes the serious consideration of anarchism almost inevitable among those workers, peasants and intellectuals who seek an alternative.

Anarchism will survive in Bulgaria. Where open propaganda is impossible it will exist through mutual aid and moral resistance. News travels fast throughout the country; from prison camp to prison camp our comrades are kept in touch and given encouragement through the help their families receive from outside.

Their appeal to the outside world is for more understanding of their plight, for help where possible and—no collaboration with the Communists!

†In *A Crisis of Mankind* "Freedom" Selections, Vol. 5, 1955 and in *Dollar Imperialism*, Vol. 7, 1957.

H-Bomb Hiccups

LAST week Britain and the United States announced their readiness to suspend nuclear tests for a year from October 31st, providing Russia would agree to negotiations for a full-scale agreement to stop tests. If agreement is reached and satisfactory progress is made towards other and more positive aspects of disarmament in general, it is proposed by the Western powers that suspension of nuclear tests should be extended from year to year.

Such is the substance of the announcement which, it is no doubt considered, should be greeted with all the unabashed enthusiasm of which naive Britons and Americans are capable, though there is unlikely to be the same degree of enthusiasm engendered within the hearts of the peace-loving potentates in the Kremlin. This is hardly surprising in view of the circumstances which have led up to the announcement.

It will be recalled that in April of this year the USSR unilaterally suspended her own nuclear testing, which gesture was intended to be regarded by the West as an invitation to do likewise. (Presumably the USSR only took this action having arrived at a point in her nuclear development where tests were no longer of much value!) However, the United States was just about to begin a considerable series of tests at that time, which subsequently continued until July 31st. Thus the Soviet action was ignored by both the U.S. and Britain alike.

A further aspect of the Western plan is also unlikely to go unnoticed. At almost the same time as the announcement a large explosion was reported as having taken place on Christmas Island—the explosion of a low-yield nuclear device suspended from a balloon—the latest test in the British series scheduled to end before October 31st.

Russia may therefore say with truth that the Anglo-American plan is a blatant piece of hypocrisy timed precisely at the most convenient

moment for themselves. Russia could also add that at the time of her unilateral suspension she made it clear that if other countries were to continue to "explode atomic and hydrogen weapons as before" she would have to reconsider the position. This is the way out if Russia wants it, though there are innumerable methods by which all three great powers may retract as and when it suits them. As in the past it is rather like a game of poker where the stakes are the maximum amount of propaganda to be gained against the minimum amount lost.

Ostensibly of course the Western announcement comes as a result of the Geneva conference of experts having agreed upon the technical possibility of establishing an effective system of controlling test-suspension. The scientists at Geneva, representing both sides, have put forward recommendations involving a network of monitoring posts around the world, including the use of ships as detecting stations.

THERE are other difficulties to be met with before any three power agreement is reached (besides the natural aversion which the three have towards an agreement), of which we would mention three.

It is stated that the British and American Governments have been in touch with the French Governments in connection with the latest plan, but that the French whilst agreeing with it in principle (*sic*) are in the midst of their own plans for testing nuclear weapons. It is thought unlikely that France will be prepared to talk seriously about test-suspension until the end of next year, when it is assumed she will have the possibility of tests to suspend! Similarly perhaps this may apply to China, who may also wish to become an active member of the nuclear club before being asked to resign.

Both sides therefore may be left with an opportunity of objecting that

the other side is merely agreeing to nuclear test-suspension having fixed up a stand-in before the event.

The second problem if it comes to the point will be the insistence by both sides that their programme of atomic - research - for - peaceful - purposes shall not be interfered with; this will present interesting speculations as to what constitutes a peaceful detonation and in what way it will differ from the detonation of a nuclear weapon. President Eisenhower went so far as to touch on this subject in the course of his suspension announcement.

Thirdly there comes the attitude of the 'practical men' in the atomic weapons field. General Twining, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has already stated "very decidedly", that new uses are steadily being found for the atom in defence policy (!) and refinements of earlier nuclear weapons—refinements which will no doubt require testing... Mr. John McCone, chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission has stated (as if to clarify General Twining's remarks), that any suspension of tests should include an American reservation allowing the U.S. to test a variety of underground and high-altitude nuclear weapons.

And so there are plenty of 'escape' possibilities should any of the great powers find themselves too close to agreement. In any case it has to be faced that agreement on test-suspension for one year only is an extremely limited project. Whilst anything of this kind is better than nothing, providing as it would the prospect of one extra year without radiation increase, it is still a far cry from a world without tension and the ever-present fear of extinction, or a world which is disarming and destroying its stockpile of nuclear weapons. That remains as much a fairy-tale future as ever, and will continue to be so for as long as we place that future in the hands of men who cannot or will not see the lunacy of their stratagems.

There'll Always be a Crisis

Continued from p. 1
sion any strengthening-through-unity of his Arab neighbours.

The Russians Keep Stirring

Ben Gurion is not the man to sit back and wait to be pushed into the sea when the Arabs are ready. If he feels that he cannot rely on any United Nations force to keep the Arabs in check, who knows but that he might lash out again in order to smack them down before they get too strong?

Nor should we discount entirely the ability of the Russians to stir up trouble. As has been frequently pointed out, Krushchev has nothing to lose in the Middle East. He doesn't have to be constructive; all he needs to do is to keep prodding, keep the pot a-boiling, and he will be embarrassing the powers who have oil interests there and causing them endless headaches and expense.

In any case, although it has been a most fruitful source of crisis for many years, we should not consider the Middle East as the *only* spot where useful trouble can occur. When one door shuts, another opens, says the old saw, and sure enough, as soon as the Arab States produced their compromise resolution to cool things down in the Middle East—the Far East flared up again.

There's Always Formosa

For the past ten days Communist artillery on the mainland of China has been bombarding the Nationalist-held island of Quemoy (only five miles from the mainland), presumably as a prelude to an invasion attempt. This would bring the Peking Government's forces one step nearer to Formosa, which the Americans are pledged to defend, and around whose southern coasts the U.S. Seventh Fleet is about to be engaged in exercises.

The United States continues its stupid refusal to recognise the Communist Government of Peking, because of the violent way in which it

was established (while recognising the new Iraq régime within ten days after the most appalling cruelties and the murder of King Hussein of Jordan's cousin!) and continues to support the discredited and equally violent Chiang Kai-shek in his hide-out on Formosa.

While, on the Russian side, it was clearly because of Mao tse-Tung's plans for an attack on Quemoy (if not on Formosa) that Krushchev suddenly backed away from summit talks after his meeting with Mao.

There, after all, we have the basis for quite a few good crises—perhaps even a limited war. So as the Middle East quiets, we can start biting our nails about the Far East.

And why not? We must have crises. How else can we continue to find reasons for armament development and the maintenance of a war-economy through high-level taxation? How could we go on needing politicians and statesmen and leaders to save us if there was nothing to save us from?—There must be enemies at the gate. There'll always be a crisis. And if there isn't, we'll have to invent one!

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

Questions, Discussion and Admission all free.
No Meetings in August.

CROYDON AREA

Will all comrades and sympathisers interested in libertarian activity in the Croydon area please communicate with:
S. E. PARKER,
228, Holmesdale Road, London, S.E.25

★ 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 Friday and Saturday from 7.30

THE MALATESTA JAZZ BAND

Members(1/6) and their guests (2/-) only.
MALATESTA CLUB
32 Percy Street
Tottenham Court Road W1
Jazz Men welcome

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

Anarchism and Utopia

DEAR COMRADES,

George Molnar's theory (FREEDOM July 26) has an appealing air of being realistic and sensible, but it is expressed in too abstract a manner.

It is all very well to advocate "permanent protest" and to write that "the contest between freedom and authority is the permanent order of the day", but the fact is that, while freedom implies creativity, love, happiness, authority implies exploitation, torture, misery and bloody murder.

Now it may well be true that this is a right portrayal of the future, a minority struggling against a world of unspeakable cruelty and needless man-made suffering. A struggle doomed to failure such as this fills one with bitterness and gloom at the mere thought. It is not far from Orwell's vision of a boot stamping on a human face "forever". It is not far from the Christian concept of Hell, for George Molnar should reflect that the simple word "authority" does not mean a few annoying taboos, a few bothersome restrictions, a few petty irritations. It means war, massacre, racial persecution, the bullying of children by adults and by each other, the harrising of the social misfit, the arrogance of the man in uniform. It means the Indian starving on his traditional "handful of rice a day", it means the poisoning of the human breed by radioactive "fall-out", it means the tight lips of the puritan, the hangman's noose, the bayonet stab, the jellied petrol bomb.

That is what I mean when I say the whole discussion is too abstract. "Authority" is not just a little bit of red-tape that it is exhilarating and not too dangerous to fight against.

I am dubious if we shall ever arrive at a free society. I never have been optimistic about it. But I do not see any reason to glory in the fact.

Frankly I do not believe that there have always been two currents in history, at least not two equal ones. There have been long periods of unopposed despotism in the slave empires of antiquity. If there were libertarian movements then they must have been very small. They are not over-large to-day. If there are two currents then the libertarian one has

been generally far the weaker, often inapparent.

Far from seeing two currents, I see a society, whose basis is fundamentally authoritarian, opposed by a tiny minority of libertarians. Perhaps eventually the tables will be turned, and we shall have six or seven thousand years of libertarianism, when the authoritarians will be a tiny minority.

This hope implies no authoritarianism, no desire to fix future society by degree. There are thousands of different forms of authoritarianism in the world, so why should there not be thousands of different sorts of anarchism?

George Molnar refers to the idea of "making the world safe for freedom" as

LETTERS

"this security-seeking ideal", with evident contempt, and considers that this is "the aim of the modern socialist movement", which involves capturing power.

But there is no connection between the ideal of a varied society with a libertarian basis (as we live in a varied one with an authoritarian basis) and the capture of political power. Nor do the socialists want freedom as the anarchists understand it.

I do not desire the sort of utopia in which there are never any quarrels. I think such a society highly unlikely. But I do desire a society in which there shall be no war, superstition, obscurantism, cruelty, exploitation and fear, and I see scant reason for the ill-concealed glee with which George Molnar jettisons the utopian ideal. He is probably right in his prophecy. The ideal will never be realised; but this is a cause for grief, though not perhaps for total despair, since the future is always unpredictable.

I believe that a free society is the normal condition of things for man. I do not however believe that man's original free society was destroyed by outside invasion or by supernatural intervention. I have in previous letters explained why I think man has declined into authoritarianism.

To abandon the ideal of utopia, however remote and seemingly impossible, is to abandon one of the things which

makes anarchism worthwhile, since the utopian ideal implies a rejection of the authoritarian society we live in. To reject utopia, and to consider authoritarianism as a permanent feature of human society, is to accept authoritarianism and all it implies. Such an attitude is not far from that of the tough-minded Tory, who despises idealists, and is prepared to take the world as it is, and to accept that it always will be the same, in spite

A Plea for Practice

DEAR FRIENDS,

I am sorry that it was not possible for me to be present at the recent Anarchist Summer School. Of course I find discussion of theories very interesting but I wonder whether any time was devoted to a problem which has bothered me and I hope other Anarchists for some time. It is this:—What are the best practical ways of behaving Anarchistically in our existing society? We criticise governments for what they do and for what they do not do. Fair enough. But do

A Good Week - What About the Next 18?

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 34

Deficit on Freedom £680
Contributions received £449
DEFICIT £231

August 15 to August 21

Coleman's Hatch: D.M. 1/-; Chelsea, Mass.: J.M. 14/-; Brussels: J. de S. 4/4; New York: J.B. £1/2/0; Wolverhampton: J.G.L. 2/6; Hartford: M.G.A. 10/-; London: J.S.* 3/-; London: Hyde Park Sympathiser 2/-; London: Anon. £35.

Total ... 37 18 10
Previously acknowledged ... 411 2 5

1958 TOTAL TO DATE ... £449 1 3

*Indicates regular contributor.

we devote enough time to what we should be doing? I don't just mean speaking in Hyde Park or running the Malatesta Club or publishing FREEDOM—all of which are essential jobs and well performed by those qualified to do them. But what about the practical expression of what we hear in Hyde Park or read in FREEDOM or discuss at the Malatesta Club?

Here, for instance, is an example:—We criticise the government for not doing anything about the recommendations of the Wolfenden Report concerning homosexuals. But then surely we didn't expect the government to do anything. Are we doing anything? Can we do anything? Assuming that nothing will be done by the state in this matter, are we prepared to act illegally, if necessary, to bring some happiness into the lives of this section of the community in the present state of affairs? I know such action would have to be a closely guarded secret and maybe I am wrong in thinking that nothing is being done by Anarchists in this matter, but I find it very frustrating, holding the views I do, and yet feeling there is nothing I can do to give them expression. I admit I am interested personally in this matter, but I feel the same about many of the other issues touched upon in FREEDOM. We have discussed the thing enough, let's have some kind of action, then we can re-discuss in the light of practical experience. Why not have a committee meeting periodically to plan Anarchist action (on however small a scale) on various issues that come up from time to time?

Yours fraternally,

Ipswich, Aug. 18.

N.J.T.