

In this Issue:

Motor Age - Anarchist Attitudes - p. 2

The Liberals Ride Again - p. 2

Freedom and the Aldermaston March - p. 4

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"Did the mass of men know the actual selfishness and injustice of their rulers, not a Government would stand a year. The world would foment with revolution."
—THEODORE PARKER.

19, No. 16

April 19th, 1958

Threepence

Bevan, Gaitskell and the T.U.C. at Trafalgar Square SOCIALISM IN A WHEELCHAIR

HE unbridled vanity of politicians as well as their utter contempt for their followers was well demonstrated last Sunday at the Labour Party and T.U.C. rally in Trafalgar Square when at the close of the meeting Bevan, whose principal theme had been that of "Unity", addressed the microphone dragging Gaitskell with him and cried out "Let us put the coping stone on this meeting". He called for three cheers "and we'll lead it," he said. Gaitskell, his arm held aloft by the eighty Aneurin, became the cheer leader, and for the first time that afternoon the crowd showed some signs of life. To judge by the mood which during and after the demonstration the lusty cheers were a flash in the pan, and the coping stone a stumbling stone in disguise! For far from putting forward new and far-reaching solutions to the threat of nuclear war, Bevan and the other speakers simply reiterated the decisions of last year's Brighton conference, which called for the ending of H-bomb testing by this country but declined to commit a future Labour Government to ban the manufacture or stockpiling of H-bombs unless agreement could be reached by the other nuclear Powers.

To describe—as does the *Manchester Guardian*—last Sunday's meeting an "anti-H-bomb rally" and to refer to Bevan's brilliant and carefully prepared piece of oratory as "an impromptu decision to add to the agenda . . . and make party unity the keynote of his speech" is to our minds the height of political naïveté. The composition of the platform, an Unholy Trinity of T.U.C., the leader of the Labour Party and the man who, more than any other member of the Party, symbolised (and for some, unfortunately, still does) the forward, uncompromisingly Socialist Movement within the Movement, made it quite clear that this was the opening of a campaign not against the H-bomb but with an eye to a General Election in the not too distant future. Recent bye-elections have perhaps convinced the Party managers that however unhealthy are the Tory prospects in such an event, the apathy, disillusionment and even cynicism within the ranks of labour are matters of concern for the Labour politicians who yearn to ride the band-waggon of power once more.

As farmer Bevan put it, while he had sympathy for those with more distant aims, he felt that now, as in 1945, having "sown the harvest, the movement must now collect it". There was, he said, a majority for Labour in the country. So the Labour Party was going to resume some of its traditional activities and organise demonstrations in the country to make clear that Macmillan did not speak for the British people.

But Mr. Bevan and his friends cannot be so sure that the Labour Party "speaks for the British people" either. Especially when the Party cannot even speak for its members! And last Sunday's demonstration was much less a protest

against the government's foreign policy than it was an attempt to rally the divided forces of labour by what was, in effect, a not very subtle form of blackmail.

★
MR. BEVAN'S 'peroration' which, according to the *Manchester Guardian*, "was as inspired as it was impromptu" consisted in the declaration that:

"The time has come for the Labour movement to be united. No more discordant voices. I do not ask for abnegation of thinking. But I ask that action should not be frustrated by theoretical differences. (Cheers.) I do honestly believe that the world can be saved from the H-bomb, but not by people who are always looking back over their shoulders at the nineteenth century. The Tories are always looking back to the past glories of the British Empire. I say to them, as I would say to Mr. Khrushchev if he were here on this platform with us to-day 'The days of empire have gone'."

Some of Mr. Bevan's audience may have had difficulty in finding a connecting link between the first half of the "peroration" and the second. What have the Tories' backward glances to do with the frustrating theoretical differences in the Labour Party? Did Mr. Bevan in fact, by a curious slip of the tongue, use "Tories" instead of "Socialists" and "British Empire" for "Socialist movement"? After

all the split in the Labour movement is not simply between jealous and ambitious politicians (supported or opposed, as the case may be, by the vested interests of the Trades Union blocs) but also by that uncomfortable, dissatisfied voice of a conscious minority which by socialism means socialism undiluted by considerations of statesmanship or political and electoral opportunism.

When Mr. Bevan referred to those people "who are always looking over their shoulders at the nineteenth century" he was surely not thinking of an anachronistic and dying band of Empire Loyalists* but of the obstinate members and outsiders who still believe that Socialism means what it meant to the pioneers of the 19th century, who saw in the organisation of the oppressed toiling masses the weapon for their emancipation and liberation from the shackles of capitalism. Ambitious politicians accept and rely on the rules of the game just as gamblers accept and rely on the

*An anachronism even in the ranks of the Tory Party whose meetings and conferences they heckle no less than the Labour meetings.

†Those of our readers who might accuse us of attacking Bevan only because his star is in the ascendancy are referred to our editorial "Watch Mr. Foot, Mr. Bevan & Co. (FREEDOM, 19/3/55), and to R.M.'s article "Bevan Toes the Line" (9/4/55), both reprinted in *Freedom Selections*, Vol. 5, 1955.

laws of probability to "break the bank".

Bevan is a case in point; he is not only one of the most capable parliamentarians, because one of the most knowledgeable of its rules; he is, equally, one of the most astute Labour politicians because his whole career is dominated by considerations of tactics and never of principles.† Tactics, let us hasten to add, for furthering his political career and not the future of the "class" of which he professes to be a part and in whose interests his

political activities are allegedly directed.

★
THIS was clearly shown at last Sunday's demonstration. Whilst on the one hand Mr. Tom Driberg, chairman of the Labour Party and of the rally paid tribute to those who had taken part in the Aldermaston march (why then did the Labour Party not officially support it?), on the other the speeches from the platform were perhaps directed more against the marchers (who for the occasion had rallied, a thousand strong, at Hyde Park and marched to the Square to form a kind of halo, albeit silent, around the "solid" Labour phalanx) than against a dithering, backward-looking government. ➤ Continued on p. 3

The S. African Racialists Undaunted STRYDOM STRIKES AGAIN

SOUTH AFRICA'S racial totalitarianism has only been equalled in modern times by Nazi Germany and some parts of the Southern States, yet she sits unmolested on the side of the "free" Western Bloc on the "United" Nations.

Britain cannot attack her because of her own discriminatory policies in Rhodesia and because of the economic tie-up of which the Nationalist Government's representatives arrogantly reminded their hosts at an official dinner given in their honour when they visited the City of London last year. France, even if she wanted to, is hardly in a posi-

tion to moralise about racial discrimination and the United States is no less embarrassed by segregation in the South.

This does not prevent them from hypocritically attacking the totalitarian communism of the Soviet Union or from regarding South Africa as yet another bulwark against communism. We can see therefore that the lack of freedom for millions of Africans and coloured people in South Africa is of no consequence to the West, so long as she is lined up with them!

The press in this country which so strenuously attacks the Soviet Union when that country deprives people of their essential freedoms has given much less space to the totalitarian measures adopted by the Nationalist Government against Africans than to their sneering observations on the Aldermaston march.

As we go to press it is reported that the African National Congress has planned demonstrations to coincide with the all-white general election due to start on Wednesday. A nation-wide strike has been called by non-white workers for to-day (Monday, April 14th), but so far we do not know whether it has been successful. But there is plenty of information on Strydom's methods which he intends using to prevent the Africans from even peacefully expressing their understandable annoyance at being treated like animals.

Gatherings of more than 10 Africans have been prohibited in virtually all South Africa's cities and big towns, but the ban is not yet being enforced. ➤ Continued on p. 3

America's H-War Preparedness

ANNIHILATION IN ERROR?

THE hydrogen bomb is more in the news than ever before; it is, and will continue to be under attack for some time to come from minorities from all sections of the community. Unfortunately nothing which can be said or done counters the dismal fact that it does exist.

Lest there are those who shrug off its existence as of little account, or merely consider it in terms of its deterrent effect, let them reflect upon the fact that at this very moment a host of hydrogen bombs could be winging their way across the North Pole—destination Russia. This is not just conjecture, or alarmist propaganda, it is something which has already occurred—not just once or twice, but many times.

Such is a recent report by Frank H. Bartholomew, President of the United Press, after two visits to America's Strategic Air Command headquarters at Offut, Nebraska, and further talks at the Pentagon. The report has since been confirmed by the official spokesman of S.A.E., Major Oswald.

The whole operation is only too simple. The Distant Early Warning system (Arctic D.E.W. line) picks up the blips of an unidentified object or objects on its radar screens—these could mean that enemy missiles or planes are heading towards the U.S.A. Automatically a series of telephone conversations take place and the senior controller on duty at the time gives the order for the bomber planes to head in the direction of the enemy. Simultaneously an alarm goes out summoning S.A.C. chief, General Thomas S. Power to the control room.

According to Bartholomew the flight-time for missiles from Eastern Europe to North America is 30 minutes, and the planes have 15 minutes warning from the D.E.W. line. Planes which have been dispatched on false alarms have set off "with a complete invasion plan" and flown more than 6,000 miles with "more than one bomb" before returning. What made them return? A simple plan called "Fail Safe", which is designed to

prevent error, "human or mechanical".

According to this plan, a pilot who is heading for his pre-arranged target, continues for a given number of nautical miles but turns back if, for any reason, he has not at that point and at that moment" received coded instructions to carry on. In any event, according to the report, only the President of the United States can order the actual release of the first atomic bomb over enemy territory.

The planes, which are B.52, B.47, and B.36 bombers no longer carry conventional high explosives, but only atomic and thermo-nuclear bombs; they are in continuous flight over the Western world and around the perimeter of the USSR, usually at altitudes almost invisible from the ground. Some idea of the scale of operations can be gauged from the fact that jet aircraft are being re-fuelled in mid-air at an average of one every three and a half minutes for 24 hours out of every twenty-four.

The U.S. Air Force has estimated that its total force of first-line operational aircraft is 20,000, of which some 3,000 are long-range bombers and tankers of Strategic Air Command. A force of 200,000 officers and men keeps them in the air. The Command is grouped with three air forces in the United States, one in Spain, an air division in the Mariannas and another in England. Its planes operate from nearly one hundred forward bases.

One major hazard looms forth from this supposedly fool-proof state of affairs. Assuming an alarm to have been given, but as yet not discovered to be false. The U.S. bombers set off at a speed in excess of the speed of sound, perhaps several squadrons loaded with sufficient bombing power to wipe out a number of Russia's major strategic areas. There is no reason why the Russian early warning radar system should not then pick up these planes and proceed in precisely the same manner. (For the sake of this example we will give the Russians the benefit of the doubt and assume they only send bombers and not missiles—probably a questionable doubt).

The situation is therefore that two forces of bombers are heading in opposite directions, bent on destruction of "the enemy"—both forces convinced that the other side has initiated the attack. Neither side has by this time any reason (according to the rules) for recalling its bombers.

Who will remain on earth to proclaim that the attacks were all a horrible mistake? And having so proclaimed, how long will it be before they too are also dead or dying from radio-activity? The irony of it all would be difficult for even the Gods to appreciate. What can be the American "infallible plan" for overcoming this possibility—if they have one?

There is also a further hazard. However error-proof, "human or mechanical", a system may be, it still depends upon humans for decisions and judgments. Regrettably there is no reason for supposing that the President of the United States has the un-human gift of infallibility, or for that matter that his advisers are any better equipped in this respect.

It is all very well for Mr. Bartholomew to report:

"The key question to be determined—'Is the enemy attacking?' So far there have been numerous alarms and alerts, numerous dispatch of bombing sorties, but always and in time the final negative answer: 'No enemy attack'."

The big question is—will the Americans actually wait until a hydrogen bomb is dropped upon them before deciding that there is an enemy attack. If not—and one suspects not—the human error of judgment remains and the final negative answer may not be given in time.

We shudder to think how close the world may already have come to complete and final disaster, and find it a fantastic situation in which it is even remotely possible that atomic bombs could be dropped by an oversight or misjudgment. It is unpleasant enough that their very existence represents a constant threat to the human race.

Freedom Needs
More Readers

LOOK!

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!
WEEK 15
Deficit on Freedom £300
Contributions received £228
DEFICIT £72

April 3 to April 9

Hindhead F.N.F. 5/6; San Francisco: J.N. £1/15/0; Northwood: E.H. £1/11/0; Pittsburgh: O.S. 15/6; St. Helena: S.S. £1/6/0; Oakland: K.C. 14/-; London: S.B.* 2/-; London: Anon* 1/11; London: J.S.* 3/-; Nairn: W.M.R. 6/-; Oxford: Anon* 5/-; London: Anon. £2; London: J.W. £1/1/0; Ware: E.B. 4/-; London: Anon. 10/-.

Total ... 10 19 11
Previously acknowledged ... 217 11 1

1958 TOTAL T ODATE ... £228 11 0

GIFT OF BOOKS: London: A.U.

*Indicates regular contributor.

ANARCHIST ATTITUDES

"The driver of a car is completely surrounded by a non-social object, isolated from physical contact with others and yet completely dependent on and related to them, even when he isn't playing bumper tags. The traffic is a stream in which he can immerse himself without getting wet, retaining the right to snarl at other drivers while making the same independent decisions as to speed and direction which they in turn resent. A far cry from Thoreau, whose creative anarchism hurt no one."

—DAVID RIESMAN

PUBLIC and private transport are an epitome of collectivism and individualism. The user of the former subordinates his personal time-table and itinerary to that of the vehicle he is using, the user of the latter has full freedom of choice limited only by the fact that millions of others are exercising their similar freedom. The motor car has decentralised transport. As Lewis Mumford wrote in his *Culture of Cities*:

"Instead of the train, which increases in economy up to a point with the number of cars attached, we have . . . a more flexibly used individual unit, which can start or stop, take the highroad or the branch road, at its own convenience, without waiting for other cars. And instead of the railway line, which tended to centralise transportation along the main arteries . . . the motor car has brought into existence the new highway network. Thus the motor car can penetrate the hinterland in a more effective and economic fashion than the railroad could; for economy in railroading depends upon loading the tracks to maximum capacity and confining transportation, as much as possible to the main routes. Moreover, the motor car can climb steep grades and penetrate hilly country with a freedom unknown to the railroad . . ."

Twenty years later Mumford stresses another aspect of the autonomy of the driver:

"Consider the bright idea engineers are already seriously playing with: the notion of taking the control of the private motor car out of the hands of the driver, so that he will become a mere passenger in a remote-controlled vehicle . . . look at the human consequences. The driving of a car has been one of the last refuges of personal responsibility, of the do-it-yourself principle, in our machine-oriented economy. At the wheel

of his car the most down-trodden conformist still has a slight sense of release; he may capriciously choose his destination, alter his speed, explore a side road, or loiter in a woody glen for a picnic lunch. One by one, in the interests of safety or maximum speed, these freedoms are being taken away. The final triumph of automation would do away with all the subsidiary purposes of travel by private vehicle; nothing would change, neither the man nor the occupation nor the scenery. Obviously the mechanical results have already been more efficiently achieved in a railroad train, while the same boredom could have been arrived at more cheaply by the simple non-technical device of staying at home."

But one does not have to imagine radar-controlled electronic 'autoways' to reach this conclusion. The standardised landscape of the super-road, made necessary by the volume of traffic, takes the point away from this kind of travel for pleasure. What is the point of going anywhere when the place you leave, your destination, and everywhere *en route* are exactly the same?

"A recent study of tourists on U.S. Highway 30 through Nebraska, by the anthropologist Jack Roberts, indicates that these drivers are seldom aware of the countryside through which they travel, unless it is defined as 'scenic', in which case they may stop for thirty seconds or so to take it in. When they do stop, they often get out of their cars too groggy and punch-drunk to walk, having no urgent reason driven without a break from Chicago or the West Coast; their interchange with the roadside service people — gas-station attendants, motel-keepers, etc., is perfunctory; and back they get into their moving tube, in which they never can or do neglect a road sign, and receive more impressions of print than of anything else."

IS private motoring more trouble than it is worth? Wilfred Wellock thinks so, and declares that "Most of the pleasure has departed. Given a fine or promising week-end our roads are so crowded that often one looks in vain for a quiet spot even to picnic, while getting

home is a nightmare. Hence, apart from business, all that is left for the car to do is odd jobs, errands and the annual holiday." But most people would not agree with him, Professor Myles Wright, talking at the RIBA last year reminded us that the number of vehicles on the road in this country has doubled since the war and will probably double again within 10 or 12 years:

"Britain is entering the motor age in a big way . . . A motor car has rightly been called a pair of seven league boots, a raincoat, a shopping basket, mobile office and even a makeshift week-end cottage; always at one's disposal for as little as 3d. a mile all in, and with virtually no breakdowns. In this difficult world of the middle class it is one of the few really good things; if you can use it, I am sure that all who can will and that the social revolution, churning on, will make cars as plentiful among wage earners as television sets."

"The commercial vehicle is not quite so advantageous because, on long hauls, the restriction to 20 m.p.h. in Britain deprives the truck of one of its great advantages. And on short hauls loading and unloading points are so often congested. Nevertheless the residual advantage is so great that nearly three-quarters of all goods by value now move by road. It follows that organised bulk transport, human or otherwise, along fixed routes, is declining and individual small unit any-direction transport is increasing. This is made only too plain by the financial difficulties of the railways and the drop in the passengers carried by London Transport and other bus companies."

He sees the motor age as part of the context of "a battle between the forces for dispersal and those which favour continued concentration of people and jobs in and very near the large cities". The crux of the problem is decentralisation—dispersal from the big urban centres of people and jobs, since the journey too and from work is one of the biggest problems.

Now as humane and sensible people trying to keep a sense of proportion, we are bound to be alarmed at the prospect of a doubling of the number of cars on

the roads. The situation is bad enough already; how can we possibly find a moral justification for the destruction of all the amenities of town life, and an increase in the number of deaths and injuries? Are we all suffering from motor mania? But of course nobody ever starts on a journey with the thought that he may be a corpse or a killer by the time it is finished, and we all regard the statistically predictable casualty list as accidental rather than as the inevitable result of our exercising our inalienable right to charge around in our individual guided missiles.

★

WE are faced with the prospect of every unpleasant aspect of the motor age getting worse while we have not found solutions to the problem as it exists. One thing we know: there is no one solution, either in the case of accidents or in that of congestion. Both have very many causes, and both can be alleviated by a variety of approaches, some of them what we would call libertarian and some authoritarian. The question of anarchist attitudes to the different attempted solutions was touched upon in a very interesting way in a controversy in *FREEDOM* two years ago on the subject of compulsory tests of vehicles. (All reprinted in Vol. 6 of *Selections from "Freedom"*, pp. 57-66).

It was declared editorially in *FREEDOM*, after a discussion of the government's proposal, that

"In the anarchist society—that is the society in which government no longer functions, because initiative and responsibility have passed to the people—in which the money system has ceased to exist, because competition, production for profit and privileges have disappeared; where status is no longer measured by wage packets, and success by the bank balance—in the anarchist society, we were saying, there will be no problem of 'dangerous' cars. No one will find economic reasons for being obliged to drive an unroadworthy vehicle; there will be no garages waiting to fleece the innocent, or dealers to pull a fast one. It will be a routine matter to ensure that cars are frequently subjected to safety tests (just as it is even to-day in public services such as the railways, bus-services and airlines). What is more in an anarchist society, one will be so obsessed of the pressure of time, to allow such considerations to override their awareness that the vehicle they are driving is a potential danger to their own lives as well as to the lives of others."

"Finally, the anarchist society offers the only real solution to death on the roads through the possession of leisure. The cult of speed is to-day not only an important weapon in the competitive economic war but also a means to escape periodically from it. We believe that in a society in which there is sufficient leisure, cars and aeroplanes will lose much of their 'glamour'. Our long-distance travelling will be by train, coach or boat but we shall do a lot more walking, at least feasting our eyes on the real beauty of nature."

A reader, A. Prunier, wrote from Paris to say that he was "profoundly disappointed" by this conclusion which seemed to him an example of that anarchist *facilism* which Malatesta deplored. The editorial, he complained,

"sets out in all seriousness a series of preliminary conditions for improving traffic conditions and the roadworthiness of vehicles, prerequisites that require, among other things, the abolition of all distinction between yours and mine. In substance it asserts that, thanks to this abolition, the number of vehicles in use and the extent to which they are used would diminish and that, on the other hand, their working condition and roadworthiness could not fail to be excellent. A contradictor might dare to claim that, on the contrary, if cars were distributed free by the factories as liberally as the catalogues at the Motor Show, if petrol was poured out by pump attendants like water from a river, and if, moreover, everyone could take possession of the first vehicle he came across as the fancy took him, traffic would be excessive and disordered, maintenance nil, and accidents numerous. We have really no

Now about the use of big names. This is directly the result of the attitude of the Press. Organise anything with unknown speakers—however competent and sincere—and the Press will ignore it. Names make news, and any campaign to attract public opinion has to face a Press dedicated to the cult of the personality. No names, no coverage. So whose fault is it?

There is plenty more to be said, but hardly space. So one last point, on 'sainine slogans' like *Back to Bows and Arrows*. Does Mr. Barber not know that it was that freak Einstein who said something like: 'I don't know what weapons will be used in the next war, but the one after will be fought with bows and arrows'?

PHILIP SANSON.

Aldermaston and the 'News Chronicle'

AS was discussed in *FREEDOM* last week, the Press in general dealt in a most superficial and sneering way with the Aldermaston march. Most disappointing was the *News Chronicle*, which has previously published relatively enlightened editorials on the H-bomb, but whose correspondent, Frank Barber, turned in reports on the march which reached a new low for cheap and facile mis-reporting.

A barrage of letters from disgusted readers took Mr. Barber to task and then he attempted to reply. But his reply was yet another piece of twisted presentation, claiming that the presence of skiffle groups on the march betrayed the essential levity of those taking part—although he had made no attempt to present seriously the speeches delivered, at the meetings on the way and at the beginning and end of the demonstration.

He tried to maintain that there were only cranks and freaks on the march and no 'workers' were there, and also tried to justify his 'Communists' smear, and his criticism of the sponsors of the Campaign who did not march, and of the organisers for using 'big names' for propaganda.

We publish below a letter sent to the *News Chronicle* in answer to Mr. Barber. Not altogether surprisingly, it was returned with a rejection slip.

★ **POOR** Mr. Barber! On reading his reports on the Aldermaston march I thought he was deliberately trying to be superficial, but now I realise he just can't help it.

Let us examine some of his points. First, the skiffle groups. For people who are short on musical education—and that means most of the British people—but who feel the urge to make music themselves, skiffle has provided the first popular means of self-expression in rhythm and melody. Mr. Barber may not like it—I don't much—but it is the only ready channel for expressing youthful high spirits in a social and enjoyable way.

Now why is this out of place in a demonstration for life against death? Although the Aldermaston march was against nuclear weapons it was an affirmation for the human spirit, faith and joy of living in the face of the apparent death-wish of the power politicians.

Had the march been silent (and dull) I can imagine the pejorative phrases Mr. Barber would have produced. The 'angry young men' would have appeared for sure, backed up by 'sincere but misguided', 'intense blue-stockings', 'puritan do-gooders', etc., etc.

Either way prejudice will out, as was shown by Mr. Barber's treatment of the serious speeches. For example, of a well-reasoned speech by Philip Toynbee this is *all* Mr. Barber had to say: 'Philip Toynbee made his usual point about being ready to have Russian domination of the world'. What a travesty of fair report! What an out-of-context gem! How serious can you get, Mr. Barber?

Now about the absence of workers on the march. Among people of my acquaintance there were four teachers, a nurse, two hospital workers, a chemical research worker, a telephone engineer, a messenger, an air-line steward, two office workers, a railway clerk, two shop assistants, two students and a street sweeper with a delegation from his T.U. branch. The telephone engineer has a beard, which of course makes him a freak, but I don't know if Mr. Barber has to see overalls and tools before he is convinced people have to work for a living?

These people are all against Russia's H-bomb as much as the West's, and are all anti-communist—and were when Mr. Barber was probably regarding Stalin as our great ally in the struggle for democracy.

But of course the Communists were there; how can you keep them away? Doesn't Mr. Barber realise that by stressing their presence he is giving them credit in the eyes of thousands who hate the Bomb? Credit to which they are not entitled since the Party here at its last congress rejected a resolution appealing to the Russian Government to stop tests!

Most non-Communists can see the dishonesty of the C.P. position, but that doesn't prevent party members and fellow travellers being most vocal whenever the opportunity arises—and silent when, as Mr. Barber instances, Fenner Brockway said that Russia's recent tests had produced an increase in radio-activity over America. But what sort of noise did anti-communist Mr. Barber make at that point? Cheer? Boo? What noise is appropriate?

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

- OPEN DAILY**
(Open 10 a.m.—6.30 p.m., 5 p.m. Sat.)
- New Books . . .**
- Niki the Story of a Dog Tibor Dery 10/6
 - Fowler's End Gerald Kerah 16/-
 - The Chertist Challenge A. R. Schoyen 25/-
 - The Angel Makers Gordon Rettray Taylor 42/-
 - Bebel in Spain Gerald Brenan 21/-
 - Erile and the Kingdom Albert Camus 13/6
 - By Way of Sainte-Beuve Marcel Proust 25/-
 - Men Against the State J. J. Martin 16/-
- Second-Hand**
- Their Stand Apart (ed.) J. Tudor Rees and H. V. Usill 7/6
 - The Trail of the Dinosaur Arthur Koestler 5/6
 - The Life and Teachings of Leo Tolstoy C. H. Parris 3/-
 - Union Now Clarence K. Streit 3/-
 - Jennie Gerhardt Theodore Dreiser 6/-
 - A View of all Existence Elystan Thomas 3/-
 - Anti Pragmatism Albert Schinz 5/-
 - The Possessed Fyodor Dostoiyevsky 7/-
 - Power Bertrand Russell 5/6
 - History of Socialism Thomas Kirkup 4/6
 - Sketches from Life Edward Carpenter 3/6
 - Persian Dawns Egyptian Nights J. Leslie Mitchell 2/6
 - The Inequality of Man J. B. S. Haldane 4/-
 - Little Lady of the Big Jack London 3/-
 - Memoirs of Extraordinary Popular Delusions and the Madness of Crowds (1856) Charles Mackay 2 vols, the set 8/-
- Periodicals**
- Liberation, March 1958 1/9
- 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**

BOOKS German 'Prosperity'

PROSPERITY THROUGH COMPETITION by Ludwig Erhard. Thames & Hudson, 25s.

THIS is a straightforward defence of competitive capitalism as opposed to the economic planning of the Social Democrats, written by the Minister for Economic Affairs and Vice-Chancellor of the German Federal Republic. It is set in the context of the West German economic recovery since the end of the war, and bears the sub-title "The Economics of the German Miracle". One of the oldest problems to be attacked by the liberal economists was that of the rapidity with which defeated countries regained their former economic positions, so perhaps, even to a capitalist economist, "Miracle" is rather an exaggeration. While Erhard remarks in the preface that it is impossible to make comparisons between Germany and other European countries, he himself does so frequently in tables of indices and prices.

What is more interesting are his philosophical arguments in favour of a competitive economy. He must have somewhere or other heard of the concept of class struggle, but it certainly doesn't appear in this book. The basic assumption is that if people are "free" then they will compete, to everyone's mutual advantage. Put in other words, this means that if the business class, whom Erhard represents, are free from those particular controls which hamper them, they will be able to exploit the workers to their own collective advantage.

The frequency with which words such as freedom, dignity and independence are used, buried in a mass of economic jargon illustrate the shallowness of mental outlook which must arise if anyone tries to justify competition from an ethical point of view. Unfortunately, the ideals expressed by Erhard are most widely held to-day, particularly by those who have power to impose them.

P.H.

Socialism in a Wheelchair

Continued from p. 1

The Labour and Trade Union leaders are jealous of demonstrations the initiative for which does not emanate from Transport House, and suspicious of rank-and-file movements which they cannot control. We have no doubt in our minds that the organisers of last Sunday's rally, forewarned that the Aldermaston irregulars had planned to descend on the Square with their imaginative protest of a week earlier behind them, and their slogans held high, which made the Labour Party's "Ban H-Bomb Tests" look more than tame, adjusted their plans and delegated their only negotiator to deal with these disturbers of the Labour Party peace. If our premise is correct, then the fact is significant not only as further evidence that the expression of opinion at rank-and-file level is not welcome to the Parties which profess to speak for the people, but equally for those who might nurture the hope that governments can be influenced in their favour by such spontaneous demonstrations.

★

At last Sunday's rally, Mr. Driberg proudly told his audience that the march to the Square had been led by Mrs. Floyd, an 86-year-old veteran of the Party. One assumes that Mrs. Floyd was offered to the audience as a symbol (just as the eleven-year-old boy who led the Aldermaston marchers for most of the way was also a symbol) that the Party had not lost faith with the objectives of its pioneers.

Labour has been in power four times, from 1945-1949 absolutely. The Labour Party and the Trades Unions have some 9 million members and control large financial resources. They are obviously in a strong position to influence and even to educate public opinion. They profess to believe in Socialism. Now, only last week, the *News Chronicle* Gallup Survey published a sample opinion on the "burning" topics of this Iron-curtained Nuclear Age, which we propose to refer to not because we implicitly trust Dr. Gallup's snoopers or are influenced by a public opinion which is as fickle as the news headlines or a politician, but because in the "democracy" in which we live, it is the only attempt to assess what the people's opinions are at the time on topics of public moment. §

According to the Gallup Poll, 44 per cent. of the sample were in favour of Britain and America stopping their H-bomb tests as a result of Russia's announcement that she would, as against 42 in favour of continuing. 61 per cent. disapproved if Britain were to give up her H-bomb "without waiting for America or Russia to move" as against 25 per cent. who were in favour of unilateral H-bomb disarmament. 77 per cent. thought that Summit talks were important and 20 per cent. that they were not.

We welcome, as brothers in the wilderness, the 20 per cent. who have seen through the farce that seeks to impose itself on the public

§The government announced in a White Paper issued in February, 1955—that is three years ago—that it was developing and producing its own H-bomb (see "H-Bomb—Made in Britain" *Freedom Selections*, Vol. 5, p.47). Apart from being faced with the accomplished fact, three years have passed during which public opinion could easily have been sounded as to whether it was in favour of its retention. Not by a *News Chronicle* sample survey but by a nationwide referendum. We have always been told that democracy was government by-and-for the people. But when are the people consulted?

SUMMER IS A-CUMIN IN-OR THE LIBERALS RIDE AGAIN

THERE is clearly something very fascinating in the idea of resurrection. It plays an important part in the mythology which has been sedulously built up around a certain Nazarene carpenter named Jesus, and was found so useful a gimmick that after more than 1900 years it was applied to his mother also.

The idea of re-incarnation, which is a variant of resurrection in perpetual motion, also has multitudes of adherents, especially among animal lovers, who like to think that little Fido, who already understands every word you say, will sooner or later make the grade and emerge with his faithful soul and loving heart clothed in human shape.

And much good that will do little Fido, who, if he has any sense at all, which is doubtful, ought to realise that he is treated much better than many human beings, and is well advised to keep himself well tucked away under his furry canine hide.

The Human Conceit

The ideas of the resurrection and re-incarnation of the soul are each aspects of the human conceit of immortality. Man thinks himself so damned important to the universe that he cannot bear to accept the notion that he can disappear without trace. There is one more contradiction here in the religionists' attitude, for although they maintain that here is an overall scheme of things, they cannot allow that man is no more important in it than trees, crocodiles or mosquitoes. Yet when Mother Nature does stretch herself and blows her top through a volcano, shifts her crust in an earthquake, or weeps so copiously as to flood the land, she shows no more concern for Man's puny constructions than she does for the heaver's dam. When this happens the religious can do no more than mumble feebly about God working in mysterious ways his wonders

as "vital Summit talks". But what of the 77 per cent., at least a half of whom vote Labour, who believe these talks are important? Is this not the most damning indictment of the political, as opposed to the Socialist, approach to the problem of power politics of the Labour Party? Yet this party which addressed the audience last Sunday as "comrades", which through Mrs. Floyd seeks to reaffirm its socialist origins, is knowingly responsible for a "public opinion" professing views which, not only are contrary to its basic interests, but are the denial of the basic tenets of socialism.

★

PERHAPS, after all, old Mrs. Floyd, bless her, is the symbol of Labour Party "Socialism". For we forgot to mention earlier that she led their march in a *wheel-chair*.

We see more hope in 11-year-old Roger Kirby who led the Aldermaston protesters. His slender shoulders, and whatever it was that made a young boy prefer the company of a mile of protesting adults to a gang of playmates of his own age, are the perennial guarantee that some, at least, of our youngsters will know how to shrug off the invasive attentions of the politicians and the pressures of the conformists in the years that lie ahead. Their task, however, will be that much easier if we remain true to the values which inspired the founders of socialism.

Looking back over our shoulders may be a bad thing for the Grand Moguls of the Labour Party and the Trades Unions. But if in so doing we capture something of the enthusiasm, the determination as well as the uncompromising values and intellectual vitality of those past generations, we may well have the key to happiness, peace and well-being in an age ripe with scientific and technological achievement.

War is a symptom, not a cause, of social ill-health; poverty is not the result of under-production but the cause. And happiness? Ah! That is more elusive. But how much less important its final attainment would be if mankind were to free itself from the man-made miseries and anxieties with which it is now plagued . . . quite unnecessarily!

to perform. Oh mighty mysterious, brother, mighty mysterious.

Resurrection has so powerful an appeal that it appears constantly in popular mythology—and there is no richer field of modern myth than the Western story or film. Here, Destry, or someone like him, is always riding again. The ex-gun-slinger comes out of his retirement to defend the town against the bad men terrorising its good but ineffectual citizens. Even in that most anarchist film, *Viva Zapata!* at the end the peasants refused to accept the dead body flung down in the market place as that of Zapata. Somewhere up in the hills he was waiting for the next time they would need him—and he was symbolised up there by his flying white horse. The same theme runs through the song on Joe Hill, the Wobblly organiser shot in 1915. 'Takes more than guns to kill a man,' says Joe, 'I didn't die.'

From Pagan Times

In the harsh reality of modern power institutions, concepts of the immortal soul play little part. So oblivion is carefully guarded against by the cult of the personality. We have always been able to see the religious function played by the Leader/movement relationship. As divine religion claims less and less hold on men's minds, the Leader takes the place of God, and the apparatus provides the means for him and his disciples to make their mark on history and achieve the only sort of immortality there really is—to live in the memory of man and in the history books.

In Christian countries the Resurrection is of course plugged at Easter time, the time when Jesus was resurrected and passed up to heaven. Whether the events commemorated really took place at this time of year is probably doubtful, but the Christians have always taken care to make use of existing pagan practices where they could be adapted to their purposes, and the celebration of the advent of Spring and Easter festivities go far back in pre-Christian times.

They were celebrating the resurrection, the re-awakening of the earth after its long winter sleep, when the sap begins to rise and young men's fancies lightly turn to thoughts that the fields will soon be dry again for tumbling in. Warm days and nights, fresh fruit and flowers growing, the harvests filling the granaries again—all the joys of summer are promised in the first signs of Spring. There can be few human cultures in history where the end of Winter and the coming of Spring are not celebrated in some way.

Modern city dwellers, of course, are so divorced from the natural processes that they have no open celebrations of Spring. But at the Easter holiday they put on new clothes (if they can afford them) and exchange Easter eggs (without any conscious recognition of their ancient symbolism of fertility) and beat it for the country or the seaside or the Fair on the Heath.

Strydom Strikes Again

Continued from p. 1

The entire force of 22,000 police are at the ready, and, a *News Chronicle* correspondent writes:

Detachments of the Union Defence Force are to stand by. Armoured cars have been seen in the main cities.

Troop carriers are ready to transport to the effected areas an auxiliary labour force which is believed to include non-white convicts.

Minister of Justice Charles Swart said this week-end that if demonstrators got hurt they must not "squeal".

Some people have been arrested on allegations of incitement to strike—a serious offence carrying five years imprisonment and flogging.

The police are theoretically mobilised to prevent violence, but South African friends inform us that it is not an uncommon occurrence for the police with their brutal methods to actually incite the Africans to riot. To-day the police will no doubt have been given a free hand by the Government and any trouble which arises as a result of the strike will be pinned in to the Africans who have no legal voice with which to defend themselves. They have, however, economic strength, and if the Africans are determined enough to risk the threat made by the big employers that jobs will not be kept open for them (who would do them anyway?), the strike could be very effective in proving to themselves the

strength of organised resistance, either by withdrawing their labour or by refusing to allow the products of their labour to pass into hostile hands.

A Lucky Time

For country-dwellers the whole thing is much more vivid. There must be a real feeling of release from the dark grip of winter and a renewing of man's partnership with the earth.

It is in this connection that one can view with interest the recent Liberal victory at Torrington in Devon, and the Liberals should count themselves lucky that they contested a by-election in a West-country rural area at Easter-time, for they too are staging a resurrection—they hope.

The long dark night of disillusionment and frustration under Labour and Tory Governments has certainly produced widespread apathy. Nobody quite knows what to do about it, for within the Parliamentary framework there is no alternative at present to the two major parties and they don't provide real alternatives to each other.

In this situation the Liberals look around for policies. The trouble is that both the Tories and Labour have pinched parts of Liberalism; indeed they are meeting in the middle of the road over the dead body of the Liberal Party. The Labourites have stolen the welfare schemes first envisaged by the Liberals as a way of ameliorating the worst aspects of industrialism—on the tide of which the Liberals had floated to power in the late 19th century.

The Tories agree with the Liberals in opposing nationalisation and have been forced to accept much of the welfare state idea also, and now with their free trade area in Europe are playing down their traditional imperial preference and protectionist policies and veering towards the free trade position of the Liberals—at least in Europe.

The Dawn Breaks

Robbed of their political clothing, the Liberals have, unlike the State, tended to wither away, and have been left standing shivering on the bank while Tory and Labour have chased each other home and dried.

And shivering they have remained until the Spring sunshine woke them up to the fact that a deadlock between Tory and Labour represents the only sort of opportunity they are ever going to get to steal back some votes for themselves.

So they have hotch-patched up a patch-work policy quilt to cover their tired old bones and have thereby given themselves the appearance of youth. This has been helped by turfing out their old leader and replacing him with young, energetic Mr. Jo Grimond, and attracting, by the offer of places on a brand new band-wagon (the old one being packed tight) for young and ambitious personalities unlikely to appeal to the crusty hierarchies of the Tory and Labour parties.

And what is their patch-work policy? Well, it's a bit difficult to sum up, be-

cause it would appear to have been drafted by opposing this in Tory policy, that in Labour, and compromising with both here and there—but with a difference of course, if only of label.

It aims at a reduction in government expenditure but has 'positive' policies for all the welfare services and colonial and Commonwealth development, with the eventual aim of a world government. It is a policy of co-partnership and co-ownership aimed at ending class-warfare, but encourages competition through free trade and curbing restrictive practices. It calls on Britain to give a lead in ceasing H-bomb manufacture, while maintaining her place in Western defence. This will undoubtedly entail permanent conscription, but they are of course all for individual liberty.

Something (or Nothing) for Everybody

It is a combination of policies cannily designed to offer something for everybody. And since the Liberals know they have no chance of achieving power they can afford to ignore the contradictions and conflicting interests.

The Liberals can cash in on the disillusionment with the other parties. They can kid themselves—and thousands of voters—that they have something radically different to offer and in the prevailing political atmosphere they will gather much support. They will have plenty of time to adjust their policies later should they build a machine capable of taking power again—but this is most unlikely. The most they will probably achieve is to present a balance of power between the Tory and Labour parties.

But what else lies behind their present apparent revival? The first part of this article points to one possible, if rather fanciful, explanation. The whole world loves a resurrection—especially in Spring-time. Why even the Liberal colour is green!

And it is in the West country where the Liberals expect most support. Well, they still believe in pixies in Cornwall, where they still have the floral dance, and the mysterious arena of Stonehenge is in Wiltshire. It is a territory of pagan background and distrust of the foreigners up in London.

How they would love to create the equivalent of a peasant rising by sending, from the moors and valleys and craggy coves of the West country, a handful of irritating Liberals to upset the apples of those smart-alecs in Westminster. Against the bureaucracy of the party-line machines goes up the weird cry from the men of Milton Damerel and Frithelstock: 'The Liberals ride again!'

It might satisfy their atavistic yearnings for resurrection. It might not do any harm. It won't do any good either, of course. Except for the handful of Liberals. P.S.

FREEDOM PRESS

SELECTIONS FROM 'FREEDOM'

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

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

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

VOLINE :

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

E. A. GUTKIND :

The Expanding Environment 8s. 6d.

V. RICHARDS :

Lessons of the Spanish Revolution 6s.

GEORGE WOODCOCK :

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

K. J. KENAFIKIN :

Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx paper 6s.

★

Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications :

Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute cloth 1s.
Journeys Through Utopia cloth 18s. (U.S.A. \$3)

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

FREEDOM AND THE ALDERMASTON MARCH

DEAR SIR,

As a subscriber to FREEDOM for the last four years or so, and one of those who took part in the march to Aldermaston (not the whole way, I am afraid), may I comment upon the unsigned remarks in FREEDOM upon the desirability or otherwise of the march, and the simple-mindedness of many of the marchers?

The writer committed himself to a number of propositions which call for closer examination, though he frequently played safe by putting many of his assertions in the form of rhetorical questions ("How many . . ." etc.). These assertions are:

(1) Most "people who to-day find sympathy with the Aldermaston march did not bat an eyelid over Hiroshima, or the development of the H-bomb by the West, but now that Russia has it . . . suddenly discover it to be an evil thing." Did they? Have they indeed? What is the evidence for this slanderous drivel? Who took the poll—was it one of those people whom I saw hanging around the fringes of the march, trying to flog FREEDOM? If so, they no doubt found that the majority of the marchers were young people—surprisingly young—who could hardly be blamed for not demonstrating five years ago, let alone 13. I as an older person was extremely gratified to see them.

But let us be sensible—there has been no poll—this article was written well in advance—and was just another of those *a priori* pieces of wishful thinking—that stands in lieu of analysis, and which too often take up space in FREEDOM.

I say wishful thinking, for the writer wished neither the march nor the campaign well. He does say "this will be a laudable enough endeavour and we shall be pleased enough to see it succeed," though "it is another case of too little and too late." (Too late?) As compared with—the numerous campaigns and demonstrations supported and/or

organised by FREEDOM? But ill will he did wish the enterprise, for he then says to "those people": "Suppose your campaign is successful, and nuclear weapons are renounced by Britain . . . and by America and Russia. What then?" (Ye gods!) "You will be *ensuring* (my italics) that the next war will be just like the one that killed dear old Dad. Bombers with ordinary block-busters . . . submarines with old-fashioned torpedoes . . . etc. You will also be ensuring there will be another war." So the writer should *not* be pleased to see the campaign succeed. Contradiction established. Now just what did he say in the passage just quoted?

One of the things he must be saying is that the H-bomb is a deterrent—its possession makes war *less* likely. Now I know Dulles and Bevan profess this view—but I didn't know FREEDOM did. Certainly it is a view which requires an

extensive defence—of which not a word appeared in this quite long and discursive article—nor can I recall such a defence in previous FREEDOMS. It is a view which I believe to be false to the point of unreality, and immoral. Immoral (among other reasons), because few of those who maintain it, believe it, but rather employ it as a means of keeping up the Cold War—is FREEDOM similarly involved?

Another thing he seems to be saying, is that there is nothing to choose between a nuclear war, and a war that killed old Dad. This surely reveals a disturbing ignorance of the implications of nuclear warfare. The former will very likely involve the annihilation of the entire human race—then there will be *no one* to be "drawn into the revolutionary positions" of which the writer speaks. A war like the one which killed old Dad, no matter how unjust and de-

testable we might regard it, does *not* entail such consequences *i.e.* is *not* the same as one which also kills Mum and the kids, and *all* the relations, in every land. Now if FREEDOM cannot distinguish, at any level, between these two possible states of affairs, then, verily, communication has broken down.

But we do *have* to choose between two wars—is not the purpose of this campaign to push this country into a position of disengagement—both for its own sake and with the further object of forcing our allies "to do likewise", *i.e.* to procure a state of affairs where the likelihood of *any* kind of war, is eliminated? Now whether this campaign, or any campaign, will get this far—no one knows. One can only try and see.

Now FREEDOM is continually lecturing its readers about the absolute necessity of co-operation, but when a spontaneous non-party, anti-authoritarian movement

against the H-bomb arises, does FREEDOM co-operate? No; instead we have the spectacle of anarchists using the occasion to make a few sales, all the world like the ice cream vendors. (And what an edition to sell! Imagine the converts!)

It seems clear to me that any anarchist society will be ushered in, not by a series of apocalyptic events, but by the operation of groups outside the framework of State and party, and these groups will, in the beginning at least, *not* see eye to eye on many issues. Anarchists will be expected to convert others by example—not by half-baked armchair waffling. One wonders whether FREEDOM *really* looks forward to this prospect. Certainly the purist holier-than-thou tone of this article, rules out any move to co-operate with *any* group—except already convinced anarchists.

Not that the article was very clear on any question—for the sake of discussion I have contributed to it a clarity which really it does not possess. Have another try, FREEDOM!

Oxford.

MAX TEICHMANN

EDITORIAL REPLY

MR. TEICHMANN'S letter refers to the front page article in FREEDOM of April 5th. Last week (12th) we published 'Aldermaston and After' in the same position and this week we print a letter to the *News Chronicle* (which it rejected) on the dishonest attitude of its correspondent, Frank Barber, in his pathetic defence of his biased reports on the march. This letter was written by one of the editorial board of FREEDOM.

Assuming he has read all this, Mr. Teichmann is probably thoroughly confused by now as to just what anarchists stand for. If this is so, it represents a failure on our part (if we assume his ability to understand), for he tells us he has been reading this paper for four years.

Just so that he knows clearly, however, from which position we argue, we should like to remind him, if he ever knew, that half of the present editorial board of this paper were jailed during the last war for activities in opposition to war. Opposition to war, Mr. Teichmann, not to any particular weapon, however dreadful. And our argument has consistently been that it is futile to oppose certain aspects of war and even war itself without opposing, attacking, and working for the destruction of, the economic and political systems which make war inevitable. This is what we mean by the revolutionary position as distinct from the purely pacifist one which opposes violence without embracing a social outlook which understands the bases of violence in governmental society, and the causes of war in capitalist economies.

Now let's look at Mr. Teichmann's debating tricks. First he accuses us of playing safe by using rhetorical questions but then he turns our questions into assertions and terms it slanderous drivel, while ignoring what was actually said. We can give him a bit of evidence for his point (1) even so.

Take the case of Bertrand Russell, A.C.O. jailed in World War I, he supported World War II. By 1950, Mr. Teichmann as 'an older person' may remember, Lord Russell was speaking in favour of the West using its atomic bomb advantage to stop the Communist threat once and for all. What has made this eminent philosopher and stimulating thinker and speaker change his mind? Could it possibly be that with Russia possessing the H-bomb a nuclear war would mean the end of the West as well as the East?

And does Mr. Teichmann think that Bertrand Russell's attitude is unique among the supporters of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament? If he does, then I ask him to look down a list of its distinguished sponsors, and see how many of them supported the last war and did not protest against the atom bombs on Japan because they couldn't, having approved of block-busters on Germany for years.

It is to these people we referred when we asked 'How many people who to-day find sympathy with the Aldermaston march . . . etc.' This did not specifically refer to the marchers who, incidentally, included us for part of the way (like Mr. Teichmann) and several anarchists who went the whole way. (His cheap sneer about the anarchists 'hanging around the fringes, trying to flog FREEDOM' could apply equally to the sellers of *Peace News* and the other journals with a point of view to put, by the way). But what about, for example, the Communist and Labour supporters of the march? Mr. Teichmann must know the equivocal position of these politicians. The former don't oppose the Russian H-bomb (al-

though that's the one which would kill them in a nuclear war!) and Bevan's antics have shown how much we can trust the latter. Both parties, in supporting States, have supported wars, and will do so again.

To say that we wished the campaign ill-will (while granting that we wrote ' . . . we shall be pleased enough to see it succeed') is arguing by some considerable extension. A well known but dishonest debating trick.

The reference to 'too little and too late' means precisely this: that in our opinion—which is what we express, not the views of the organisers of the march—it is not nearly enough to demand a cessation of tests, a ban of the H-bomb or nuclear disarmament. Nor is it enough to limit the campaign to meetings, marches and the presentation of petitions. While these are helpful to arouse public opinion, what is necessary is public *action*. Now although the organisers of the march were pleased (presumably) to have a number of marchers from the supporters of Peter Fryer's* *Newsletter*, they refused to let their point of view be put to the demonstration from the platform. This section of the marchers did in fact circulate a duplicated sheet disclosing this and showing that they were interested in calling for industrial direct action against the Bomb. This is a point of view with which we sympathise, but which the organisers, primarily Christian and Labour Party pacifists, did not want aired.

That is the sort of thing we mean by too little. By too late we mean that these demonstrations should have been organised years ago, when the West was alone in possessing horror-weapons, for example—which was when the anarchists were speaking and writing against them—and before agreements had been made for building missile bases in this country (and Spain) and for the re-arming of Germany with atomic weapons. Once these things get under way it is much more difficult for public opinion to force governments to go into reverse. A loss of face is almost as important to a 'statesman' as loss of power.

Round about 1950 (4 years before Mr. Teichmann started reading FREEDOM) the London Anarchist Group saw all this danger and organised public meetings. They were sparsely attended; the young people staying away and the Press not concerned because no big names were involved. And since he is so concerned about why we do not take a more integrated part in these demonstrations, perhaps he could find an answer to the question of why we are never approached to provide speakers on these occasions in spite of our known attitude? Perhaps he will then arrive at similar conclusions to our own—that the organisers of such campaigns (like that for abolition of the death penalty, incidentally, in spite of our consistent record in the matter) are always very concerned to keep their activity *respectable* and *constitutional*. Anarchists tend to be embarrassed when you are wooing M.P.'s and organising petitions.

Now about the prickly 'deterrent' argument. In the opinion of this writer, nuclear weapons do make the governments think twice before going into a war where they might be used. When even world wars were fought by armies sent out to battlefields as far as possible from home, while the governments sat back and glorified those who did the

*Peter Fryer was the Foreign Correspondent for the *Daily Worker* who resigned and left the party after his despatches from Hungary were suppressed.

dirty work, the leaders did not have to worry overmuch about their own skins and property and way of life. (Although Nuremberg did establish an unhealthy precedent for modern times). But since a nuclear war would mean the annihilation (in spite of their priority down the deep shelters) of the governors themselves, a deterrent does exist. They may not care for their people, still less for the 'enemy's' people, or for the future generations, but they do care for themselves.

The fallacy in the deterrent argument does not lie in this. It lies in the fact that even the existence of the 'ultimate deterrent' will not prevent war if some idiot presses the wrong button, misreads a dot on a radar screen, or if economic and political stresses push a situation of tension too far. In other words if the causes of war are not removed.

The leaders of the world are not in control. They are controlled by economic and political and even psychological forces over which they have no control. It is the system which is running amok. Now if nuclear weapons are banned—if they are even made 'clean'—any pressure there is on the governments, either from public opinion or their own fear, will be lifted. After all there has already been Korea, since the atom bombs on Japan, and Suez, in our view was not stopped by public opinion but by American pressure. A war—like the Korean—where both Government and Opposition agreed, would get very little public opposition in this country as has already been demonstrated.

This is what we mean by our contention that the banning of the H-bomb will ensure the next war being like the one that killed dear old Dad, and since the agitation is only for nuclear disarmament (even though Mr. Teichmann may clasp his brow and say 'Only! Ye gods!') then we maintain that nothing will have been done to eliminate the causes of war—in fact it will have been made acceptable and safe for governments again—and so there will inevitably be more wars.

Mr. Teichmann thinks that 'the purpose of the campaign [is] to push this country into a position of disengagement . . . *i.e.* to procure a state of affairs where the likelihood of *any* kind of war is eliminated.' Well, we do hope he is right, since this is our own desire, but since we believe we have thought the matter out a little more thoroughly than he, we are convinced that such a likelihood demands a revolutionary change in the world—a change that is not envisaged in phrases like 'this country', 'our allies' and so on, and is certainly not even implied in such literature as the campaign has so far flogged like so much ice-cream (since that seems to be correct phraseology) nor in the speeches, nor the resolution delivered to Downing Street and the Russian and American embassies.

Then Mr. Teichmann first tries to sell us on the superior desirability of old-fashioned war as against nuclear, and then asks the question he should have asked first: Do we have to choose? He doesn't seem to realise that as soon as he asks that he is betraying the anarchist influence although he would probably hotly deny it. But behind the question is the real one: reform or revolution? Do we reform war by making it not so horrible, or do we abolish it by abolishing its causes?

If his answer to his own question is that we don't *have* to choose a lesser-evil kind of war, then he can only mean that all war must be eliminated. He will forgive us if we maintain that this train of thought must lead him to a revolutionary position, since its solution strikes at the roots of most of the institutions of modern society.

Now Mr. Teichmann has been rather nasty to us, but that is probably due to the confusion of his own position. We have indicated, certain of his attitudes betray the influence of anarchist ideas—or something like them. After four years, however, he still seems pretty hazy on a lot of things, which is not surprising if you mix a little bit of anarchism with a lot of . . . well, something else.

It's a pity Mr. Teichmann didn't meet all the way to Aldermaston. He could have met up with some of the anarchists who did and have had some stimulating discussion.

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

APRIL 20.—S. E. Parker on
SHOULD ANARCHISM BE
REVISED?

Questions, Discussion and Admission
all free.

HAMPSTEAD LIBERTARIAN GROUP

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

Next Meeting
MONDAY, APRIL 28th.

★ Malatesta Club ★

SWARAJ HOUSE,
32 PERCY STREET,
TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD, LONDON, W.1.

ACTIVITIES

Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.
London Anarchist Group Meetings
(see Announcements Column)

Every Wednesday at 7.30 (prompt)
BONAR THOMPSON speaks

FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

Postal Subscription Rates:
12 months 19/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)
6 months 9/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)
3 months 5/- (U.S.A. \$0.75)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies
12 months 29/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)
6 months 14/6 (U.S.A. \$2.25)

Cheques, P.O.'s and Money Orders should be made out to FREEDOM PRESS, crossed a/c Payee, and addressed to the publishers

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

Freedom and Authority

SIDNEY WARR and 'Socialist Llanelli', whose letters you published on April 12, both seem to be somewhat confused by the fact that the paper is called FREEDOM. Yet they must both be aware that 'freedom' means very different things to different people, not because some people use the word wrongly, but because it describes a relationship and not a substance. Freedom *as such* is a linguistic absurdity; there can only be freedom *from something* or freedom *to do something*. And when people see or hear the word 'freedom' on its own, there is no predicting what specific freedom they will think of.

I was once told that *Freedom* was also the name of an American Jesuit periodical! My informant was unreliable and I cannot say his statement was true; but if the Jesuits had called their journal *Freedom* it would be quite logical. The Jesuit takes a strict vow of unquestioning obedience to his superior; and in trying to keep his oath he seeks *freedom* in the sense used in St. Paul's epistles, namely freedom *from himself and his worldly appetites*.

The anarchist attitude is just about contrary to this. The anarchist wants (to quote Douglas McTaggart) 'the absolute sovereignty of every individual over himself,' and this entails freedom from obedience and superiors, and freedom to use one's resources for whatever purpose (excepting the invasion of another's sovereignty) one thinks fit.

But neither Jesuit freedom nor anarchist freedom includes that required by your two correspondents, the freedom to express oneself at will through the medium of a journal, and at the expense of a group, whose *raison d'être* is to propagate opinions contrary to one's own.

Mr. Warr asks how you justify your authority in rejecting contributions. Let him be reminded of Stirner's observation that every *specific* freedom involves a new authority, and he can work out for himself that your *freedom* to use your journal for your own purposes positively depends on your *authority* to reject matter which does not serve those purposes. And let our friend from Llanelly reflect on the fortunate circumstances that your purposes are wide enough to embrace an occasional free puff for the SPGB (such as his letter). He cannot seriously expect anyone as unserious as he says you are to publish the solemn litany written in 1904 which begins every "statement of the SPGB case" April 12, 1958. DONALD ROOM.