

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"Man has a right to think all things, speak all things, write all things, but not to impose his opinions."  
—MACHIAVELLI

## A LETTER TO ALL SCIENTISTS

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,

The developments in all fields of science during the last hundred years have been watched with awed wonder by all but the most bored and unimaginative of us. Your achievements, and those of your forerunners, the pioneers of genius and the many who have developed and consolidated the inspirations of the few, have pushed further and further the frontiers of man's knowledge until the deepest secrets of matter are being disclosed.

In the service of medicine and psychology and the new social sciences, your achievements are making the difference between life, death and living death for people the world over. Malaria, yaws, typhus, the killing plagues which have decimated mankind through the ages are at last coming under control. Millions of children are growing up today who would not have survived their first year had it not been for the devoted and untiring efforts of scientific workers in laboratories and in the field—in many cases giving their own lives in the service of others. And while much remains to be done in the treatment of the sick in mind, the general attitude is changing from regarding them as outcasts possessed by devils to sympathetic attempts at understanding the working of that most delicate instrument—the human brain.

In all the applications of the physical sciences to satisfy human—and animal—needs, we stand indebted to you. In agriculture, continually expanding knowledge of the soil and

the needs of growing organisms open the way to the abundant production of food, while the development of farm machinery eliminates much of the tedious labour previously necessary. Indeed, abundance in all things becomes at last a conceivable possibility as electronics and automation make possible tremendous increases in productivity without the soulless monotony of assembly-line work reducing men and women to the status of mere adjuncts to the machine.

Man-made fibres and plastics, only at the beginning of their development, offer boundless opportunities for raising standards in clothing and furnishing materials; new techniques with building materials and the inventions of labour-saving devices in the home offer possibilities for leisure our grandmothers would not have dreamed possible.

Food, clothing and shelter: the basic necessities of mankind. Thanks to your efforts we can at last see the means by which these needs can be satisfied. Thanks also to your efforts a more rational attitude to sex is pushing out the old taboos, and greater knowledge and more widespread availability of birth control facilities are conquering the fear of unwanted children which marred the lives of so many women. But not only does this provide for the mental tranquility of women in advanced societies like ours; it provides the key for the conquering of the grinding poverty of the over-populated, under-developed countries.

In all these matters and many more we stand indebted to you and your forerunners in the sciences. We wish this were the whole story.

Unfortunately, the pace at which technology—with your help—has advanced, has not been matched with similar advance in social thinking—even by yourselves. It is a matter of sad amazement for many of us laymen that whereas all scientists *have* to be rational and logical

and honest in their work, *have* to be (like artists) responsible to their medium and their material, so many of you shrug your shoulders when the question of responsibility for the application of your work is concerned.

"This is not our concern" you say. "We are not responsible for the use or mis-use of our knowledge you declare. But if you are not, who is?"

For the tragic fact is that side by side with the benefits which you have provided for mankind and the high hopes you offer for the future, you have developed such ghastly means of destruction of life and property that you may well ensure that there simply *is* no future.

You cannot have it both ways. You cannot be respected for the good you do, the lives you save, and not be condemned for the misery and the deaths you cause. What is the point of it all? What is the good of providing the means by which millions of people live longer, healthier, better than ever before if you also provide the means to kill them more quickly and in greater numbers than ever before? Do you keep them alive in order to demonstrate your ability to slaughter them rather like the grazier fattening cattle for the butcher?

Oh we know that 'science' is neutral; that it is the ends to which your disinterested knowledge is used that may be right or wrong. A kitchen knife of shapely, functional design may be used to peel a potato or to kill a man—but how many of you would plunge that knife into the heart of your neighbour?

It depends how your knowledge is used . . . But your knowledge is *your* knowledge and can only be used through *you*. How your knowledge is used, therefore, depends entirely upon how *you* are prepared to be used. How, by whom, and for what.

When Nazi doctors performed inhuman experiments upon helpless

inmates of concentration camps, the world was disgusted and they merited the condemnation of the rest of their profession throughout the world, for doctors take the Hippocratic oath, swearing to do no harm to those in their care.

Where does the rest of the scientific world stand on this issue? Does it bang the door of its ivory tower and claim that its duty is solely to scientific truth and objective knowledge and disclaim responsibility because they are not policy makers?

The world's experience of Nazism provides us with the answer to that also. At the Nuremberg trials it was not only the top policy-makers, the psychopathic leaders of a criminal system, who were judged and found guilty. The guilt spread right down to the lower rungs—to the guards of concentration camps who only did as they were told.

Does that not apply to us all? At least two of your number obviously thought it did. Mr. Leslie Williams, head of the chemistry department at the Government's Microbiological Research Department establishment at Porton, Wiltshire (the botulinus toxin factory) killed himself by taking cyanide five years ago. His wife told the coroner that he sometimes came home late, explaining that he had stayed out 'until he felt civilised again'. And a woman doctor from Porton, after a stay in a mental hospital, killed herself. Electricians have been horrified at what they saw at Porton and have quit their jobs—one apprentice to spend many months in a mental hospital.

You of the scientific professions, like the rest of us, will have heard many persuasive arguments to justify the production of atom bombs, hydrogen bombs, missiles to deliver them, and, now that it is in the news, toxins of such fantastic properties that a few ounces could wipe out the human race.

You can, if you will, accept those arguments. You can use them as

justification and you can sell yourself to the Government and be well looked after. A secure, well-paid, well-pensioned job with accommodation provided. The very best and latest in equipment with unlimited resources for inspired guesswork or humdrum development or mass production.

There are only two factors you need to crush in order to do this work: your respect for your profession and your respect for yourself. If you sell yourself for purposes of mass murder, if you prostitute your rare knowledge and skill to dream up more effective means of torturing or poisoning masses of ordinary people, it is clear that you have already lost your respect for *them*.

And if they retaliate by losing respect for you, you will have only yourselves to blame. If the layman, finding your work loathsome, finds you loathsome for doing it, can you blame him?

It is up to you, of course. You don't *have* to do this work. As we indicated at the beginning of this letter there are so many fields in which you can do so much that is wonderful and good. Unhappily, such is the position today, the good you do may be interred with *all* our bones.

### Feminine Emancipation Goes East

IT is generally accepted in the West that women have freed themselves from the male yoke, but whether they are emancipated in all other respects is debatable. With the exception of Switzerland, women have attained the franchise and are free to compete with men in most jobs, but the curious thing is that few women are attracted by revolutionary ideas and the impetus for social change generally comes from men. The Suffragette Movement was an important exception although its aims were limited, but the things for which suffragettes fought are now taken for granted in many countries. In others the struggle for equality with men still goes on but unfortunately in the relationships between the sexes the trend always seems to be authoritarian. It might be argued that there is an unconscious desire on the part of women to punish men for holding them in slavery for so long, but can any movement claim to be liberative if it imposes its own yoke—even on previous oppressors? To fight for equal rights is one thing, to prevent others exercising freedom of choice is another.

In South Viet Nam last week a bill on the rights of women instigated by Madame Ngo Ninh Nhu, sister-in-law of the President, was accepted by the Assembly, which should change the status of women considerably in a country where the laws demanded that women could not marry without their parents' consent whatever their age, or refuse a husband of their parents' choosing. In addition:

"They had to live with their in-laws, endure without protest their husbands' infidelities, could be turned out on the flimsiest charge of 'disobedience' or

Continued on p. 4

### Hazards of Nuclear Weapon Tests

NUCLEAR explosions release radioactive fission products, e.g. strontium 90, the harmful effects of which are fairly well known. In addition, neutrons are produced which react with nitrogen in the air to make carbon 14, which has a half-life of about 5,600 years.

Reassuring statements by W. F. Libby, an American "official" scientist have played down the danger of this latter effect, until Professor Linus Pauling made some calculations of his own (*Science*, 1958, 128, 1183). He concluded that the carbon 14 produced during one year of nuclear weapon tests (30 megatons of fission plus fusion bombs) could be expected to cause in the world 425,000 embryonic and neonatal deaths, 170,000 stillbirths and childhood deaths and 55,000 children with gross physical or mental defects. These numbers are about 17 times the numbers usually estimated as the probable effects of the fallout fission products from one year of tests. In addition, radiation damage to bone tissue and bone marrow (causing leukaemia and bone cancer) and to other tissue could be expected to be about equal to that of fission products.

Prof. Pauling is one of the world's foremost scientists, but that did not prevent a rather hostile official reception when he visited this country recently. Apparently foreigners (including Americans) are not encouraged to come to this country to make statements which are contrary to (British) government policy!

This is hardly surprising when such statements clearly indicate the stupidity and irresponsibility of continuing to explode nuclear weapons. Now that it is possible for anyone who really wants to, to bump off the human race (Prof. E. M. Backett) we hardly need any *more* people with gross mental defects.

### Apartheid in British Territory

*Negroes are barred from Parliament, are excluded from most hotels, must use separate entrances to Post Offices and banks, are denied entrances to some shops which serve them through hatches opening on to the pavement.*

THE above reads like an extract from a description of South African apartheid policy, but in fact it refers to a few of the laws which govern Africans in British-controlled Southern Rhodesia. There are about 211,000 whites in Southern Rhodesia and with measures which differ very little from the fanatical South African Nationalists' they manage to deprive millions of Africans of rights and dignity.

Anyone, black or white, who speaks out for African rights outside the limits of those conceded by law is banished or jailed. Black "extremists" are treated like criminals, but not so white individuals who encourage hates and divisions, which makes nonsense out of the claim of the white authorities that extremists have to be curtailed because their actions lead to disorder. If "extremism" and not colour is the crime why is it that organisations such as the European National Congress

which originated in Salisbury and has now spread to Northern Rhodesia, Kenya and Tanganyika, and whose members must swear not to "contribute to multi-racialism in any form" and to resist all efforts to give power to Africans in their present "immature state", is allowed to flourish?

It is not enough for the Prime Minister, Sir Roy Welensky, to feebly state that: "the Congress is not the sort of organisation I believe will benefit the Federation, you can't fight extremism with extremism with any hope of success", particularly since his own policy for African "advancement" is practically meaningless.

We might ask why the extreme European organisation has not been condemned and its leaders treated like Dr. Hastings Banda from Nyasaland for example, who was classified as a "prohibited immigrant" and escorted out of Southern Rhodesia because he was rash enough to suppose that the principles of free speech made so much of by western politicians applied to Africans as well. He is not the only African with any influence to be

mistaken in this interpretation of British democracy.

The key to the racial conflict is largely economic. Southern Rhodesia is a rich territory which holds economic possibilities for Britain and the white settlers. If "natives" were allowed equal educational and social advantages together with their numerical superiority the dominating position of the white man would be threatened. It never occurs to them that relationships based on equality makes for a more stable environment and could lead to plenty for all if white men were willing to share the undoubted benefits of western technology which could be applied with wisdom to underdeveloped areas.

Unfortunately, apart from materialistic considerations, there is an irrational element contained in racial prejudices which can only begin to be overcome by the willingness of people to accept and understand cultural differences without being afraid of the consequences or of mistaking different levels of development for innate superior racial attributes. Racial mixing in every way seems the soundest way of breaking down barriers.

# A World to be Born

LIBERO ig'is ja bezono  
Por homaranoj ciulande.  
Mi diras ne nur propagande  
Ci tion, nek por fanfaronoj.

Jes, en Britio kaj Usono,  
Kaj Malte, Cipro kaj Ugande,  
LIBERO ig'is ja bezono  
Por homaranoj ciulande.

Ec Kruscev diris, prov-demande,  
'Nu, jes, gi eble estas bono!'  
Cu kun permes', au kontrabande,  
Gin gui devas ciu homo . . .

LIBERO ig'is ja bezono . . .

The words above (a one-minute commercial ad for FREEDOM\* belong to the same stock that was originally marketed 70 years ago, by a Polish doctor who invented it during the ten years following his graduation from high school.

Since that day Esperanto has become a cult; one might even say, a way of life. The latter phrase would be more appropriate if America had not, alas, given it a sinister tone; or if Esperanto were, which it is not, an object of widespread approval.

In fact, of those who have learnt it at one time or another (and they include President Tito and the late Joseph Stalin) few regard it as having important social or political consequences. The authors of the present collection, however, are in a different category: for the common factor linking them is that they all write poetry in Esperanto and find it (apparently) a satisfactory medium of expression.

At the very least, this is a unique volume. As the fly-leaf states, no previous work has collected poetry from 28 different countries without having had recourse to translation. But if the claims

\*A free translation of which reads as follows:

FREEDOM is now a must for believers in humanity in every country. I say this, not merely for effect, or as a piece of sales talk.

Yes, in the states of the West, guardians of human liberty, as well as in politically backward areas, FREEDOM is now a must. . . .

When cross-questioned, a member of the Supreme Soviet said: 'Well, yes, it might be a good thing!' Whether legally, or under the counter, everyone must have it.

FREEDOM is now a must. . . .

made for it by the editor and publisher are justified, it is more than a literary curiosity; it marks the emergence of a new literature.

Most writers prefer to keep to the language of their place of origin. A few choose a neighbouring, less provincial idiom: as when Kafka chose German rather than Czech, or Koestler, a Hungarian by birth, chose German, and finally English.

In some cases, this has a political bearing, and the writer's social conscience has to decide the issue.

But a very few indeed would choose a language spoken by less than 1 million, and actively by fewer than 16,000.

What are the motives which would prompt such a decision? And do the results justify it?

There is no doubt that through Esperanto one can reach a more heterogeneous public, though perhaps an unpleasantly anonymous one. Size is of little importance. Every writer acknowledges the value of cliques, and appreciates the stimulus of writing for a group, however small that group may be. The Esperantist group is small, and offers some of these advantages.

The use of a neutral language enables one to stand outside the loyalties and prejudices of one's own group. For William Auld, the editor of this anthology, himself represented in it by some lively and politically progressive verse, this is evidently the deciding factor.

The transition from an over-used medium to one in which all roads are new and untried, can also have a liberating effect. Marjorie Boulton, an English authoress who now writes verse only in Esperanto, chose it because it is more passionate; Kalocsay, a Hungarian doctor and scholar in 12 languages, because speech and intonation has always fascinated him; speech in general, not any one language. He is the Chaucer of this group, and imitates Japanese and Finnish with equal ease.

On the whole, however, those who look for a distinctively international ideology (and those who think that by writing in Esperanto they will achieve it) are in for a disappointment.

Poetry has to have roots in society. Since Esperanto is still, after all, only a cultural movement, its poetry is lacking in the specific relevance necessary to great art.

The long-term aim of Esperanto, of course, is well known. It differs little from the aims of such bodies as UNESCO. An auxiliary language is conceived as a means to the end of universal literacy and democracy, and a free exchange of knowledge on a basis of equality between groups. This ideal is in itself admirable.

Embodied in Esperanto, it leads to a fascinating paradox. For in order to reach this goal, everyone will have to speak Esperanto as they now speak their own language. This means, in effect, that it will have to displace the present linguistic habits of people everywhere: a goal which, if not humanly impossible, is at least Utopian.

Half-measures are unthinkable, since a language either takes full command (i.e. it is a vehicle for all and every kind of expression), or it is purely incidental, confined to certain occasions.

## Book Reviews

Esperanto clearly should remain incidental. It should fulfil some role akin to that of Latin in the Catholic liturgy; subservient, that is, to the purposes served by the already existing ethnic languages.

Doubtless with the best intentions, the poets in this book have passed the limit at which a created auxiliary is still socially useful. In making it a literary language, they have in fact turned their backs on the needs of humanity and opted for esotericism.

Still, the poetry is good. Some of it is very good. There is here part of an epic by a Jesuit missionary to China, as well as selections from a cabaret which, as the reviewer remembers, used to run within the sound of the elevators on the Eiffel Tower. The same author, in his humorous verse, is capable of lines worthy to stand beside Dylan Thomas's cheerful lubricities.

The mention of Thomas is relevant, for Dylan Thomas was born in Swansea, and yet wrote a kind of English nurtured in the courts of Elizabethan London.

The fallacy and the fatal lure of esperanto writing is that, although humanity needs a single language, one cannot write for mankind simply by using a neutral medium.

In Russian, English, or even Cornish, writers can always transcend the nation and social group they belong to. The elements of their work, as well as their personal loyalties, remain identifiable, but the unity created by these elements is symbolic, and so released from its one-to-one correspondence to time and space.

Obviously the transition from Swansea to London, from English to Esperanto, from the smaller to the wider circle, does not in itself mean anything. It is the native usefulness of the elements at the writer's command, allied to his own transforming power, which results in universality.

Dr. Zhivago would be unthinkable without the unique background, conveyed in every word and paragraph, of the Soviet revolution. Dylan Thomas would be lost without the forerunners from whom his rhetoric is however indirectly, derived: the Euphuists, the romantic diarists, and the preachers in Wesleyan tin chapels.

Now and again Esperanto has taken root: in Siberian slave-cities, in Israeli kibbutzim. But its seed has been uprooted time and again in the successive crises of our age. It may, through some unforeseeable turn in events, become definitely established, as the right tool for serious undertakings. Only when that happens, can its role as a vehicle of poetry be fully acceptable.

Meanwhile this book is a milestone, since it demonstrates how near, and yet how far, mankind is from unity.

A.D.F.

(*ESPERANTA ANTOLOGIO* is obtainable from the British Esperanto Association, 140 Holland Park Avenue, W.11.)

**ESPERANTA ANTOLOGIO.**  
Poemoj 1887-1957. Edited by William Auld. Published by J. Regulo Perez, La Laguna, Tenerife. 640 pp., 27s. 6d.

## The Lost Days

THE recently heralded Act of Parliament on Mental Health was designed to safeguard the apparently large numbers of people who, once condemned to life in a Mental Hospital found it impossible to get out even if they felt they were cured. Generally, the new Bill will make it more difficult to detain such people, although it is claimed in some quarters that it does not go far enough.

Added to that there has been growing disquiet over the way that Mental Hospitals are run, and a feeling that a more humane and understanding attitude is necessary. This has even been partly put into practice by doctors in the Worthing area.

Jane Simpson's account of her fourteen years in Mental Homes is a horror story of the first magnitude. She was beaten up, kept in a strait-jacket and padded cells, and submitted to draughts, injections and nauseating "treatments". Such a life seems far worse than imprisonment and would have driven most "sane" people to distraction. At last, one doctor saw she showed none of the residual symptoms of schizophrenia, and began a constructive treatment which helped her on the way to freedom. It is he who vouches for the truth of the account. At

times, the completeness of detail after so many years introduced a suspicion into my mind that some of it might be "filled in", quite sincerely of course. Jane Simpson is content to tell her own story and describes the problems with the 'lost days' have left her. She does not claim that her treatment was typical nor does she explicitly ask for a clean up of Mental Hospitals. Her book however is a grim account of the things that can happen here in England, and an indictment of at least some black spots on the scene, and vicious minds among the nursing profession. The methods of the nuns of a convent hospital at which she spent two periods should be interesting reading for Catholics and their fellow travellers.

P.H.

**THE LOST DAYS OF MY LIFE,** by Jane Simpson. George Allen and Unwin, 15s.

## BOOK SALE

From February 7th, hundreds of books (from Philip Gibbs to David Grayson) at 1/- each or 3 for 2/6d. Come and see them at **FREEDOM BOOKSHOP**

# The Lunatic Republic

THIS is another totalitarian-technocratic horror story, though perhaps one should point out that it is written in a humorous style and the horrors lie in its implications.

The republic of the title is a civilisation of little blue-skinned men who live on the other side of the Moon. They resemble Tweedledum and Tweedledee and speak a sort of Lewis Carroll language. Everyone is the same, wears the same clothes and can only be distinguished by numbers pinned on their shirts. They are the survivors of an atomic war between two lunar states, a war with a religious basis because one state worshipped the Earth, the other the Sun. The Sun-worshippers survive, but only at a price, for they develop a sort of anti-state. The Earth-worshippers are wiped out, and very little knowledge of them survives, all records having been destroyed.

In many ways it would be true to say that we have been here before often enough. Such prophecies of the future are common now. It certainly seems as if things are developing in this direction. The Moon is a waste as a result of the war. Trees and water do not exist. The only edible growth that has survived is a kind of bean. Those who live on it never need to evacuate their bowels. Such natural functions are regarded with horror by the Moon-men. Reproduction is by artificial insemination. There are no wars and little conflict within society. Offices of state are chosen by lot.

Compton Mackenzie is a Catholic and should understand totalitarianism.

"On earth the Catholic Church, unaccountably as it appears to many of us" (the date is supposed to be 1997), "still exercises as much power over the minds of many millions of human beings as ever, and although the Orthodox Church seems to have surrendered to a political idea and the various Protestant sects, in spite of achieving a kind of expedient unity, show an ever-growing decline of influence, the Godless humanitarianism which controls the world economically, politically and socially is still pathetically nervous of that religious revival which it would try to stamp out as a reactionary plot."

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

**THE LUNATIC REPUBLIC,** by Compton Mackenzie. Chatto and Windus, 15s.

## 'Focus' on Racial Prejudice

LAWRENCE NEWMAN was the envy of his neighbours. He was employed by a corporation. Such was and had been the quality of his faithfulness to the corporation (he had introduced the all-glass partition between his office—he was personnel manager—and the office occupied by his 'selected' staff of girls. Thus Mr. Newman saved the firm money, for time is money, and it is a fact—to the Newman's of the world—that girls waste time on such things as foolish enquiries and visits to the toilet), that he had been retained by his employers even during the recession. His was a happy lot. He owned his own house and a car, but approaching middle-age had brought him a problem. He was getting short-sighted and could no longer supervise his girls and to top it he had hired a 'not so select' girl. His superior had advised him to purchase a pair of spectacles. This he did, and upon looking into the mirror, found that he looked like a Jew. Even his mother noticed it.

This worried him for a while but this problem was dispelled (temporarily at least) when he was approached by his next door neighbour to join with the rest of the 'decent citizens' to take steps to keep the neighbourhood 'clean'. For it was rumoured that the newsagent Finklestein was coming to live in the vacant house on the block. Mr. Newman being a rather mild man, and considering himself a little above his neighbour, was reluctant to commit himself. The Finklesteins moved in and the newly-formed 'organisation' soon made their first move. They brought in an 'all-American' street trader. Mr. Newman had always been opposed to street traders on the grounds that they didn't have to pay the shopkeepers licences and overheads, but sooner than offend, he bought from the 'all-American'.

Now he was considered a supporter, and to conform even further, he had turned down a girl applicant who although she had declared she was born Episcopalian, was obviously a Jew. But all this conformity could not alter his appearance and the anti-Semitic chief of the corporation demotes him. This proves too much for Mr. Newman and he resigns. Now he is faced with the problem of seeking employment against the policy he has implemented for twenty-five years.

Arthur Miller\* has drawn a convincing portrait of conformity which everyone (including anarchists) feels and which has to be fought against every hour of our lives.

Mr. Finklestein has to fight the same kind of battle. His is against the fatalistic tradition of his race, and this is brought home vividly by a story within the story. His decision gives a sound kick in the pants to the turn-the-other-cheek doctrine. It could be said that "Focus" is too full of coincidences to be true to life, but I believe that the coincidences that happen to Mr. Newman are the kind that really happen when it seems that life is hurling itself at you with such speed that it almost knocks you over.

Since the racial riots many pamphlets have been written on racial discrimination by Socialists, etc., most of them full of facts and figures and digestible only to the converted. Where the pamphleteers failed in showing up the irrationality of racial prejudice, in an easily readable form, Arthur Miller has succeeded by his portrait of an average American who, up to the last page, believes his salvation lies in conformity.

J.G.L.

\***FOCUS,** by Arthur Miller. Ace Books, 2s. 6d.

## Keep it Up!

**PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!**  
WEEK 5  
Deficit on Freedom £100  
Contributions received £116  
SURPLUS £16

January 23 to January 29

London: Anon. 2/1; London: P.F.\* £1/0/0;  
London: J.S.\* 3/-; Seattle: F.H. £2/0/0;  
Skegness: R.W.M. 2/6; Wolverhampton:  
J.G.L.\* 2/6; New York: N.R. £1/4/6;  
Phoenix: A. & R.deT. £3/10/0; Dudley: M.G.  
5/-; Preston: R.S.M. £2/12/6; Newcastle,  
N.S.W.: B.C. £3/0/6; Bournemouth: D.M. 1/-.  
Total ... 14 7 7  
Previously acknowledged ... 102 6 6

1959 TOTAL TO DATE ... £116 14 1

GIFTS OF BOOKS: London: S.F.; London: V.R.

\*Indicates regular contributor.

## FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

[Open 10 a.m.—6.30 p.m., 5 p.m. Sats.]

New Books . . .

Philosophy of Humanism  
Corliss Lamont 15/-

Havelock Ellis  
Arthur Calder-Marshall 30/-

Dr. Zhivago  
Boris Pasternak 21/-

Reprints and

Cheap Editions . . .

Moll Flanders Daniel Defoe 3/6

Private Life of Duke of Richelieu 2/6

Frankenstein Mary Shelley 7/-

Literary Reviews and Essays  
Henry James 17/6

Second-Hand . . .

Margaret McMillan  
D'Arcy Crosswell 3/-

Personal Identity C. H. Rolph 5/-

History of Trade Unionism  
1666-1920 (Shabby)

Sidney & Beatrice Webb 7/6

Sartor Resartus, Chartism &c.  
Thomas Carlyle 2/6

Walls Have Mouths  
Wilfred Macartney 3/6

Russia and the Struggle for Peace  
(1918) Michael S. Farberman 4/6

Lover under Another Name  
Ethel Mannin 2/6

The People of the Abyss  
Jack London 3/-

Men in May  
Leslie Paul 3/-

Red, Black, Blond and Olive  
Edmund Wilson 5/6

Poetry and Prose P. B. Shelley 3/6

Comrade, O Comrade  
Ethel Mannin 3/-

Money Writes Upton Sinclair 3/-

Out of the Deep: letters from  
Soviet Timber Camps (1933) ... 3/6

Four Thousand Million Mouths  
Clark, Jacks, &c. 3/-

Pamphlet . . .

This is Apartheid L. Rubin 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**

## IMPRISONMENT AND COMPROMISE

LAURENS OTTER, one of the two Swaffham direct actionists who fasted during their recent imprisonment, asks his anarchist friends in a letter we publish this week, what, in their opinion, should be the attitude of anarchists in prison. Should they court discomfort? Should they break the rules and disobey orders and inevitably be punished? Should they behave in a way calculated to upset prison routine as well as the tempers of their "guardians"? Should they refuse to say "Sir" to the Governor and his lackeys, and take their hands out of their pockets when ordered to do so?

We believe there can be no straightforward yes or no answer to these questions. If we are asked our opinion as to whether an anarchist or any "political" prisoner should accept a "red band", special "privileges" or report fellow prisoners to the authorities our answer is an emphatic No! If we are asked whether we should protest against the ill-treatment or provocation of fellow-prisoners by the staff, our answer is an emphatic Yes! Again, if we wish to protest against wrongful imprisonment then it seems to us an obvious thing to do to draw attention to one's case by whatever action we think will serve these ends.

IN qualifying our use of the term "wrongful sentence"—all prison sentences are wrong if one is opposed to the penal system—we may also explain why we do not think there is a black and white answer to our correspondent's questions. On many occasions in these columns we have argued that though the system under which we live is immoral by definition, there are moral and immoral ways of behaving within that immoral society. We may not believe in the money system but the shopkeeper who gives the wrong change or the wrong weight cannot be put on a par with the shopkeeper who does not; we may be opposed to the property system, yet is one blinded to the fact that there are extortionist landlords and "fair" landlords? We may be opposed to the system of law but we can still distinguish between its honest and dishonest application. Similarly we may be opposed to the prison system but cannot deny—those of us who have tasted its bitter fruits—that there are those in its service who carry out their jobs in a more humane way than others.

NO-ONE in his right senses goes to prison willingly. But revolutionaries of every complexion must approach the possibility of imprisonment as one of the many consequences of their actions. For our part we see no special virtue in "breaking the law" as a principle, just because all laws or rules today are imposed from above. To do so apart from its consequences in permanently removing us from the outside world, encourages a fanaticism, and a concentration on the Self which may be good for the purity of our souls, but which in the end, however, divorces us from the realities of the social struggle.

We believe that the revolutionary who can hope to make some real contribution to this struggle of humanity for a better world, is the one who sees the problems of society as concerning individuals yet whose actions and decisions rise above the individual self, the ego. For this reason we are always wary of those who are introduced to us as anarchists because they are considered as individualists.

We believe that every man should learn to make his own decisions, yes. But we also believe that he should have a breadth of vision, and feeling towards the ideas he seeks to further to make it possible for him to distinguish between those actions which truly serve the cause he has espoused and those which only serve to give him, as an individual, a feeling of satisfaction or self-righteousness. Conscious martyrdom, we think, is an unhealthy symptom.

A TERM of imprisonment, on condition that one sees this curtailment of one's liberty as serving useful ends, can be (if not too prolonged!) for some individuals a valuable experience. It can help one to see more clearly many social problems as well as strengthening those qualities which make up an integrated human personality. We do not think, however, that this is achieved by a calculated attempt to disrupt the prison routine at every turn. (That is, not unless it is a concerted effort by at least a majority of the inmates). An individual who breaks all the prison rules can hope for neither sympathy from outside or from most of his fellow prisoners nor from his gaolers who are obliged to work overtime as a result! What is important, and a positive achievement, is the ability of the prisoner to broaden his personality, to earn the respect of his fellows and his gaolers by his bearing at all times. One can be uncompromising in prison without breaking the rules!

FOR many politicians, imprisonment has been a stepping stone to power. There is probably not one nation which has achieved "independence" in these post-war years whose leaders have not served considerable terms of imprisonment. To court imprisonment as a means of shaking the public conscience is a good thing: as a means of furthering the cult of the personality it is harmful. If the result of an individual's imprisonment for breaking the law in protesting against an injustice or for upholding what he considers a fundamental right, is that of giving others the strength to do likewise on other occasions, or to provoke reflection among them, away from the traditional patterns, then, to our minds, that action, and the personal inconvenience as resulting from it, have been more than worth while. If, on the other hand, imprisonment serves only to build up a personality in the mind of the public, then the privations involved have been of no avail—unless, as we pointed out earlier, one happens to be an ambitious politician, in which case they are the very results one was hoping for!

THE question our correspondent, Laurens Otter, should ask himself is whether he went to prison to further a cause, to court martyrdom (in the pure, unadulterated, masochistic sense!) or to further any hidden or open desire to gain approval among his circle of friends. (As the writer of these lines knows our correspondent only by name we are neither "hinting" nor being personal in our 'reflections'). To our minds (and we hope we are right), the majority of the Swaffham demonstrators accepted 14 days in prison rather than the alternative of undertaking to be "of good behaviour" for 365 days, for tactical reasons. Firstly because for a propagandist or

'direct actionist' 14 days in prison is the lesser of the two punishments for their "illegal" actions. Secondly because as good propagandists they saw the added publicity value as well as the moral impact on some people of (a) being remanded in custody over the Xmas holidays and (b) serving 14 days rather than abandon their plans for more 'direct action' during the next 12 months. In the circumstances the social aspects of imprisonment *per se* were of secondary importance, and one cannot be surprised if the public, and some Swaffham supporters among them, found some difficulty in relating the hunger strikes to the main issue. This is not a criticism of our young friend, who did what he did in all sincerity, without, if one is to judge from his letter, much considered thought. It is simply a point of view informed by some experience of prison and propaganda which we hope may stimulate discussion. Not just for the sake of discussion but in order to propagate more effectively ideas which, many of us connected with FREEDOM, sincerely uphold as the bases for a new way of life.

## PEOPLE AND IDEAS:

# Keeping it off the Streets

THIS year marks the centenary of the birth of Havelock Ellis and two biographies are being published to celebrate it. The general tone of their reception can be predicted: a faintly amused and patronising superiority to this mid-Victorian mystic of sexual enlightenment. How little we can afford to adopt this attitude is illustrated by Mr. G. F. Seddon, discussing the Ellis centenary in the *Manchester Guardian*. He points out that

"the legal attitude to homosexuality advocated by Ellis in 1897 is roughly that now reached by the Wolfenden Committee, and for that, says Mr. Butler, 'the time is not yet ripe'. (Seemingly all that the time is ripe for is a retrograde Street Offences Bill; under it Ellis's one encounter with a prostitute—in sight of a policeman he gave her a shilling for an interesting conversation—would have landed her in gaol without a doubt)."

The Wolfenden Commission was libertarian, or relatively so, in its proposals on homosexuality, and authoritarian in its proposals on prostitution. We need not be surprised that it is the libertarian side of the Report which the government has shelved, and the authoritarian side which it is enacting in the Street Offences Bill which had its second reading in the House of Commons last week.

We have continually claimed that for all the problems of social life there are authoritarian and libertarian solutions, and that we are faced with a daily choice between them. How do we apply this axiom to the Wolfenden proposals? In the case of homosexuality the problem posed is a problem of the law, and the libertarian solution is to get the law liberalised, and for this purpose the Homosexual Law Reform Society, of 32, Shaftesbury Avenue, W.1, appeals for your support. In the case of prostitution, the pros and cons (so to speak) of the Wolfenden proposals have been debated interminably, and it is sufficient to say that almost everyone closely concerned with the problem except from the punitive angle, whether the probation officers or the Church of England Moral Welfare Council, is opposed to the Bill. As Mr. F. E. Jones said in the debate:

"Seldom had a measure, purporting to be one of social reform and moral welfare, been so generally condemned as to its fundamental provisions by almost all the responsible organisations concerned with social reform and moral welfare. Most people would think prostitution was deplorable, demoralising, and wasteful but it had persisted in many civilisations over many centuries and the failure to stamp it out by repressive legislation showed clearly that it could not be eradicated through the agency of the criminal law."

But the girls have no union, and as in all non-union trades, are consequently exploited; their conditions of work are onerous (I can't imagine that they really enjoy hanging around in the street); they are exploited by middle-men, as we are so constantly reminded; the customer does not get value for his money (to judge by the police evidence on the rapid turnover); there is no provision for retirement; nor have they any facilities for free and competent defence in the courts; they are at the mercy of the police.

Mr. Butler himself in introducing the Bill admitted as much. It was not intended, he said, "to make prostitution illegal or to provide a cure. The history of the world would show this to be impossible, at any rate by statute". Even the *Times Educational Supplement* feels bound to point out that

"to leave it to the police to decide that a girl is a common prostitute and has been soliciting looks worse than fraught with danger of error. It looks like creating a category of second-class citizens; for prostitution, whatever we think of it, is no crime."

The *Daily Mirror*, whose progressivism, like that of all who wear their heart on their sleeve, is only skin deep, is behind the government on this issue, since it hopes to "drive vice off the streets", though sweeping the dirt under the carpet is the more honest way in which Mr. R. T. Paget put it in the Commons debate. (He also declared, by the way, that "Experience shows that the more lax the moral standards, the fewer are the prostitutes".)

The barrenness and uselessness of the authoritarian approach to the question of prostitution is obvious. What is the libertarian attitude?

A LIBERTARIAN approach would declare, first of all, as Mr. Winthrop Parkhurst did in a letter to the *Manchester Guardian* last month, that prostitution,

"is the answer, however inadequate for some and repulsive for others, to the question of what the human race is to do with a biological force that exceeds by a hundredfold the procreative ends that it can be put to. In this sense, prostitution is a compromise between a biological mandate and a social convention. The convention says that sexual activity is socially proper only within the domain of matrimony. The mandate says that sexual continence is physically impossible for some, neurologically harmful for many, in complete disregard of all social conventions."

"Leaving aside such aspects of the biological case as homosexual and auto-sexual activities, the willingness of women to rent their bodies, and the readiness of men to lease them, represents a nearly inevitable meeting place for monetary needs and sexual hungers. To blame the women for the needs, the men for the hungers, is to lay an accusing finger on the wrong culprits. The real ones are the laws of society and laws of nature."

Once one has accepted this rational view of the phenomenon, and got away from the urge to punish and the urge to moralise, it is possible to see in prostitution the usual market situation where supply and demand meet. (Even the M.P.s last week talked knowingly of the girls "plying their trade"). Now in almost every trade certain conditions of work and safeguards for the worker are enforced either by legislation or by the demands of trade unions. A British government would never do anything so vice-condoning as to regulate prostitution (even though that is what the present police supervision amounts to), so the task rests with the union.

But the girls have no union, and as in all non-union trades, are consequently exploited; their conditions of work are onerous (I can't imagine that they really enjoy hanging around in the street); they are exploited by middle-men, as we are so constantly reminded; the customer does not get value for his money (to judge by the police evidence on the rapid turnover); there is no provision for retirement; nor have they any facilities for free and competent defence in the courts; they are at the mercy of the police.

SO if people are really concerned at finding libertarian solutions to the question of prostitution, they should start by getting some of the well-intentioned public figures who always do start societies for reforms of one kind and another, to start a union, under a fairly innocuous title (it would be perfectly legal, and, as Mr. Butler has reminded us, prostitution as such is not a crime), and persuade the girls to join. Considering what we are told about the attitude of professionals towards ama-

teurs who invade their pitches, it should not be difficult to get that minimum degree of solidarity which assures the success of trade unions. The union would work for improved working conditions (thus clearing the streets for Mr. Butler), it would eliminate the middle-men (thus satisfying the opponents of Mr. Butler's Bill), it would provide free medical and legal aid (thus cheering up the Minister of Health, and protecting the girls from the police exploitation which Mr. Butler denies), it would release the police for directing the traffic (to the great relief of the Minister of Transport), and it would serve as a bureau for alternative employment, a focus for welfare work, and could operate a pension fund.

This is the libertarian alternative, and if you think that it is merely flippant, just wait and see if the policemen and the moralists can produce any suggestions as sensible.

C.W.

## Prostitution and American Business

NEW YORK, JANUARY 20.

Mr. Robert Wagner, Mayor of New York, said to-day that he would ask police to investigate charges made in a broadcast last night that American business men were employing prostitutes to promote business deals. A spokesman for the Mayor said: "If there is any truth in the reports . . . the police will crack down fast. We will not tolerate such scandal and vice in the city."

A Columbia Broadcasting System official said they would try to co-operate as far as possible, but people taking part in the programme had been promised that their identities would not be disclosed.

The programme, narrated by Mr. Ed Murrow, sought to show how prostitution had become part of the American business way of life and included recorded interviews with "call girls", who were described as "the aristocrats of the prostitute world". Mr. Murrow said it was estimated that each could average a yearly income of \$10,000 to \$25,000 (about £3,500 to £8,900) or more.

"In some cases," Mr. Murrow said "top executives are directly involved—giving instructions as to the type and extent of the entertainment their company will provide." Some companies maintained one or two of the women on the payroll as part of their public relations staff.

One business man said: "This is the fastest way I know of to have an intimate relationship established with a buyer. The point is that I know that the buyer has spent the night with a prostitute I have provided. In the second place, in most cases the buyers are married, with families. It sort of gives me a slight edge; well, we will not call it exactly blackmail, but it is a subconscious edge over the buyer. It is a weapon I hold, and I could discreetly drop it any time when the (buyer's) wife is present. . . ."

An unidentified man said that "a very famous madam" in New York would make a flat fee of \$3,000 to \$5,000 (about £980 to £1,700) when big corporations had a party. "Send them a book and they'll pick out the girls—there's no guesswork here. And she deals with the largest corporations in the United States."

Spokesmen for two Chambers of Commerce discounted any suggestion that they might protest officially but one said individual members might protest on their own behalf. The spokesman for the American Chamber of Commerce added: "If that sort of thing does take place, I doubt whether it takes place to the extent made out. It is more restricted than the way they describe it. Even if it does occur, it is not in very good taste to handle it as they did." (Our italics!).

Reuter.

I WANTED TO FIGHT IN THE SPANISH CIVIL WAR....



ANYWAY, IT WAS RATHER MESSY...



OF COURSE BASICALLY THE SPANISH ARE ABOUT AS AUTHORITARIAN AS YOU CAN GET...



...AND THEY PROBABLY ALL REALLY LIKE FRANCO....



NOW THAT WE ARE ALLIES, THINGS ARE NOT TOO BAD....

...BUT MOTHER WOULD HAVE BEEN SO UPSET.

...AND WITH ALL THOSE FACTIONS YOU DIDN'T KNOW WHO WAS WHO.

...DEEP DOWN, THAT IS.

...ESPECIALLY WHEN YOU THINK HOW MANY PESETAS WE GET TO THE POUND!

# To What Extent Compromise?

DEAR FRIEND,  
I wonder if you would spare me a little space in which to muse on the subject of fasting in prisons, so as to clarify the subject for people imprisoned for Direct Action in future, as I feel it is a subject that needs to be raised in Libertarian and Pacifist circles.

Whereas, writing to *Peace News*, Phil Cook is faced with the problem of justifying fasting in the first place, since taking part in Civil Disobedience "it is our job to expect the law to punish us"; I find myself hard put to explain why I only fasted, why I was willing to co-operate with the prison authorities at all other points; even to the illogical extent of walking over to be forcibly fed, and sitting in the medical chair, and to the degrading extent of taking my hands out of my pockets when ordered to do so.

The problem is, is one in prison as a Nuclear Disarmamentist, or as an Anarchist; as an Anarchist obviously I hold that, if there were no prisons, there could be no hydrogen bombs—or any other form of war (even as a Direct Actionist—I may well point to the fact, that since I am inside in order to prevent my demonstrating in some other way, the prison warders are in effect doing the work of guards at nuclear weapon sites). Nevertheless as a Campaigner I am interested in convincing as many people as possible as quickly as possible, and the majority of people are not capable of understanding that the abolition of war entails the abolition of States; and either way I am certain that unless the

Cold War is ended in the very near future (which I believe can only happen if our country starts progressive unilateral disarmament), we are faced with 1984. Impasse: if one is an absolutist one fails to win the support necessary to abolish the Bomb; if one is not, abolition is impossible.

Since therefore the only way the Libertarian can hope to see improvement is to find some compromise between absolutism, and pure and simple Nuclear Disarmamentism, reserving to himself the right at all times to introduce more Anarchism into the mixture if he feels that the cake will stand it.

Nowhere is this provisional compromise more necessary, than in one's behaviour when in prison (of course anything one does would partake to some extent of the nature of compromise; even those who in the past have practised complete non-co-operation—refusing voluntarily to move, dress, undress, get up, go to bed, eat, drink or whatever, have, as far as I know, always voluntarily gone to the lavatory when necessary, rather than defecating *in situ*).

Looking back I am certain that I was wrong in accepting orders to take my hands out of my pockets, to stand up straight, to fold my blankets according to correct army-prison fashion. Equally obviously, it was ridiculous to walk to be forcibly fed, or to sit down on the chair for it; but if one is to refuse to walk over to be forcibly fed should one refuse to walk more than a certain distance from one's cell (thus losing what

to the prisoner in an observation cell is the untold luxury of exercise—on the rare occasions one is permitted to have it); or merely to leave with the hospital warder and such other warders as may reasonably be suspected of trying to take one down there.

To what extent does one court discomfort? Fasting itself is not—after the first day or two, particularly unpleasant, going without water is very unpleasant—especially when one has already been forcibly fed with milk and marmite, and perhaps been cut enough to start coughing blood. Prison cells are not in themselves as bad as barracks or public schools, but loneliness in prison cells for 23 hours a day is not such fun and to deliberately refuse exercise, one's sole and rare company needs a lot of determination. Prison beds may be hard, prison floors are much harder and to refuse to go to bed is an act of heroic asceticism; while to go without a bath deliberately in prison is comparable only to St. Anthony doing it for forty years in the desert.

Where does this get one—quite frankly I don't know; but I want to! I doubt very much if I have the courage to do the sort of non-co-operation that I suspect prison sentences demand; but in order to decide exactly what this is I would be grateful to other Anarchists for their suggestions as to where one draws the line.

Sincerely,  
Harston, Cambridge. LAURENS OTTER.

## Letters to the Editors

### 'WHEELS IN THE HEAD'

DEAR COMRADES,

Without disagreeing with Peter Feak's letter of January 31, may I correct him on one small point? Max Stirner did not use the expression "Wheels in the Head".

True, there is a passage headed "Wheels in the Head" in S. T. Byington's translation of *Der Einzige*; but the original heading for this passage is "Der Sparren" (literally "the rafter") which is the precise idiomatic equivalent of "The loose screw" (vide *Oxford German-English Dictionary*), or "The bats in the belfry". It may be said that "wheels in the head" has much the same meaning, but the significant difference is this: "a screw loose" and "bats in the belfry" are jocular slang phrases which everyone understands, whereas "wheels in the head" is an uncommon, awkward and slightly obscure expression.

This kind of subtle distortion of Stirner's language is a general fault in Byington's translation. I do not know why it occurs (was Byington perhaps a German-American with an incomplete knowledge of English?), but I think it is the chief reason why many English

readers think Stirner is a "difficult" writer.

The first sentence of the particular passage means, translated literally: *Man, it haunts in thy head; thou hast one rafter too many!* Byington renders this as: *Man, your head is haunted; you have wheels in the head!* I suggest that a more correct rendering would be: *You're potty, mate! One of your screws is loose!*

Readers are requested to make the appropriate substitutions in Comrade Feak's letter about Comrade Uloth.

Yours faithfully,  
DONALD ROOM.

### The Women of Viet Nam

Continued from p. 1

reduced to the status of a servant to a new mistress in the house."

Now the Family Bill has become the law of the land and

"From now on, any Vietnamese wife will be free to practise a profession, even if her husband says no. She will not have to marry against her will or live with her in-laws. Her husband will no longer be able to be unfaithful with impunity, nor will he be allowed to take his bastard children into the house as if they were legitimate, or repudiate his wife at whim. A married man, seen too often in the company of an unmarried woman, is apt to find himself having to explain his conduct to the authorities. In the first version of the bill, divorce was outlawed entirely. But on this point, Mme. Ngo did not quite get her way: the Assembly passed an amendment empowering the President to grant divorces in cases where marriage had clearly become intolerable."

It is difficult for some of us to understand the necessity for a woman 'enduring' any situation against her will if she has two legs with which to walk out of it and two hands with which to earn her living. We are also unable to support Madame Ngo (a Roman Catholic convert) in her attempts to prevent by law the annulment of marriage under any conditions. Nevertheless we cherish the hope that having rejected parental control and husband interference in work these Viet Nam women will one day realise how unwise it is to force their men to be "faithful" as well. Apart from the principle of freedom involved, if men are going to be punished for being seen with other women in public, they will go "underground" as they do in "civilized" countries, resulting in hypocrisy, deception and painful recriminations when hubby carelessly allows himself to be found out.

### MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

#### LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

Regular Sunday meetings now held at "Marquis of Granby" Public House, Rathbone Street (corner of Percy Street, Rathbone Place and Charlotte Street), 7.30 p.m.

FEB. 8.—Ian Leslie on  
Subject to be announced.

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

# Are we a majority — in outer space?

DEAR FRIENDS,

The Editors of FREEDOM are used to letters from cranks and crackpots, etc., and so, having often been told I'm one of that noble company, I make no further apology for returning to the subject of flying saucers.

The latest issue of the *Flying Saucer Review* says that two writers of books on these objects have been offered large sums of money, twenty-five to thirty-five thousand dollars, to sign statements saying that their books were fiction. They both refused, and their works are still being sold as non-fiction.

Also, the same periodical states that members of the U.S. Air Force are liable to the ferocious penalty of \$10,000 fine plus ten years imprisonment if they divulge information about sightings of 'unidentified flying objects' to the public.

This suggests strongly that some people, obviously wealthy and powerful, are pretty anxious to suppress information about these probable visitors from other worlds. And in the case of the U.S. Air Force, it is clearly the American Government, and judging by the rare and evasive answers to questions in Parliament, our own dear British Government is also in no way willing to spread the light on these matters.<sup>1</sup>

It's an old axiom that the enemy of my enemy is at least my ally, whether he's my friend or no.

Please introduce  
FREEDOM to  
NEW READERS  
on or off the Earth

And that's where anarchists are concerned, since any being who causes alarm to the rulers of this unhappy planet may be our friends.

And indeed, by now quite a number of people all over the world claim to have had contacts with flying saucer occupants from other planets. These messages may be myths but they increase in number so much, and are, on the whole, though not completely, so consistent, that one is inclined more and more to believe them.<sup>2</sup>

If these tales are accepted, then it appears that on nearly all other planets some form of communistic or anarchistic social system is the norm, though it may be more or less centralised and in some cases combined with monarchist or oligarchic features. But in all these stories of life elsewhere, certain themes recur monotonously. These people are pacifists, they don't make war and won't take life, they don't use money—indeed one description of life on Venus reads like an old Utopian pamphlet, with universal technological abundance, money unknown, and people go to work as we play games, because they like it, coming and going when they like, people who like cooking running restaurants, people who like farms farming, people who like playing with spacecraft making flying saucers and so on. Another theme that occurs monotonously is vegetarianism, and a form of religion rather like 'Vedanta' or high level Hinduism. Master Jesus appears to be a very important person, but for the rest Christian theology and a highly personalized god (the old man in the sky) are certainly not endorsed. God appears to be considered a sort of conscious electricity, to use a term recently developed by certain unorthodox terrestrial researchers.

At any rate if this be the truth, no wonder our earthly rulers are alarmed.

Suppose people all became aware of these ideas and took them seriously? Suppose it was demanded that the earth caught up with the other worlds, and we all became pacifists, moneyless anarchists, Vedantists and vegetarians? It would be the end of our ruling classes and of capitalism and the state as we know it, and also militarism, orthodox religion and slaughter houses.

These people, according to some reports, also have unconventional ideas about 'marriage'. Their customs seem to be centred, not round sex and reproduction, as with us, but round romantic love. Consequently, contrary to Christian practice, marriage is made fairly difficult, but divorce is easy, indeed, almost instantaneous, at the request of either party, though it is the custom to wait three years, so we are told, before living with another person. The idea is that the union of twin souls, i.e. Romeo and Juliet, Tristan and Isolde stuff, is of supreme importance and marriage with the wrong person, or the separation of twin souls by a third person is an outrage never to be tolerated. In short, practically the reverse of the approach of most earthly religions, including Hinduism, which forbids divorce and seems to ignore romantic love altogether.

For the rest, it must be admitted that these messages show a rather disapproving attitude towards sexual pleasure, as such, and alcohol is not regarded with favour. Smoking is not mentioned but I am sure they disapprove. However, one can't have everything, and this earth-ite intends to carry on with his little pleasures—in moderation, which is common sense, at least.

Nevertheless, these 'messages' all add up to the proposition that we anarchists, and similar 'progressives' may not be a tiny minority at all. To imagine that only the earth is inhabited may be as

absurd as if the citizens of the Isle of Man thought only their island was inhabited, and the rest of the world empty, with the additional factor that only the Manx were backward, barbarous and capitalistic, while everywhere else was advanced and anarchistic.<sup>3</sup>

In other words, taking a larger view of space, with millions of worlds and planetary systems it is only the earth and a few other isolated retarded specks of dust that have states, capitalism, war (and meat eating).

In short, comrades, it is not we who are a minority, and it is not we who are cranks and crackpots—it's the others!

Oxford, Jan. 7. J. W. SHAW.

### Editors' Notes

<sup>1</sup> The fact that the *Flying Saucer Review* makes these "disclosures" does not inspire us with confidence. Who are the two writers and who offered these huge sums? Has anyone checked up with the U.S. Air Force whether the penalties for "divulging information" about flying saucers are official?

<sup>2</sup> Again the fact that a growing number of people say they have contact with "flying saucer occupants" is no reason for believing in them. Millions of people declare they have contact with God, other millions are in contact with the "spirits" of their departed loved ones. Is that a reason for accepting the God story and believing in Spiritualism?

<sup>3</sup> The relationship of the Isle of Man to the world is quite different from that of the world to outer space. In our opinion it really is a waste of time for anarchists to engage in speculations as to whether we can hope for reinforcements for our cause from the "occupants" of outer space. Whether they exist or not makes no difference to our problem which is that of inducing people to be more interested in life on this planet—in their own personal lives here and now. Whatever the "occupants" of outer space can contribute to making life happier on earth will be welcome, if and when they show up. And if instead of being co-operative they are in fact out to destroy our planet, well even then there is no cause to worry overmuch. After all aren't we already living in the shadow of the H-bomb and Germ warfare both man-made-means for the extermination of human life on our planet. So a menace from outside won't make things much different.

FREEDOM prides itself with being up-to-date (indeed some critics object that we anarchists live in the future!) and in these columns have defended the "Freedom to be a crank" (Selections, Vol. 6, p. 157), but to our minds the Speculations contained in our correspondent's letter are much more suitable for the *Flying Saucer Review* (or *Psychic News*) than for a journal which is interested in Man learning something more about and understanding his own nature. We will obviously have to take into account the inhabitants of other planets when they make their influence felt. Until then, we shall ignore them... and indeed we go on ignoring "God"!—EDITORS.

## 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*

Vol. 7, 1957, *Year One—Sputnik Era*  
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.  
*(Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21)*  
*The Unknown Revolution*  
cloth 12s. 6d.

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

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

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

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

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

GEORGE WOODCOCK :  
*New Life to the Land* 6d.  
*Homes orhovels?* 6d.  
*Railways and Society* 3d.

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

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

ERRICO MALATESTA :  
*Anarchy* 9d.

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

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

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

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

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