

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

With the Top Boys at THE POLITICAL CIRCUS

BY the time this issue of FREEDOM is in the hands of its readers, the latest political circus staged this time in the big-top in New York, will be in full swing.

Unarmed desperadoes from both East and West (the New York police have instructions to relieve the Cuban and Russian delegates of their guns) are all set this week for a verbal shooting contest at the fifteenth session of the "United Nations" General Assembly—the prize, the prophets tell us, the allegiance of the up-and-coming "uncommitted" nations.

Krushchev's decision to attend the session has incited the State Department into action, and elaborate plans to confine the Russian leader to a limited area during his visit have been set up. The American people, indignant at Krushchev's humiliating treatment of their President in Paris a few months ago, are staging demonstrations, not discouraged by the authorities, as an expression of loyalty to their own leaders and their dislike for the foreign "bum".

United States television networks and newspapers have "been advised by the State Department that the Government would welcome minimum coverage of Mr. Krushchev's visit". This "advice" has angered TV officials who say that they had already decided among themselves "only to those occasions when the Russian leader merited such national coverage by the importance of his declarations". This of course

would have given them wide scope since they could put their own interpretation on what is "nationally important".

Now that they have been virtually deprived of a TV orgy, officials complain that the decision will be regarded as a surrender by the networks to State Department dictation, which of course it is.

Meanwhile, back home, Britain prepares to get in on the act. Following Eisenhower's decision to address the United Nations Assembly, newspapers and politicians are clamouring for the Prime Minister's presence at the U.N. Mr. Gallop, quick off the mark, polls 75 per cent. of people interviewed in favour of Mr. Macmillan going to New York (*News Chronicle*).

The Observer (Sunday, Sept. 8th), sees the coming days at the U.N. as a challenge to the West. With fifteen new members from Africa and Cyprus the "cosy sessions" which previously resulted in an automatic anti-communist majority might be disturbed.

In expressing the view that: the world has never so desperately needed an organisation whose existence expresses not a Utopian fantasy but the biggest international reality of all; humanity's collective need for peace for the sake of survival—a need which overrides the national or ideological interests of any member state.

The Observer does not overstate the need for collective survival, but it stresses too much the "new importance of the United Nations forum in world affairs".

In the first place an organisation which does not include the biggest nation of all, Communist China, cannot be said to be an "international reality". Nor can we talk realistically about united nations when clearly there is no unity between the member powerful blocs. On the contrary, the United States and the Soviet Union backed by their satellites seem bent on destroying each other, not with superiority of ideologies but with devastating weapons or war which must involve the whole of mankind, "uncommitted" or not.

At this stage both are ready and apparently willing not to submit their differences to international arbitration, but to go through the motions of collective discussion because neither is yet prepared for open conflict which might result in war. There is no respect for international law or the cause of humanity, and it seems to us that it is only a question of time before one side or the other reaches the point where the cold war ceases to be useful and bloody war will ensue.

It is for this reason that we do not put our faith in summit conferences or United Nations sessions as the mediums through which the US and Russia can be persuaded to agree to settle down in permanent "peaceful co-existence". It cannot be assumed that the other nations are neutral when the majority of them are bound to East or West, economically and politically. The most independent, India, even if she could survive without economic aid from outside (at the moment economic investment in India comes from the West) thus retaining her neutrality, is not powerful enough to have any real sway with East or West without support from countries who cannot afford to give it. And if she had support she would then need weapons with which to defend her neutrality and her interests, so another big bully would be born.

But if there is no hope for sanity from the uncommitted countries, there is even less chance of finding it at these endless conferences con-

vened by the big powers and attended by political delegates committed to policies which all know will not be agreed to by either side.

This week in New York another farcical session has begun between men to whom ordinary people everywhere still look for moral leadership and depending on which ones they support, and considered the embodiment of wisdom.

We cannot hope to persuade the mass of people to have sufficient faith in themselves to end the con-

flict between nations by intelligent non-political action, or to convince them that their leaders are not dedicated to the "peaceful survival" of their peoples even if it means loss of face or power.

We can only hope that eventually their own experience with political leaders will start a few on the apparently difficult road of thinking for themselves. But if history is any guide political leaders will be rumbled when it is too late to take effective action. R.M.



The Sailors' Enemies

State Bosses Union—and Apathy

WHEN an institution comes to be taken for granted in a society, there is nothing that can spotlight its function more successfully than the sudden discovery of a little corner from which it is absent. It is also quite clear that the five week old strike by seamen in British ports is showing up the absence, and not the presence of trade union organisation, as represented by the National Union of Seamen, and its leader Sir Thomas Yates.

The structure and methods of this union make the ordinary unions in Britain look like fighting, revolutionary movements. Its branch officials are all appointed from head office, its meetings are held when most of the members are at sea, and it does not recognise shop stewards. The result is that the sailors are fighting a battle that most other workers left behind them fifty years ago. It has involved incredible truculence on the part of the bosses, arrests and imprisonment of strike leaders, blacklegging on a massive scale by white collar workers (a feature becoming very frequent nowadays) and most decisive of all, a factor which most left wing journals have ignored, the indifference of the majority of sailors to the fight being put up by the militant minority.

The world of seamen is not one in which conventional trade unionism can operate with its own standards of success. The formal monthly branch meetings, joint con-

sultation, discussion over interpretations of agreements, increasing the rate by a halfpenny an hour are out of place on board ship, and attempts to carry out union business on dry land produce monstrosities such as the N.U.S.

The sailors themselves have shown both a readiness to tolerate conditions which no other workers would put up with, and periods of determination to fight. The hell which life at sea could be made by hard conditions and brutal masters produced the mutinies of the *Nore*, the *Potemkin*, the Wilhelmshaven revolt, and the revolutionary actions of the Kronstadt sailors in 1917 and 1921. These short-lived communes, were made possible by the closeness and solidarity which binds together men working at close quarters, isolated from the rest of the world. The internationalism of the work loosens the ties which the men feel for the movements of their own countries, which at a time when working-class movements are essentially nationalist, makes the development of conventional unionism difficult. Within the last two years, the seamen and the International Transport Workers' Federation carried out the only recent large-scale international industrial action, in the boycott of flags of convenience (*FREEDOM* 6/12/58), but that was only necessary because there are sailors willing to work on such ships.

Continued on p. 4

David Pratt Defends his Act

THE trial of David Pratt, started last week in Pretoria but was adjourned for a fortnight by order of the judge so that the accused could be committed for observation at a mental institute. It might seem a little surprising that having kept Mr. Pratt in prison for the past five months the court should wait until now before ordering a mental report. However, the reports that have appeared of the two days hearing before the Supreme Court, indicate that whatever Pratt's family and their advisers may be trying to do to save him from the legal consequences of his actions, he steadfastly refuses to either apologise or recant. One of the witnesses, Professor Hirst, declared that "Pratt recognised that he was doing wrong when he shot Verwoerd. But in the terms of his belief he felt it was for the country's good, so he could set

this consideration aside." Pratt himself told the Court that he did not shoot at Verwoerd "as a person". "I shot at apartheid," he said, "the stinking monser of apartheid which was gripping South Africa by the throat."

In a further statement he said: "When police and doctors had finished with me and I was pushed into a cell, I had my best night's sleep for six years. From then until now I have spent my life in the isolation of a cell with short exercise breaks. Five months seldom seeing the sun—conditions I never before experienced. Yet these five months have been a hundred times happier than the past five years.

If you live in guilt you are never free. If you know you must do something and you don't do it you are not free."

Of his abnormalities (which we reported at length in last week's *FREEDOM*) he spoke "eloquently"

but added "To me my abnormalities do not represent insanity."

And he then told the Court what his message for South Africa was and had been since 1954.

"Every South African—Afrikaner, English-speaking, coloured, Indian, African and Malay—must play his part if we are to build South Africa, as I know can be done.

"South Africa must throw off the slimy snake of apartheid. Practical apartheid cannot go immediately, but the principle must go now."

Pratt then turned to the judge saying: "Thank you, my lord. That is all I have to say."

It is ironic that David Pratt is now in a mental Institute having his mind probed while the advocates of racial segregation, of apartheid, are occupying the armchairs of government in South Africa obliging others to carry out their inhuman and disgusting policies!

BOOK REVIEWS

THE GOOD SEED

MANY of the most important movements in English thought have begun at Oxbridge. There have been the first Oxford movement (led by Wyclif), the second Oxford movement (led by Wesley), and the Oxford Movement (led by Newman); then the Aesthetic movement (led by Wilde), and the Brotherhood (led by Morris and Burne-Jones); more recently the left-wing movement of the 'thirties, the "Movement" of the 'forties, and the New Left. At Cambridge there have been the pioneers of the English Renaissance and Reformation, and then the Cambridge Platonists; and during the reign of Victoria there was the Society of Apostles, which became perhaps the most influential movement of all.

The Society began as a small group of brilliant graduates and undergraduates—mostly from Trinity and King's—which carried on a semi-secret existence for more than eighty years, co-opting new members as it went along and aspiring to a Good Life in the tradition of Plato and Aristotle. The importance of this self-conscious and high-minded élite was two-fold. On the one hand it set the intellectual tone in Cambridge during a thoroughly philistine period in English history (great names like McTaggart and Moore, Whitehead and Russell, Lewis Dickinson and Forster are relevant here). On the other hand it happened that during the first years of this century the Society included a number of remarkable men who kept in touch when they began their separate careers in London, and who also married into one another's families. The result was the Bloomsbury group, and an absorbing account of its origins given by one of its few surviving figures in this book*.

It is easy to laugh at Bloomsbury now, after half a century, but there was something very fine about it at the time. It was based on the Strachey and Stephen families and their circle. The intellectual leadership was provided by Lytton Strachey, whose eighteenth-century turn of mind showed the general connection between Bloomsbury and the Utilitarians (a more direct connection was shown by Sidgwick, who belonged to the Society until his death in 1900 and was

also the last Utilitarian); the hospitality was provided by the children of Leslie Stephen. Thoby Stephen died young, but his sisters Vanessa and Virginia married his friends Clive Bell and Leonard Woolf. Round this nucleus were gathered Maynard Keynes, Duncan Grant, Roger Fry, Desmond MacCarthy, Arthur Waley, Edward Garnett, Edward Marsh, and many other men of formidable talents. Bloomsbury was in the Establishment, but not of it; it grew on a foundation of private incomes, but repudiated the system that gave rise to them; it came to dominate English high-brow taste—indeed its influence is still very much alive in the weekly and monthly press—but it carried the seeds of its own destruction. It was perhaps the last great effort of the Whigs, and it deserves a full-length history of its own.

What held the original group together, apart from personal friendship, was a common devotion to the same principles as the Society of Apostles at Cambridge—the pursuit of the true, the good and the beautiful, tenderness in private relationships, complete frankness in discussion, a sense of serious purpose, a sceptical attitude to religion, a progressive attitude to politics, a determination to consider anything new or strange with sympathy and without prejudice, a love of irony, and the outlook summed up by the famous motto *Only Connect*. The atmosphere of Bloomsbury before the Great War may be found in the novels and criticism of E. M. Forster and Virginia Woolf, and will no doubt be further illuminated in Leonard Woolf's second volume when it appears. Until then we must be content with what he has to say in this one.

Of all the group, Leonard Woolf had the most common sense. He was more sane and realistic—more ordinary—than the rest. Reason and passion, hope and pessimism are mixed in his character, just as his prose resembles roughly equally Bertrand Russell and George Orwell. *Sowing* describes his life until he left Cambridge for Ceylon in 1904. His family were prosperous Jews struggling from the business into the professional world. His father, Sidney Woolf, was a very successful barrister who died suddenly in 1892; his wife and children had to adjust themselves without warning to relative poverty, though they still belonged firmly to the London middle class. Leonard suffered under several incompetent teachers, but he learnt enough Latin and Greek to win a scholarship to St. Paul's School in Hammersmith, where he learnt enough more to win an exhibition to Trinity College. He spent five glorious years at Cambridge (on £120 per annum) and then at the age of 24 went to serve in the British administration in Ceylon, taking with him ninety volumes of Voltaire and a dog.

He rightly thinks little of his education—"What a strange, haphazard muddle it all seems to have been"—and bitterly recalls "the boredom of being taught by bored teachers". He survived because he was "the incorrigible, the born intellectual" with "a streak of obstinacy", and he escaped censure for being a swot because he was also good

at games. Astonishingly enough, he does not seem to have encountered a trace of anti-semitism during his childhood and youth. The death of his father when he was 11 and his uncomfortable position in a philistine environment forced him to develop mental toughness—"the carapace, the facade"—as "a protection to the naked, tender, shivering soul" at an early age. He declares, "I have never been able to detect in myself, even in childhood, a conscious sense of sin", but thinks he has always been a great coward; there is a fascinating description of the tremor which has always afflicted him in moments of crisis, like a stammer. We leave him as he leaves Cambridge, a sardonic but serious young man, with great ideals boiling under the surface, and good friends on every side.

His political attitude will no doubt be described in the next volume, along with the traumatic experience of Ceylon (including, he promises, the loss of his virginity at Jaffna!), the appearance of Bloomsbury, the foundation of the Hogarth Press, and the fostering of his wife's sanity and genius. But much is already clear—his religious attitude, for example. He calmly refused to attend synagogue at the age of 14, and his atheism has remained unaltered: "The only tolerable Gods were those of the Greeks, because no sensible man had to take them seriously." He accepts mortality, but lodges a protest against it: "I greatly resent the stupid wastefulness of a system which requires that human beings with great labour and pain should spend years in acquiring knowledge, experience, and skill, and then just when at last they might use all this in the service of mankind and for their own happiness, they lose their teeth and their hair and their wits, and are hurriedly bundled, together with all they have learnt, into the grave of nothingness."

Compare the end of *The Waves*. It is also clear that he has an excellent sense of humour, of the stoic brand, and he tells some delightful stories—of pulling Sir William Jenner's nose, of Mr. Floyd and the canary Chickabiddy, of Henry James and the leaning chair, and of his medical examination—as well as some sad ones of his first acquaintance with cosmic despair. And there are some charming pictures of the best side of late Victorian life (among a happy bourgeois family) together with some grim ones of its worst side (among the desperate poor); he sees both the good and the bad, and regrets the loss of one while rejoicing in the passing of the other. Like another, slightly younger Jew who also went to St. Paul's and rejected Judaism and became a Socialist and a publisher—like Victor Gollancz, Leonard Woolf has never been able to get out of his mind the sight of the London slums fifty or seventy years ago. The memory has driven them both on and served as a sort of yardstick of progress: insofar as those frightful places are no more, there has been progress (of course analogous places exist outside London or Britain, but both Woolf and Gollancz have spent much of their lives struggling against these as well). There are also strong affinities with George Orwell.

We cannot agree entirely with Leonard Woolf, but certainly this book makes it impossible not to have increased respect for him and for the creed he shared with his friends: "I think it to be, not merely my right, by my duty to question the truth of everything and the authority of everyone, to regard nothing as sacred and to hold nothing in religious respect." Best wishes for his eightieth birthday in November!

N.W.
**Sowing*, by Leonard Woolf (Hogarth Press, 21s.).

THE FABIAN STORY

THE influence of the early Fabians on British socialism can scarcely be exaggerated. When the Fabian Society was founded in 1884 the so-called 'socialist revival' in this country was just beginning. At that date, apart from the voluntary socialism of the Co-operative Movement which had all but succumbed to the blandishments of its Liberal well-wishers, British socialism was a small but revolutionary force. In the then current phrase it was a 'socialism of the street' in contrast to the 'socialism of the chair'—academic-sponsored social reformism. This socialism of the street had two wings: a Marxist wing led by Hyndman in the Social Democratic Federation and an anarchist wing whose chief protagonist was the libertarian, William Morris, and which, shortly afterwards, found organised expression in the Socialist League and Kropotkin's *Freedom* group. A revolutionary transformation of society appeared to be on the horizon—optimists hoped that it would conveniently coincide with the centenary of the outbreak of the French Revolution—and the great question for socialists was whether the English proletariat would choose the Marxist or the anarchist road to the millennium.

That it chose neither is in large part due to the work of the early Fabians. This group, led by the Webbs, Shaw, Wallas and Annie Besant, embraced in its first years a quota of anarchists—notably Charlotte Wilson, Kropotkin's collaborator in the foundation of *FREEDOM*. But the interests and outlook of the majority of this group of high-minded bourgeois soon led to a breach. The anti-parliamentarians in the Society were manoeuvred into resigning and the rest were left free to develop their own distinctive brand of socialism. The result was that, instead of a revolution, the year 1889 saw the publication of *Fabian Essays in Socialism*, a coherent expression of the new creed which was destined to dominate British socialist thought for the next sixty years and which exercised a major influence on Bernstein's 'revision' of Marxism a decade later. The classic Fabian *modus operandi* was 'permeation'—the tactic of nobbling anyone, Tory, Liberal or what-have-you, who had any influence in government. This tactic made no appeal to those in the Labour Movement, like Keir Hardie, who were eager to get 'independent' representation in Parliament. The Fabians, therefore, played little part in the actual moves which led to the formation of the I.L.P. and its offspring the Labour Party. Nevertheless, they did provide the basic elements in the programmes of these parties. The Labour politicians had essentially only one idea of their own—representation independent of the older

bourgeois parties; the rest of their ideas they bought at the Fabian shop.

The principal items in the package of goods were these:

(i) Acceptance of the bourgeois democratic State as a suitable instrument for the achievement and application of socialism. No essential change, the Fabians argued, was necessary in the apparatus of government. To break the State machine would be tantamount to political Luddism. All that was required was for the people to gain control of the machine through the ballot box and to perfect it for their own ends. This notion assumed that the democratic State could be identified with the community and made possible the conclusion that State ownership and control was the same as ownership and control by the community in the interests of 'the community as a whole'.

What Shaw called the 'resolute constitutionalism' of the Fabians brought them at one bound within the pale of the dominant British political tradition. Until then, British socialism, with the minor exception of certain left-wing Chartists, had pursued a political tradition of its own which was antipathetic towards the State. The earlier co-operative socialists had ignored the State and saw socialism as coming about through the spread of self-supporting communist communities or through the trade unions developing into huge national producers' associations. Of the Fabian contemporaries, the anarchists and semi-anarchists of the Socialist League wanted to abolish the State and to replace it by freely federated autonomous communes, while the Marxists of the SDF, remaining convinced of the need for a central political authority, wanted to transform the bourgeois State into a 'people's State'.

(ii) Rejection of revolutionary economics. The early British socialists had demonstrated how bourgeois economics with its cornerstone, the labour theory of value, could be turned into a weapon for use against the bourgeoisie. Marx completed the demonstration. In response to this turn of events, bourgeois economists ditched the classical theory and developed a new economics based on the concept of marginal utility. The Fabians followed the new line. They espoused the economics of utility and added to it a large dash of the Ricardian theory of rent. In their hands, economics was used to support the case for socialism but in the process of presenting that case the guts were cut out of it. The old revolutionary economics was essentially a theory of class exploitation. Fabian economics was simply an attempt to justify State ownership. The

class struggle had no place in the Fabian picture of the world: socialism was not a matter of classes; it was rather a question of the 'community as a whole' taking charge of what was rightfully its own. In this connection, the different wording of the broad objective of the Fabians in comparison with that of other socialists is significant. For revolutionary socialists the aim was 'the emancipation of labour through the abolition of the wage system and the socialisation of the means of production.' For the Fabians the aim, as stated in their Basis, was simply 'the emancipation of land and capital from individual ownership.'

(iii) The notion that socialism would be achieved through a process of gradual evolution. That socialism was the next step in the development of modern society, Sidney Webb, writing in the *Essays on the historical basis of socialism*, argued that socialist principles had been implicit in much of the development of social organisation in the 19th century. Successive regulation and limitation of private ownership in the course of the century had cut 'slice after slice' from the profits of capital and the incomes of rent and interest. 'Step by step' the political power of the country had been used for industrial ends. The logical end result would be the complete ownership and management of industry by the community, a consummation that would be achieved 'with no more dislocation of the industries carried on by (capitalist shareholders) than is caused by the daily purchase of shares on the stock exchange.' Not for a moment were the Fabians prepared to countenance the idea that State ownership might, in certain circumstances, be in the interests of the capitalist class: socialism was State intervention and that's all there was to it.

Acceptance of the bourgeois political structure, repudiation of revolutionary economics, insistence on the inevitability of gradualism. With these major ingredients in it, the Fabian brand of socialism proved attractive. For the first time in history socialism became respectable and within a few years of the publication of the *Essays* the Liberal politician, Sir William Harcourt, could safely declare: 'We are all socialists now.'

In the 20th century Fabianism was to be faced with some competition from other brands of socialism, notably syndicalism and guild socialism. But this competition resulted in only a modification of the wrapper. The basic goods remained the same and three-quarters of a century later we are living in a Britain shaped very much in the Fabian mould.

I have suggested that the British Labour Movement bought its doctrines at the Fabian shop. The Fabians, of course, offered the goods gratis. But a price, nevertheless, had to be paid and we are now paying it.

The Fabians succeeded in changing the whole character of socialism. For the 'socialism of the street' they substituted 'the socialism of the bureau'—the socialism of a bureaucrat anxious to enlarge his department. In modern parlance, they were the harbingers of managerialism. They valued above all social efficiency, an ideal which, if it has always found expression in socialist literature, had previously been subordinate to the more human values of freedom, mutual aid and social co-operation. The Fabians never tired of emphasising the economic advantages to be gained from a collectivist economy—the replacement of the 'anarchy' of competition by planned production and the elimination of wasteful unemployment and poverty through the establishment of a national minimum standard of living. The total effect of Fabian doctrines was thus to transform socialism from a moral ideal of the emancipation of the proletariat to a complicated problem in social engineering, making it a task, once political power had been won, not for the ordinary stupid mortal—Beatrice Webb's 'average sensual man'—but for the administrator armed with facts and figures provided by diligent research. It is small wonder that, nurtured for three generations on such fare, British socialism presents today a spectacle of spiritual exhaustion.

A charitable person might be prepared to forgive the Fabians for their part in leading us into a blind alley in which we find ourselves. True, there were those like William Morris warning the Labour Movement against taking the deceptively easy Fabian way. But the Welfare State is undoubtedly a better place, in many respects, than the 19th century capitalist State and perhaps we ought to be content at that.

It would, however, be easier to be charitable if one did not know that the early Fabians were also aware of the destination at which we have almost arrived. Writing in 1897 on 'The Illusions of Socialism', Shaw contrasted the enthusiasts who conceive the idea of socialism and who win converts by presenting civilisation as a popular melodrama, with the statesmen who in the 'raw reality' have to draw up concrete proposals, capable of being adopted by a real executive. "Out of the illusion of 'the abolition of the wage system'," he concluded, "we shall get steady wages for everybody and finally discredit all other sources of income as disreputable. By the illusion of the downfall of Capitalism."

Continued on p. 4

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

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

New Books . . .

Married to Tolstoy
Lady Cynthia Asquith 30/-
Atomic Radiation Dangers
Hugh William Heckstall-Smith 3/6
Brigitte Bardot and the Lolita
Syndrome Simone De Beauvoir 10/6

Reprints and

Cheap Editions . . .

The Call Girl H. Greenwald 3/6
Selected Tales Ivan Turgenev 12/0

Second-Hand . . .

Bernard Shaw Frank Harris 6/0
The Genius and the Goddess
Aldous Huxley 3/6
I Was a German Ernst Toller 3/-
Continental Stakes (1944)
Odette Koun 3/-
Last and First Men
Olaf Stapledon 4/6
Strait is the Gate André Gide 5/6
Commonsense and the Child
Ethel Mannin 5/6
Guild Socialism Re-Styled
G.D.H. Cole 5/-
News from Nowhere
William Morris 4/-
Russia and her Western
Neighbours (1942) G. W. Keeton
and Rudolf Schlessinger 4/-
Death Pays a Dividend Fenner
Brookway & Frederic Mullally 2/6
I want to be Like Stalin (1948)
B. P. Vesipov & N. K. Goncharov 4/-
The Trial of Mussolini (1943)
Cassius 2/6
France is a Democracy (1943)
Louis Lévy 3/-
Origins of our Time Karl Polanyi 4/-
Bavarian Story Ethel Mannin 2/6
Christ Stopped at Eboli
Carlo Levi 3/-
A Room with a View
E. M. Forster 3/-
All post free.

This is the last week at

27, RED LION STREET,

After September 29th we are at
17a, MAXWELL ROAD,
LONDON, S.W.6

17a Maxwell Road
London, S.W.6. England

Tel.: Renown 3736

AN ANARCHIST STATEMENT ON WAR

The Secretariat of the International Anarchist Commission in London, has issued the following text on war which will be delivered by the Japanese Anarchist Federation, affiliated to the War Resisters International, to their Congress to be held in India in December.

CHARACTERISTICALLY opposed to everything which oppresses and impedes creative impulses and the satisfaction of instincts which are not themselves oppressive, anarchists are even more categorically opposed to that extreme form of oppression which is suppression of human life, and in particular to war, which is organized suppression of human lives on a huge scale.

Their ideal being a feeling of brotherhood, or at least a practice of tolerance, among all human beings, and a dispensation under which individuals and societies could each peacefully attend the pursuits of their choice, anarchists condemn war as the most potent and violent denial of human unity, and as the most serious threat to the freedom and the very existence of individuals and societies voluntarily formed and maintained without compulsion.

Anarchists wish to emphasize that no helpful analysis of modern wars can be made without recognizing the overriding importance of the State as the very apparatus which forces war upon mankind, which waxes stronger with each war, and which can only justify its existence through fear of war and preparation for it.

Anarchists, few and scattered as they are today, are in no position to stop or hinder (to any significant degree) States from waging war on one another, and from causing death and destruction to an alien or their own population.

Realistically assessing the unprecedented might of modern States, and the difficulty of undermining them from within,

they will be encouraging him to give it a good display which may attract more readers among the growing numbers of office workers in the Red Lion Street area.

★
ALL correspondence from now on should be sent to our new address which is:

**FREEDOM PRESS,
17A MAXWELL ROAD,
FULHAM,
LONDON, S.W.6.**

Will all book and periodical publishers who send us review copies of their books, who exchange journals with FREEDOM please make the necessary alterations in their mailing lists so as to avoid any correspondence going astray. In spite of the efficiency of the post office some letters and parcels will go astray in the course of redirecting them, so please reduce the chances to a minimum by getting our address changed now.

And please remember that FREEDOM's bookservice will be as efficient as ever, and as necessary to the finances of FREEDOM PRESS as ever it was. Post your orders or phone them (RENowN 3736) and they will be posted (post free) by return!

Anarchists sadly recognize the illusionary character of hopes pinned on any particular class or set of people whose historic mission might be to bring peace to the world. The intelligentsia and the industrial proletariat are as a part of, and are forced to support, the war-like structure and policies of the State, as is any other class or social group.

Notwithstanding the argument that the final effect of pacifist campaigns in countries where they are allowed, with no counterpart in countries where they are not allowed, is likely to result in a net advantage to the States which disallow them. Anarchists recognize the value of such campaigns, if for no other reason than that their denunciation could be tantamount to an acceptance of the present status quo.

Anarchists admire, when the case demands it, the courage and spirit of sacrifice of some integral pacifists, but not sharing with them a religious faith, and being sceptical of heroic attitudes and missions, have no wish to dictate to any-

one the policies and practice of integral pacifism. They recognize every man's right to refuse to sacrifice his life for any cause, and at the same time recognize his individual right to defend himself against other men trying to impose upon him conditions which seem to him intolerable.

The threat of organized violence does not present itself in the same way to every man in every country, and the means at each man's disposal to defend himself against the threat and the reality of organized war, or even to further the cause of peace, also vary from country to country and from individual to individual. Anarchists therefore feel unable to lay down the lines of a general policy for a concerted effort, but leave it to each individual or group of individuals who cherish life, freedom, and ethical values, to act in what they judge to be the best possible way to preserve, defend and strengthen the things they cherish.

We do not consider, however, the pre-

sent outlook in entirely pessimistic terms, nor are we taking an attitude of unqualified despair. We think that the increasing violence deployed by the State against the individual may defeat its own ends. We feel that human nature silently, by devious and incalculable ways, will express its revulsion to the kind of life the State expects from it, and that the most hopeful answer to war is in people's refusal to believe either in it, or in the men who say it is just, necessary or inevitable.

Whatever the W.R.I.'s reaction to our position as stated above, and whatever their criticism thereof, we warmly salute their present Congress, express our appreciation of their intentions and efforts in trying to free humanity from the scourge of war, and wish them the highest success in their Congress, and in the new light, hope, and determination by which their work may be further inspired.

SECRETARIAT FOR THE INTERNATIONAL ANARCHIST COMMISSION,

THE MOVE!

By the time this issue of FREEDOM reaches subscribers in this country shall be on the last stages of moving from Holborn to Fulham. During the past month preparations have been made at our new premises receive us. Yards and yards of books have been assembled to use the library, the bookshop and FREEDOM PRESS. The office has been receiving a coat of paint and a dozen other jobs have been started. For several days, a van has been proceeding between the two premises trying the stock, the files of newspapers, the books and pamphlets which have accumulated during the last fifteen years. In many ways it has been an exciting operation for us all been done by volunteers giving up their time during the day in the evenings after work, to ensure that by the end of September shall be installed in our new premises and with a minimum of disturbance to the smooth day-to-day running of our various activities.

The work has been done by people who have accepted to carry out certain tasks, and without orders from above (since there is no one above among us), they have shouldered their responsibilities. While the shelves were being built at Fulham, down in the basement at Holborn the dusty job of sorting, packing and moving has proceeded apace. And then a fortnight ago the team of "removers" sprung into action with a borrowed van proceeded to move some 20 tons of books and papers Westwards! And as we write most of these papers have found their way onto the right shelves. Much still remains to be done, but we know that it will be done without the need for anyone in particular to give instructions for it to be done!

★
A LARGE number of readers in London have been accustomed to purchase their copies of FREEDOM at the Red Lion Street Bookshop. Some have now taken out subscriptions, others will be coming to see us at Fulham. But for those who cannot there are a number of newsagents in Central London who stock FREEDOM. A list is appended. But we would specially draw the attention of those readers to the fact that we have made arrangements with a newsagent situated on the opposite side of Red Lion Street to stock the paper each week. We hope that in this way therefore, we shall retain the goodwill built up during our fifteen years in the street. By purchasing their FREEDOM from him

VIEWPOINT

Anarchist and the H-Bomb

A CURIOUS feature of the anarchist movement of this country in recent years has been its equivocal attitude towards the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, and the various actions which have been taken in opposition to the preparation for nuclear war, the setting up of rocket sites, etc. Now no-one associated with the anarchist movement has ever advocated preparation for nuclear war as a "good thing"; no anarchists have temporized and approved of the holding of The Deterrent by NATO or some international body; all anarchists have condemned the continued existence of nuclear weapons. But the practical results of such condemnation from the anarchists has been smaller than might have been expected considering the anarchists' past record of militancy.

The anarchist movement is unique in its consistent advocacy of direct action as opposed to political action. Now there has been considerable direct action against the preparations for nuclear war in this country, but it has been the work of people who, generally speaking, have little connection with the anarchist movement. A number of individual anarchists have participated in such direct action, either by going the whole hog and landing in gaol, or by participating in the organization of a continuous campaign. But on the whole the participation of the anarchist movement such as it is, has been small.

Looking at FREEDOM over the past few years one may detect a tendency to be highly critical, even mocking, of many of the aspects of the whole broad campaign against nuclear weapons. The criticism has been reasonable, but there is a general impression of being critical from the outside rather than as participants in a campaign on various fronts.

Now I am not one to suggest that anarchists, because they are anarchists, ought to do this or that. I feel no personal remorse that I have not been lying down in front of lorries on rocket sites, or getting myself put in prison, or even marching in street demonstrations. I am sure the great majority of people who consider themselves to be anarchists likewise feel no remorse at their non-participation. What I am concerned to consider is why resistance to preparations for nuclear war has evoked so little practical response from the anarchist movement. The readership survey conducted by FREEDOM has indicated that there is an alive and interested body of anarchists in this country and that it has been considerably augmented by young adults over the post-war period. One might have expected that such people would have felt moved to do more about anti-nuclear activities than has in fact been the case. Anyone is entitled to disagree with my interpretation of the facts; but making such an assumption, I am going to ask what may seem a surprising question. Do anarchists regard the existence of the H-bomb as entirely deplorable considering the nature of modern society? (Before you reach for your pen to write to the Editors protesting at such a heretical question, do please read the reasons for asking such a question). If there is some substance in the idea that anarchists have reason for accepting the H-bomb in the hands of the power maniacs as a social fact which cannot be changed then it is not surprising that they are somewhat lukewarm about efforts to abolish the H-bomb.

warm about efforts to abolish the H-bomb.

War and the State

The distinctive contribution of anarchism to social theory is that anarchists insist that the State is a morbid excrescence on human society rather than a desirable social institution. While many social theorists, and notably Marxists, insist upon the economic motive as the prime force in social dynamics, anarchists insist upon the primacy of power. To anarchists the power structure of human societies is taken as the most important social fact. Anarchists can now point to the totalitarian régimes as examples of the economic structure being clearly subordinate to the power structure; also in the modern world, inter-State rivalries such as that between the U.S.S.R. and U.S.A. certainly cannot be explained in the economic terms of Marxism. Such rivalries are power-rivalries, and the existence of the "enemy" has among other functions, the important function of consolidating the power of the States over their own peoples.

The evolution of the National States is inextricably bound up with the institution of war. Although the army as a distinct entity may have a greater or lesser importance in the power structure of different States, it is nevertheless an indispensable adjunct of the State. Purely military States have been comparatively rare, but no State has come into being or maintained its existence without an army. Fortunate, important States like Switzerland and Norway have not had to have recourse to warfare in recent history to maintain their existence (Norway was a helpless battleground in the last war) but war and the threat of war has been the lifeblood of all States.

In the 19th century it was the pious hope of thinkers such as J. S. Mill and Herbert Spencer that warfare would be-

come outmoded by the steady growth of industry and commerce. Such utilitarian thinkers regarded warfare as part of the barbaric and romantic past, and took it for granted that it would have no place in a society dominated by hard-headed practical men intent upon leading the prosperous lives of well-organized citizens. But the weakness of these 19th century social philosophers of the optimistic rational school was that they did not in fact appreciate the true nature of the State. They looked upon the State as a social convenience, an institution of circumscribed function which should have the role of ensuring public order but not interfering with the lives of ordinary citizens.

We have seen, however, that the institution of warfare has flourished in the present century, and that the State has vastly augmented its power. The Liberal-pacifist wing in all countries has taken a tremendous beating and so has the socialist-internationalist element which sought to outlaw war by the international fraternity of working men. The irrationalists have been indecently triumphant all round. Far from being relegated to the barbaric past, warfare has become enshrined as the natural expression of advanced societies, and Liberals and Socialists have dropped their pacifist leanings.

The anarchists have always been pessimistic about the Liberal-pacifist hope of the State abandoning warfare as a permanent institution, for the anarchists have held that war is a necessary expression of the existence of the State. Like the Liberal-pacifist and socialist anti-war opposition, the anarchists' anti-war agitation has also been a huge failure. The power of the State has been maintained and grown, as so too has the institution of warfare become a steadily more important drain upon the national product of all countries. Our anti-war agitation has been utterly powerless.

Continued on p. 4



Change of Address:
FREEDOM PRESS
27 Red Lion Street London WC2
move on September 28 to
17a Maxwell Road Fulham London SW6

In London you can Buy Freedom at ...

Colin Cordell, 56 Red Lion Street, W.C.1.	And Pilgrim's Bookstall, School of Art, Charing Cross Rd., W.C.2. (10 p.m. to 1 am nightly).
Housman's Bookshop, 5 Caledonian Road, N.1.	And Hyde Park on Sunday afternoon (of fine).
I.L.P. Bookshop, 6 Endsleigh Street, W.C.1.	The following wholesalers handle FREEDOM and your newsagent might be persuaded to obtain it through them.
S. Solosy Ltd., 53 Charing Cross Road, W.C.2.	London
Herbert Straussberg, 10 Ooptic Street, W.C.1.	Boon & Sons, 36 Camden High St., N.W.1.
Herbert Cigar Stores, 39 Bloomsbury Way, W.C.1.	F. Duncumb & Sons, 173 Midland Road, E.10.
Librairie Parisienne, 48 Old Compton Street, W.1.	Edward Martin & Sins, 4 Durham Street, S.E.11.
Shelly's Library, 184 Drury Lane, W.C.2.	Toler Bros. Ltd., 130 Newington Butts, S.E.11.
J. Crace & Sons, 145 Fleet Street, E.C.1.	300 Brixton Road, S.W.9.
F. Street, 2 Borough Road, S.E.1.	George Vickers Ltd.,
Freedom Bookshop, 27 Red Lion Street, W.C.1.	

Towards Greater Fairness in Warfare

As a result of technical progress, certain novel features have been introduced into the institution of warfare in this century. It used to be so simple; the common people of opposing countries were rounded up and put into uniform by their masters and sent out to the slaughter for their country's glory, with such officers as felt that way, also partaking in the thrill of personal danger. The technical developments which had come about by the 1914 war produced two new elements; first, large numbers of young gentlemen were slaughtered as infantry officers alongside the common cannon-fodder, and this led to protests from men like Sassoon that the older generation were sending out "the flower of young manhood" to die for them, while they sat comfortably at home. Second, the invention of aircraft made it no longer completely safe to sit at home cheering on the young.

The continued development of aircraft went further in the removal of inter-class and inter-age-group differentials in warfare. In the 1939 war, all sections of the community were involved to a greater degree. The rich could no longer sacrifice the poor, or the old men and the women sacrifice the young men with complete impunity. The bombing aeroplane made warfare much fairer, if one can use such a word in so monstrous a context. Pacifists are apt to emphasise the shocking atrocity of the impartial bombing of civilians—but in the long run is it not fairer to involve the whole community as the price of war, rather than to select certain sections by class and age and to sacrifice them as on an altar?

And now we have a weapon of war which will not spare even cabinet ministers or brass-hats, if it is used at all. This seems to me a very satisfactory weapon from that point of view. I know that it may well extinguish most of the

life on this planet if it is used, but by its very catastrophic powers it may never be used. All the other weapons, from swords to T.N.T. could be used and were used with utter impunity and callousness by the power maniacs to the greater glory of their god, the State. Now they have got their ultimate weapon, and since the minor experiments of Hiroshima and Nagasaki they have been afraid to do more with it than rattle it in one another's faces. They know well enough that the one who presses the button annihilates himself.

The Dawn of a New Era?

I am not all that hopeful for the survival of life on this planet in the ensuing years. The rulers of this world have given ample demonstration of just how barmy they are, and if I get the four minute warning signal I shall not be very surprised. But I do think that there is some genuine hope that the H-war will never be launched. Now this is tantamount to saying that there will be no more big international wars, and if this is so a new era dawns for the world. When the "great Powers" have rattled their H-bombs for so many years without daring to use them, it may be that the bluff will wear thin and all will be forced to acknowledge that war is outmoded, not through sanity, or humanity or amity, but through sheer crude fear.

What then of the future of the State when it has lost its historic prop of war? The anarchists have tried to draw the teeth of the State by arousing men to withhold their allegiance from it—without success. It will be very curious if it proves to be the case that the scientists and technicians, far from drawing the beast's teeth will eventually have succeeded in choking it with cream.

Orwell, with characteristic pessimism, envisaged a future condition in which three States continued to maintain their existence by not using the atomic weapons at their disposal. Instead they played at serious warfare as a permanent condition using only conventional

high explosives, and were thus able to maintain their existence *ad infinitum*. This is of course, quite possible, and there is nothing inherently impossible in a future as depicted in "1984". But to take a more optimistic view, it may be that we have seen the final end of the era of warfare, thanks to the "blessing" of the H-bomb.

The Tree and its Fruit

The sentiments and reasoning expressed above may lead some to charge me with complacency in the face of the existence of the H-bomb in highly irresponsible hands. But I maintain that we must accept the H-bomb as a social fact. Nothing can now abolish the know-how which produced it, and if all stocks were abolished tomorrow, if ever there is another "conventional" war between the technically advanced States, the H-bomb will again be made—and used. Therefore, although it is entirely understandable, human and laudable to yell "Ban the H-Bomb!" it is not a realistic campaign. It is one step along the road of understanding to yell "Abolish War!" but we have seen that it is impossible unless we are prepared to—"abolish the State"—and we have seen how little we have achieved in past circumstances.

I am concerned to be neither Job's Comforter, or prophet. But I do think that the furtherance of our movement lies along the road of seeking to understand the implications of contemporary events as much as in plunging into energetic campaigns to abolish this or that. We will always have our energising myths; the natural and healthy reaction is to come out and yell against whatever threatens most obviously, like the H-bomb. Yet when people have yelled until their throats are hoarse and marched until their feet are sore, and the H-bomb is still there, their reaction should not be one of despair. The H-bomb is the inevitable result of the idea of the National State in a technically advanced world. The tree that bears the fruit is still supported by the vast majority of those who march from Aldermaston.

Direct Action & Violence

The Editors, FREEDOM, DEAR FRIENDS,

It is often asserted that the "Direct Action Non-Violent" methods tempt other people to use violence, and therefore are more evil than using violence oneself.

There are many degrees of violence from the scuffle, at one extreme, to the violence involving the use of nuclear weapons, and the preparation for their use, at the other extreme.

People employed at rocket bases, in any capacity, are helping to keep a base going. If the base were ever to be used, the bombs launched could kill about 3 million people. They are preparing for the ultimate violence, and absolve themselves by thinking that these weapons deter, and will never really be used. It will be too late for them to have second thoughts, after the order to fire has been given, and the chain reaction set in motion.

Direct action gives a direct and personal challenge to these workers, factory workers, manufacturing H-bombs, etc. and service personnel. In England, no

retaliatory violence, of any significant has occurred. In France and the U.S. the usual violence meted out to violent demonstrators, has been used by police and servicemen. But the usual response is respect, not violence.

Two examples which show how non-violent methods have challenged potentially violent people in a novel way happened during the Montgomery boycott. A white American hurled abuse at a negro participant, who smiled back. Reporters photographing the former returning the smile, and asked him why he smiled when he had to hate a man if he did not fight back. The second example, was when the Klux Klan marched into the quarter to intimidate the negroes, beat up some of their number, negroes, instead of hiding in fear, came out onto the streets, dressed in their clothes, and singing joyfully, and lit up their homes. The K.K.K. was nonplussed, and marched to the end of the street, and dispersed without hurting anyone.

I applaud FREEDOM for publishing facts about direct action and non-violence, for the general press almost ignores these demonstrations.

Yours sincerely, D. H. BARAS

The Fabian Story

Continued from p. 2

talism we shall turn whole nations into Joint Stock Companies; and our determination to annihilate the bourgeoisie will end in making every workman a bourgeois gentilhomme. By the illusion of Democracy, or government by everybody, we shall establish the most powerful bureaucracy ever known on the face of the earth . . .

Clearly, the Fabian story is worth telling in full and worth pondering on. All I can say of Miss Fremantle's book* is that it is not this. As historical chit-chat, culled from secondary sources, about the leading Fabian personalities, it is quite amusing and occasionally the anecdotes are very revealing. For instance: "The Webbs used every occasion to further their schemes. For example, when they went one Good Friday to hear Parsifal at Covent Garden, they met Lloyd George and Herbert Samuel during the long intermission. Asked next day how he had enjoyed the opera, Sidney said, 'We had a most enjoyable time. Our discussion with Samuel was enlightening on the striking tendencies of sickness in pregnancy.'"

A book for the bedside table, not the student's library. Small facts Miss Fremantle often gets wrong: the big facts have escaped her entirely.

GEOFFREY OSTERGAARD.

*This Little Band of Prophets: the Story of the Gentle Fabians. By Anne Fremantle. (Allen & Unwin, 28s.).

No Stopping Now Please!

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!

WEEK 38	
Deficit on Freedom	£760
Contributions received	£641
DEFICIT	£119
September 9 to September 15	

London: F.W.T. 10/-; Shoreham: M. & D. 2/6; Leighton Buzzard: A.E.S. £1/1/0; London: "C" 5/-; London: Anon. 1/3; Shepton Mallet: C.L.N. 2/6; Surrey: F.B.* 5/-; London: Anon. 2/6; London: Anon. 1/-; London: J.S.* 3/-; Los Angeles: Group Labour Day Picnic £11/18/0; Tampa: A.C. £1/1/0; Tampa: A.B. £1/1/0; Leicester: R.H. 4/3; London: A.D. £1/0/0; London: I.C. 2/6; Bolton: R.T.S. 10/-; Petworth: C.B. 16/-; London: E.W. 5/-; London: Anon. 7/-; Dovercourt: L.C.W. £1/0/0; Wolverhampton: J.G.L.* 5/-; London: Anon. 5/-; Birmingham: G.O. £1/0/0; Swansea: R.R. 5/-; Shoreham: P.P. 11/-.

Total	27 19 6
Previously acknowledged	613 3 3
1960 TOTAL TO DATE	£641 2 9

*Indicates regular contributor.

And don't forget to send your Contributions to Our New Address

The Seamen's Strike

Continued from p. 1

The London magistrate who first condemned strikers to prison insisted that they were in a different category to other workers, while union officials, in supporting this attitude and their own refusal of a shop steward system have commented that "you cannot have a ship run by a committee". What they mean is precisely the opposite, that a ship is the most natural thing in the world to be run by a committee, and that they are doing their best to prevent such committees being formed.

Unfortunately, the dead hand of the official union hangs heavily over the minority of seamen who are actively trying to better their conditions. No one can doubt that if a union were to call for a strike: it would be obeyed; but just because there is a union which would rather dissolve itself than take militant action, and doesn't show any sign of doing that, the militants are finding it harder than ever to generalise their strike. Further, the sympathetic action which would be taken to support an official strike has been more or less absent in this case.

The National Seamen's Reform Movement are behind the strike, and so far attempts to label them as communists or Trotskyists have misfired. On the whole the serious press, despite condemning the methods of direct action, has been forced to admit that they have a sound case. While it seems that their object is to conquer rights equal to those of other unionists, they are being forced to use revolutionary means. It will be a pity if, as often happens, the militant spirit and organisation fades away as soon as the immediate object is achieved. The Reform Movement will have a tough fight against bosses, State and unions, but the major obstacle will be the apathy of the majority of seamen who are apparently content with low wages, bad conditions and a bosses union.

Book on Africa

AFTER INDEPENDENCE, WHAT?

PERHAPS, at long last, Africans and coloured people everywhere are having doubts about African Nationalism. One should not get too excited, but despite pacifist praise for non-violent men like Nkrumah (the new African imperialist), questions are being asked. What after Independence?

This, the first pamphlet in the series to have appeared, is by a group of French-speaking Africans called *Présence Africaine*. After a good and concise summing up of the evils of Capitalism throughout the world, and in Africa in particular, the authors demand that Africa should in future be Socialist when it is independent. But, they ask,

"Does independence mean the same as freedom? No, for Africa to be free and independent Socialism must be coupled with democracy: 'Socialism depends on democracy: it depends on a government elected by the people of the country, which will seek to satisfy the needs of the people, and which, if it fails, can be criticised by the people. Unless there is a freely-elected government, a country cannot have Socialism'."

Thus such an essentially unfree institution as government is accepted without question in the fight for freedom. In other words we have advocacy of State Socialism (a juxtaposition of words as ridiculous as *Young Conservatives* or *Revolutionary Government*). How sorrowful it is to read the authors arguing that "The first need" of a newly independent country "is money".

When India achieved independence, at least Gandhi gave the struggle a meaning and value to all men. Although no very great progress was made in India with the coming of self-government, fresh, original ideas were forthcoming. Many Indians demonstrated very great human courage, exciting social action was taken. But in Africa, not one original, fresh, exciting idea has been voiced. The heights of wisdom are the boring, dead ideas of Nationalism, utterly useless and futile. This is not just the fault of imperialists but of Afri-

*AFRICA. WHAT AFTER INDEPENDENCE? By *Présence Africaine*, 6d (Obtainable from The Committee of African Organisations, 200 Gower St., London, N.W.1.)

cans trying to behave like white men.

In Africa, perhaps Kenyatta and Mpathelele stand alone as original thinkers, and both are now trapped in politics. In Africa, where independence could mean a birth of a truly progressive and Socialist society, we get the very best brains chiming away about democracy and Socialism as if the last fifty years of history had never happened. It is tragic, especially to those of us who are admirers of Negro culture, to see men of the quality of Huddleston and Michael Scott praising Nkrumah and his corrupt régime. If members of the Opposition in this country were arrested there would be an outcry from the progressives, but in Ghana such action is seen as mildly disturbing.

It may be that the doubt that is starting will mount and the next few years will see some strong minds appear with worthy African thoughts behind them.

AMONG the books on Africa which are appearing in such numbers nowadays, are some that are nothing more than a waste of time and money. *Curtain-up on South Africa*, by Garry Allighan (Boardman, 21s.) is one of them.

Garry Allighan, an ex-Labour M.P., and now a journalist, has, he believes, exposed the situation in South Africa for the very first time; he sees himself as lifting the curtain on the play that is being acted at the Southern extremity of Africa. Thirteen years in the Union have given this ex-politician many warped ideas about the African population (the Bantu as he chooses to refer to them) and one need say no more than that they approximate to the views held by the Afrikaner Nationalist. As such they are quite unsupportable. One has only to read books dealing sympathetically with the problems of South Africa, books by Huddleston, Paton or Mpathelele, all South Africans by birth, to realize that Mr. Allighan has raised no curtain on South Africa but has vainly tried to cover up the essential baseness of apartheid; all he has done is to frighten away anyone who might have felt the Afrikaner type could be considered as a rational character.

R.J.W.

What's in a Name?

To the Editor, FREEDOM,

DEAR SIR/COMRADE/FRIEND, May I point out that the J.R. of London (Sept. 17th) is not this J.R. of London and any resemblance is purely coincidental.

May I also, whilst we're at it, point out that the George Woodcock who pamphlets ore on FREEDOM's list is not the new secretary of the T.U.C., the Tony Gibson who speaks to L.A.G. is not the Tony Gibson of the B.B.C., and that T.S. (of the Pratt case) is not Tony Tram Shandy.

Life gets complex, don't it? London, Sept. 19. J(ACK) R(OBINSON)

Meetings and Announcements

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP and MALATESTA DEBATING SOCIETY

IMPORTANT

MEETINGS WILL BE HELD in basement, 5, Caledonian Road, N.1. (near King's Cross Station) at 7.30 p.m. All Welcome.

SEP. 25.—Philip Holgate on ANARCHISM: QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

London Anarchist Group AN EXPERIMENT IN OFF-CENTRE DISCUSSION MEETINGS

1st Thursday of each month at 8 p.m. At Jack and Mary Stevenson's, 6 Stainton Road, Enfield, Middx. Last Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. At Dorothy Barasi's, 45 Twyford Avenue, Fortis Green, N.2. 1st Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. At Colin Ward's, 33 Ellerby Street, Fulham, S.W.6.

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