

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"Man seeks freedom as the magnet seeks the Pole or water its level, and society can have no peace until every member is really free."

—JOSIAH WARREN.

Vol. 19, No. 3

January 18th, 1958

Threepence

## GOVERNMENT BY STEALTH

WHEN heads roll in the Kremlin the world pays due recognition to the ability of totalitarians to keep dissensions secret. Never a top official topples from the higher echelons of the Russian Communist Party but a flood of speculation is kindled from beneath howling headlines. What sinister, ruthless struggle for power is going on behind the iron walls of that grim citadel in Moscow? the correspondents are not to know.

But nobody expects to be told. The almighty leaders of total states are accountable to no-one. They make the decisions and the citizens are to do it and that is all as it should be. The régime is running true to form.

In a democracy, however, all decisions of policy and practise should, according to theory, be the result of exhaustive public debate. This is what Parliament is there for—to provide the means for representation of the people—the Sovereign People—to make sure that only the wishes of the people are translated into Government policy. Secret decisions and policies arrived at by a select conclave of the ruling party are utterly alien to the true spirit of democracy.

### One-Party Rule

Yet remarkably few, even among the politically enlightened, are prepared to admit that that is precisely how this country—and every other—is governed. Among the politically enlightened, of course, the anarchists are alone in not seeking power. All those on the political band-wagon realistically recognise that government can govern only by wielding its power irrespective of the opinion of the Opposition, but since they have ambitions of becoming the Government themselves, there is no desire to give the game away before they get to office.

But in fact, what have we in Britain but one-party rule? Clearly the party with a majority in Parliament can make decisions and carry them through whatever the official Opposition says. There is nothing the Opposition can do about any policy of the Government since, by virtue of its own constitutional position it can only oppose by constitutional means. And these the Government can over-ride by constitutional means. In its own interest the Opposition cannot appeal to the country to take unconstitutional

### Witness Sent to Prison

A WITNESS who for two days had refused, on religious grounds, to give evidence at the Central Criminal Court was last night sent to Brixton Prison by Judge Block. Peter Michael Alexius Lawless, a prosecution witness, was asked by the prosecution on Wednesday to identify a signature. He refused, quoting St. Matthew: "Judge not that ye be not judged," and saying that he would give no evidence that might result in the conviction of a fellow-being.

Yesterday Lawless was again called to the witness-box, and again refused, saying: "I will not bear witness against my neighbour." The Judge said that Lawless would be kept in custody until he was prepared to reconsider his decision.

Just before the Court rose he was again brought before the Judge, who asked whether he was feeling disposed to alter his opinion. He replied: "No, your honour." The Judge then told him: "I shall commit you to Brixton Prison and I shall ask for arrangements to be made for the doctor to have a talk with you."

—Manchester Guardian, 20/12/57.

action, or its own safeguards are destroyed.

We remember for example the haste with which Labour toned down its attacks upon the Eden Government after the Trafalgar Square meeting which ended up in a mass demonstration outside Downing Street against the Suez campaign of October '56. The Labour Party from then on restricted their opposition to Parliamentary debate. No more mass meetings! It never does for the people—the Sovereign People—to get the idea that they can do things for themselves.

### Nobody Knew!

And what about secrecy? Here again our democracy does not lag far behind the Bolsheviks, as the resignations of Mr. Thorneycroft and his buddies showed us last week.

For all that the public knew, Messrs. Macmillan and Thorneycroft were as one in their ideas on how to do the people. And for all that the smart journalists with their ears to the ground and their eyes to the keyholes knew also, there was no rift in the Government lute.

The news of Thorneycroft's resig-

nation hit the headlines like a bomb-shell, as the saying goes, on January 7. On January 6 *The Times* (*The Times*, mark you!) saw fit to tell the top people of this country: "Coolly and firmly backing a courageous Chancellor of the Exchequer, he [the Prime Minister] has at last brought the inflationary part of the wage spiral within some fair hope of a halt."

Within a few hours of that appearing in print, our most prime of Prime Ministers was coolly and firmly accepting Mr. Thorneycroft's resignation, over an alleged quibble about £50 million pounds—in a Budget of £5,000 million!

There was clearly much more than that to it, but the bemused, beguiled and bewildered public have still not been told what it was really all about. The story now dribbles out that the first threat of resignation came from Thorneycroft a fortnight before he handed in his chips. And nobody breathed a word to the people—in whose name all this highly important stuff is carried on.

What is the classic definition of democracy? "Government of the People . . ." Oh, well, that's as far as we need go.

## Rouble Diplomacy

SINCE the end of the war American aid to other countries has reached a total of \$50 billion (an American billion is a thousand million), which is a considerable number of dollars. This financial help to under-developed and economically weak nations has been one of the cornerstones of U.S. foreign policy but unfortunately for the U.S. government it has not paid the dividends expected of it.

The primary object of the policy has always been to make friends and influence people, leaving out other more charitable motives, and in this instance it has been almost impossible to achieve both at the same time, in fact the American attitude towards those receiving her bounty has usually been such as to achieve neither. The main reason for this is obvious: the recipient has always known that there were strings attached to the aid, either direct or implied; not necessarily a treaty or pact, but something like the necessity for taking sides if the occasion should arise . . . A secondary reason would seem to be the remarkable lack of tact, both in general and in particular, which has characterised the American method of distributing largesse.

In recent years the USSR and her satellites have also started upon a programme of "philanthropy" to needy nations. The technique has varied from that employed by the U.S., and considering the relative "investment" has been far more successful. Since roughly 1953 Russia has committed herself to \$2 billion (or its equivalent in roubles), a mere twenty-fifth of America's contribution, but would appear to have achieved a great deal of influence in so doing.

Whereas the U.S. has tended to make outright grants of dollars, the USSR has made judicious loans at moderate rates of interest of 2½% or 3% spread over as much as 30 years. This has given the receivers of the loans the impression that they are "paying their way" and not just getting a backhander from a benefactor with too much money and doubtful motives. Russia has also made use of the barter system on what would seem to be advantageous terms for all concerned; the effect is often that the economy of the other country becomes more dependent upon Russian trade. More important still has been the fact that the USSR has not attempted to mix politics with economics in any direct way. Russian foreign relations methods are years in advance of those used by America.

### America's Shifting Policy in Asia

## PERSONS AS PAWNS

IN this society money will buy practically anything or anyone. This lamentable fact is seen at its worst when it conditions the actions of nations.

Economically the wealthy nations are in strong bargaining positions and exercise this strength with a view to winning the allegiance of smaller, less rich nations.

Most small nations can never hope to repay economic aid directly and so have to recompense their benefactors in some other profitable way. The bestseller for the small country to-day (when there is no oil or some other form of loot) is geography. Strategically situated, economically poor countries, which would otherwise be forgotten, can always strike a bargain with one of the large power blocs.

While the powerful nations are competing for "zones of influence", leaders of under-developed countries can, and do, exploit the situation in order to extract some of the gravy for themselves. Why not? We might reasonably be asked. Because they cease to be independent and become part of the struggle between the power-crazy mammoth states.

In the course of the scheming which accompanies these deals many ordinary people suffer. The official argument put forward by the countries supplying the aid is that the people derive "economic benefit" which they would otherwise not have had. As always this is only part of the bargain and in any case can be withdrawn when economic cuts have to be made or, when the receivers are no longer of any political value.

An example of this changing attitude is reported in the American press this week where incidentally the predicament of a few hundred Japanese fishermen imprisoned in

South Korea hitherto given very little, if any, publicity, is exposed.

For over five years now an "ever-increasing" number of Japanese fishermen have been languishing in Syngman Rhee's jails, held as "pawns in a diplomatic stalemate" created by Rhee's hatred of the Japanese. The fishermen have violated the "Rhee line" set up in 1952 extending Korean sovereignty a minimum sixty miles off shore.

Koreans have no reason to feel friendly towards the Japanese Imperialists who occupied the country and exploited the people. But neither have they reason to support the bloodthirsty Syngman Rhee. The Japanese fishermen are no more or less guilty for their Government's methods than the Koreans themselves are for the totalitarian tactics of Rhee.

These fishermen have been held for years in prison, deprived of their jobs and families so that Syngman Rhee could attempt to force the Japanese Government to hand over "40 years' back payment" for Korean workers exploited by Japanese companies during Japan's long occupation. How much of this forty years' payment if made would be handed over to the Korean workers?

No one will doubt that Japanese companies exploited Korean workers when it is known that they so successfully exploit their own. The tragedy is that Koreans and Japanese are being exploited all the time in the interests of their respective governments.

Over the years Japan has replied to Rhee's policy of imprisoning 1,720 Koreans, and the fact that the United States now chooses to break the deadlock by issuing subtle threats to Rhee is not because American administrators feel sorry for all the people held in prison but is due in part to her diplomatic relations with Japan and the need

to have her as an ally against the Soviet Union.

There must be many protests being made to the Japanese Government by its own people and it probably seems a suitable time to bring the issue of the Japanese prisoners to a head. In this way all Governments use their peoples.

The following report indicates America's attitude to S. Korea, which has served the United States well. Millions of Koreans lost their lives and many who were left lost their homes in a senseless struggle. A few weeks ago we discussed the homeless and hungry children in Korea whose welfare is left in the hands of anyone who has enough pity to look after them. The U.S. however, decides to cut her aid. Can it be that South Korea at this time is not quite as valuable as it was? At the moment Japan has to be wooed and as always in the power political struggle some people have to be sacrificed. Make no mistake, the U.S. does not want to lose its grip on South Korea, but that ravaged country will have to bow to the superior bargaining power of its boss:

Last week the tortured road to a détente of some sort seemed finally open again. Japan had dropped its demands for compensation for properties Korea had seized after liberation. Rhee had apparently concluded that he had extracted all the concessions he was going to get. The U.S. had warned him that it could not support him in "unreasonable" claims against Japan. Furthermore, with U.S. aid to Korea scheduled for a cut this year, Rhee needs money, and Japan hinted that reparations might take the form of economic aid. As a starter, Japanese and Korean diplomats met in Tokyo to initial an agreement for the return of their respective prisoners. True to form, the Koreans deliberately kept the Japanese Foreign Minister waiting for nearly twelve hours before they showed up to sign.

It is very well known that Russia is building a steel plant at Bhilai in India, whereas the other three steel plants being built by Britain, West Germany and America in India are seldom mentioned. In Ceylon, where a Soviet delegation is discussing the development of the sugar and textile industries, oil prospecting and hydro-electric schemes, £7 million has been received from the Soviet bloc, mostly from China which needs Ceylon's rubber. The West will not longer invest in Ceylon for fear of nationalisation threatened by the Bandaranaike government.

Egypt received Czech arms in 1955 as part of an £85 million barter and her cotton crop is now mortgaged to the Iron Curtain for years to come. Syria has an agreement with the USSR for over £200 million of aid on 19 different projects of their own choosing, although Russia can veto any of these if she wishes. Yugoslavia has reached agreement for £175 million of non-military aid, but this must be regarded as a political manoeuvre. (The Yugoslavs have discovered, as have other recipients of USSR aid, that the quality of some of the goods supplied is far below reasonable standard).

Afghanistan has received £50 million in credits toward purchases of arms and development of hydro-electricity, grain elevators, a flour mill and a bakery. Also the Russians have paved the streets of Kabul, a gesture of enormous popularity and low cost—refused by the U.S. on the grounds that it was economically unproductive. Indonesia is on the brink of an arms deal with the USSR in view of U.S. hesitancy, and has already bought 4,500 Russian jeeps. Burma has bartered rice for cement and although it was said to be an unsatisfactory deal at the time is about to repeat the operation to the extent of £10 million.

IN this column on 27th April last, we wondered whether there was any connection between President Eisenhower's intestinal disorders and the vacillations of American policy, between the sinister state of Mr. Dulles' stomach and his dyspeptic political utterances, or between the obstruction of Sir Anthony Eden's bile duct and the Suez adventure.

The same thought has struck the medical profession, and in an article in *The Practitioner* for December 31st, Dr. H. J. C. L'Etang declares that ill health had "significantly affected" the judgment of a number of British and American statesmen. He relates the various ailments that President Woodrow Wilson was suffering from before his death in 1921 to the "poor judgment, inflexibility of mind, and dour obstinacy" which characterised him from 1918 onwards, and reminds us that at the time of many fateful decisions and conferences during the last war Franklin D. Roosevelt's mistakes were those of a dying man.

Dr. L'Etang says that the publicity surrounding the illnesses of President Eisenhower and Sir Anthony Eden, which many unthinking people condemned as "an unwarranted intrusion into the sickroom and a sign of morbid curiosity" served to remind us that the statesman "is liable to suffer from the same diseases as others in the same age group. This lack of publicity in the past has resulted in the public being unaware that statesmen have continued in office when seriously incapacitated". There is good evidence, he suggests, that the "guilty men" of the nineteen-thirties (he cites the cases of Ramsay MacDonald, Stanley Baldwin and Neville Chamberlain), were "sick men rather than sinners".

Another example he gives, is that of Ernest Bevin, the Labour Government's Foreign Minister. In 1947 at a conference in Moscow, Bevin had a heart attack, and he was so ill during another international meeting that he had to be carried into the conference room. "Finally he was forced to spend each week-end in hospital". He resigned in March, 1951, and died a month later. It needs little imagination to connect Bevin's physical condition with his policies, and in particular his obduracy on the question of Palestine.

The point of the whole question of course, is the fantastically inflated scale of the activities of politicians. The illnesses that may be unavoidable personal tragedies may become immense public calamities. Should politicians have medical examinations, like engine drivers? *The Manchester Guardian*, discussing Dr. L'Etang's article points out that in any

## FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

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

### New Books . . .

Certain Women Erskine Caldwell 15/-  
Nature is Your Guide H. Gatty 16/-  
Plays John Whiting 21/-

### Penguins and

### Cheap Editions . . .

More from the Primeval Forest  
Albert Schweitzer 2/6  
The Small Back Room  
Nigel Balchin 2/6  
The Echoing Grove  
Rosamund Lehmann 3/6  
Sweet Thursday John Steinbeck 2/6  
Still Digging  
Sir Mortimer Wheeler 2/6

### Second-Hand . . .

Escape from Paradise  
(ed. C. A. Smith) 5/-  
A New Romantic Anthology  
Read, Comfort, etc. 5/6  
Seven Fallen Pillars Jon Kimche 3/6  
Assignment in Utopia  
Eugene Lyons 4/6  
The Condition of the Working  
Class in Britain (1933)  
Allen Hutt 4/-  
Mind at the End of its Tether  
H. G. Wells 4/-  
The Last of the Provincials: The  
American Novel 1915-25  
Maxwell Geismar 6/-  
The Town and the City  
John Kerouac 6/-  
Velvet Studies C. V. Wedgwood 3/6  
The Conquest of Happiness  
Bertrand Russell 4/-  
Before the Deluge Mark Aldanov 3/6  
Britain Discovers Herself  
Donys Val Baker 2/6  
America our Ally  
H. N. Brailsford 2/-  
A Policy for British Agriculture  
Lord Addison 3/-

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**

# POSTSCRIPTS AND FOOTNOTES

case "a warped mind can be much more dangerous than a disordered digestion, but it is usually more difficult to detect". A case in point, from eight or nine years ago was cited by Alex Comfort:

"An elderly company promotor who had held Cabinet office in one of the Dominion Governments was charged with murder. . . . He had no criminal record, and his sanity was not suspect. It appeared in the course of the trial that he had suborned two thugs to decoy and murder a young man of whom he was jealous, the jealousy being in regard to a middle-aged woman whom the victim had met three times only. No defence of insanity was advanced, but subsequent psychiatric examination revealed a whole system of insane delusions, some of them of long standing. In political and business life the man had been rude, forceful, overbearing and suspicious, but he had apparently been accepted by his colleagues. During the trial he remained confident, resourceful, and perfectly able to organise his defence, as he had done the crime."

The interest of this case, as Comfort says, lies in the extent of unrecognised mental disorder. "Had this man remained in politics, and reached high office, or had his paranoid ideas taken a turn against a national rather than a personal enemy, his mental state might never have been called in question". It makes you think.

★

### Children's Books

IN *Prejudice Towards Roses* (FREEDOM 21/12/57) we discussed what is wrong with children's books. The question was also raised in *Time* (USA) for 23/12/57. In America, apparently, some 2,000 are on the shelves each year (the same num-

ber as here), while the total output is fabulous. "This year the presses are turning out more than 350 million copies of juvenile books—nearly one in three of all books published in the U.S." Many of the most famous American publishing firms rely for their income on the children's market—titans leaning on tots, as *Time* puts it.

"Whatever is wrong—or right—with children's books is mainly the responsibility of 90-odd editors, only a dozen of whom are men. A literary agent who has worked long in this field says that 'with a few possible exceptions, all of them are slightly nuts'. . . . There appears to be a bond of rare sympathy between them and such organised groups as the American Library Association. . . . Since the librarians control the bulk of institutional book buying in the U.S., and some publishers count on school and public libraries to buy as much as 80% of their children's books, the danger is that juvenile stories may be written for the approval of librarians, not children."

There are, says *Time*, "still plenty of Trimmers trimming away, seeing to it that the books are inoffensive to one and all. . . . Critics charge that the message in contemporary juveniles is one of tame social 'adjustment' and of a vast undifferentiating tolerance. 'Love thy neighbour,' they say, has been replaced by 'Love that minority'. Books by the hundred set out to show that 'the little Zulu or heathen Chinese is absolutely like you and me'."

At this point however, I thought of Little Rock and of the 24 Americans whose passports have been withdrawn, and wondered whether it was not a generation or so too soon to make that particular criticism.

Some further reflections on the subject

come from another C.W., Mr. Colin Welch, in a very funny article in the January issue of *Encounter*, about 'Noddy' and his creator Enid Blyton. Miss Blyton, whose income is estimated at £50,000 a year, has such a fantastic output ("In 1955 she clocked up 59 titles, more than a book a week") that suspicions have grown up that she must in fact be a kind of electronic writing machine. This, however is not so. "Stories," she says, "flow from my imagination like cotton from a reel".

Her unique characteristic, Mr. Welch thinks, is that she is the first successful writer of children's books to write actually below her audience.

"Her Noddy books also fail to stretch the imagination of children, to enlarge their experience, to kindle wonder in them or awaken their delight in words. They contain nothing incomprehensible even to the dimmest child, nothing mysterious or stimulating. They have no 'contact with excitation'; they never suggest new and exciting fields to conquer. By putting everything within reach of the child mind, they enervate and cripple it".

Noddy himself, Mr. Welch characterises as a "witless, spiritless, snivelling, sneaking doll" whose imbecility is almost indecent:

"Though utterly resourceless himself, Noddy is never in trouble for long. There is always somebody to run to, someone to whine and wail at. The machinery of benevolent authority (Big Ears) or of the state (Mr. Plod) can always be invoked to redress the balance between cowardice, weakness, and inanity on the one hand, and vigour, strength, and resource on the other".

Mr. Welch has discovered that "Miss Blyton was a strong supporter of Suez"

## The Moscow-Trained Can Revolt

CHILD OF THE REVOLUTION by Wolfgang Leonhard. (Collins, 25s.).

THIS book is the story of the author's childhood and youth in the Soviet Union, and later on his work as a party official in East Germany after 1945.

The author was the son of an active German communist, who after escaping from Germany to Sweden, decided in 1939 to make her home in the USSR, taking her son with her.

From the very first moment therefore, he was in a privileged position in a Communist society, living in a home for German and Austrian refugees which was used as a "showplace" for visiting delegations. When the fortunes of the children's home began to decline, he managed to enrol as a student, and so maintain a position for himself. After the German army invaded Russia, the Germans living in the Soviet Union were deported eastwards. Good fortune led to Leonhard being recognised for his intelligence and achievements in study as being potentially useful in a political rôle. He was sent to the Comintern school for foreign students, and after its dissolution became a member of the "National Committee for Free Germany" organised by the Russian government.

In 1945 when the Red Army occupied Eastern Germany, leading members of the Committee were flown into Berlin to see that the government was organised according to Russian plans, and Leonhard was appointed to the secretariat of the Socialist Unity Party.

In 1948, a growing feeling of doubt as to the correctness of the Stalinist position on many matters, which is described in more detail below, reached a crisis with the outlawing of Yugoslavia from the Cominform group, and he eventually left Germany and fled to Belgrade.

The first part of the story has some terrible aspects. The writer was a school-boy during the period of the great purges. During this time his mother simply disappeared, and not until several months later did he even hear from her, and then it was from a prison camp in Siberia. His reaction to this event, after the initial shock, was to justify the action of the government. He, and friends who had suffered in similar ways convinced themselves that the purges were necessary from the point of view of state security, and that it would be wrong to attack the whole system of police security because it made occasional mistakes.

It is easy to imagine a normal child who would become very disturbed, and hate the whole system if such a thing happened, and one clearly recognises the psychopathic elements of the children under the Nazi régime who denounced parents to the police, but it is difficult to fully appreciate what sort of things were going on in the minds of these children (and of course the adults as

well), holding slightly privileged positions, who could see their parents, friends and the whole staff of their school arrested on charges which were well known to be false, and yet continue to be outwardly fairly normal, to carry on making progress in their studies, and even to be enthusiastic about communism, the Russian government, and discussion of political matters.

In his introduction to the book, Edward Crankshaw (the *Observer's* Russian expert) expresses the opinion that the adolescent emerging from a Russian school is rather less highly conditioned than the average English Public School product, and considerably less so than that of an American High School.

Perhaps this indicates that a most valuable social study would be those aspects of life under a totalitarian government which remain normal, or rather adapt themselves so as to preserve their ultimate functions, rather than to continually think in terms of the abnormal aspects, with which everyone by now should be thoroughly familiar.

It is significant that the type of opposition to Stalinism which led Leonhard to take the step of leaving Germany, and later of writing a critical analysis of his early life should develop in one who did in fact live among the privileged "class", and it invites comparison with the development of revolutionary ideas among the youth of Tsarist Russia. One of the dominant notes is that there was always a lack of a satisfactory alternative. The students were continually made to study the arguments of Western bourgeois writers, and to learn to refute them, which they did without difficulty, but they were never allowed to consider the views of revolutionary writers who were opposed to Bolshevism.

Is it possible that this lack of ready-made alternatives would force opponents of Stalinism within Russia to create for themselves a really radical alternative? This book unfortunately gives no evidence of this; the lack of possibility of free discussion and difficulty in exchanging heretical ideas seem to result in an inability to really consider seriously a complete rejection of authoritarian methods of achieving social aims.

There did, however, develop certain relationships between people in which it was possible to exchange confidences about disapproval of the régime. During the purges many of the students felt that it should not really be necessary to use quite such severe methods to rule a socialist country, and at times revolutionary literature was secretly circulated. On page 82 we are given the heartening information that "One of my friends in the Komsomol confessed in a conversation I had with him to being an anarchist".

It was a landmark when, while filing the archives of the American C.P. Leon-

hard came across copies of the Trotskyist paper *The Militant*. To him it represented the fact that there were, somewhere in the world, Marxists who were opposed to Stalin. It is interesting to speculate on what would have been the effect of seeing a copy of *War Commentary for Anarchism*.

Even the physical suffering of the few weeks during which, as a German, he was an outcast, did not lead Leonhard into really fundamental opposition to Bolshevism, but he did at that point meet rough peasants who were not afraid to say openly to anyone that they hated the government. A startling experience! It is made clear all the time that jokes and expressions of contempt towards the régime were current among the people, in the factories. If only we could have a book by a genuine Russian worker giving his views on communist government!

However, after the return to Germany, his opposition seems to take on a more substantial basis. He had been dismayed by the non-socialist nature of the propaganda his committee had been putting out, and now he was faced with the attitude of the Soviet occupation authorities towards the German people. We read of the way in which the Red Army leaders refused to take steps against the army's behaviour towards civilians, and of the distortion of the development of the German Communist Party, against the wishes of comrades who had spent years in the underground struggle.

The carefully graded system of privileges for Party officials was one of the most important factors in making Leonhard disgusted with the régime, but it only crystallized when a visiting West German communist remarked on it with amazement. We are continually shown how important in fomenting anti-Stalinist opinions are contacts with revolutionary left wing opinion from abroad. This clearly places a challenge before anarchists. What can we do, and what are we doing, to give such people a chance to see the expression of anarchist ideas, which contain a radical challenge to the very bases of both the capitalist and communist systems?

A question which the author's attitude raises is why, after having gone through such a struggle, he can go no further than to become a supporter of Tito. His glowing description of Yugoslav socialism seems rather naïve, but is understandable from one who has lived under Stalinism, and should serve as a warning against facile "They're all as bad" attitude among libertarians. The dust-cover describes the author as being now "not far removed from what he calls 'Democratic Libertarian Socialism', whatever that is. He is now working at Oxford, on a book about the evolution of the Soviet Union since the death of Stalin.

P.H.

and he concludes, "So, I bet, was Noddy: indeed, circumstantial evidence might suggest that he was the most spirit behind the whole enterprise".

★

### Harnessing the Sun

UNDER this title, we discuss FREEDOM for 23/3/57, the articles that have been made in various countries to make direct use of solar radiation: the poor man's nuclear energy might be called, for it is those parts of the world which most urgently need sources of motive power, the "undeveloped" countries of South-East Asia, India and Africa and Latin America which will be the last to benefit from exploitation of atomic energy, but at the same time the ones which get most sunlight.

The progress of the French *Laboratoire de l'Energie Solaire* is reported in *the Times* (8/10/57), describing the building of the biggest mirror in the world at Mont Louis near Perpignan. Its purpose is to use the energy of the sun to melt high-temperature alloys and heat refractory materials. Solar furnaces already installed there operate at temperatures up to 3,500 degrees Centigrade on a scale of expansion in this work. *The Times*, "suggest that confidence was felt in the method".

It is claimed from India that the world's first solar domestic cook-mach is being made there. "The present device consists of a four-foot diameter aluminium bowl, to be suspended over the cooking pot. It was produced by the National Physics Laboratory of India and commercial models are available at a cost of £3. 10s." An article by Maurice Bunsley mentions a high-temperature helio-installation at Stalinabad in Soviet Asia operating a refrigerating plant. The same thing is done at Mont Louis which at the same time produces steam for drying, sterilising and processing agricultural products. "The arid regions nearby have been transformed into pastures by the traction of deep-lying water with pumps driven by helio-engines".

In this connection, writing of a simple engineer's invention of a cheap and simple method for constructing large parabolic mirrors of the kind used in attempts to utilise solar power, Aldous Huxley comments:

"This discovery could be made to contribute very greatly to the decentralisation of production and population and the creation of a new type of agrarian society making use of cheap and inexhaustible power for the benefit of individual small-holders or self-governing co-operative groups. For the peoples of such tropical countries as India and Africa the new device for directly harnessing solar power should be of enormous and enduring benefit. . . . The technicians of solar power will be confronted with a clear-cut choice. They can work either for the complete enslavement of the industrially backward peoples of the tropics, or for their progressive liberation from the twin curses

Continued on p. 4

### The Unholy Trinity

"In the beginning was power; that is to say, the police and the military. And the only-begotten son of Power is Respectability, and proceeding from Power and Respectability is Money, the product of their mutual love. What a beautiful idea! Clearly nothing can be done without force—how can it? You must be able to call in the police and the gunmen. Everyone admits that war is the ultimate sanction, the only begetter of all our glorious empire. But do not think there is anything disreputable in all this. Nothing could be more entirely self-righteous. (What price the 'white-man's burden'? i.e. to protect the natives in all countries where there is coal or oil. . . .) Highly respected are the war-makers, for they shall get what is going. Highly respected are the one-eyed, for they shall see war very soon. Highly respected are you when men shall lick your boots, for great is your reward on earth. For our father Power will send a very comfortable income to all that worship him in the proper spirit. Come, Holy Gold, fill the vaults of thy faithful and tickle the unfathomable maw of their concupiscence. May we always be truly well-off and ever rejoice in thy gilt-edged consolations. Send forth the collateral and we shall be credited, and thou shall renew our overdrafts at the Bank."

ERIC GILL,  
"The Unholy Trinity"  
—1938.

## Reflections on Peace Mongering

In the international-political maze becomes more and more complex, and the missives passing between governments so numerous that we have lost count and no longer know who is waiting for a word and from whom, there is a strong tendency to lost sight of all the pother and shindy is about. To assume in 1957 that the times are what they were in 1947 is the height of political naïveté. "Policies" are designed to fit a counter-policy at any particular moment and not *vice versa*; policy determined by sectional interests in the unending struggle for power. These interests and this struggle for power obviously cannot remain the same—there are too many contestants for the plums of privilege, and the political limelight—with the result that what may be the "only possible policy" for to-day, is reverent to-morrow and perhaps reintroduced the day after to-morrow.

Now this is nothing new; indeed, as old as politics and the power struggle. "Politics—as the old Marquis of Salisbury once pointed out—"is a dirty business". But whereas the "dirty business" was confined at the top and hardly touched the misery of the people one way or another, to-day everybody is involved. Not only are their pockets tapped but their allegiance and obedience codified. The Law is for the modern state what the whip was for the slave-driver of the past. The difference is one of presentation. Whereas the slave-master did not even imagine that his victim might object to being a slave, our political leaders to-day are dealing with human material not altogether devoid of literacy and organisation. Mass communications and mass production have created at the same time a new class of slaves as well as classes within a class which cannot accept sacrifices and demands by orders or the whip. Politicians to-day are expected to give reasons for their actions, which means wrapping up their own ambitions in fine phrases, in appeals to national dignity, to freedom or to sheer survival.

It was noticeable, for instance, that during the first five years of Hitler's régime in Germany the persecution of Jews and the concentration camps and *Mein Kampf* did not exist so far as the spokesmen of the British government were concerned. Yet the moment preparations for war were started, conscription introduced and generally, the country was put on a war footing, everyone was made aware of all these things. Suddenly freedom of speech and of the press became burning issues, freedom of organisation and of association rights as fundamental to free men as their daily bread. We were on the side of freedom; Hitler and his Gestapo the sworn enemies of all we stood for. And with those comforting and self-righteous thoughts the politicians introduced so-called Defence Regulations which removed every vestige of individual freedom in the name of the crusade against the forces opposed to freedom! With such an approach little wonder that the Churchillian slogan in such a crusade was that anyone prepared to kill Germans was our ally or that at the end, apart from death, destruction and full employment, the victorious nations emerged into the era of peace more authoritarian, more regimented, more bellicose than at the outset.

They had not cleared the concentration camps, or started the trials of the war criminals before a new enemy to freedom had loomed on the horizon. In fact they were all

"enemies of freedom" depending on the side of the Iron Curtain from which they observed each other.

THE situation existing in the world of 1957 allegedly stems from the immediate aftermath of World War II when the United States and Russia emerged as the two unchallenged powers in the world, politically, militarily and economically. Each was accused by the other of representing the forces opposed to freedom, yet to the world one posed as the representative of the "Free World" the other as a "People's Democracy". Sparing no efforts in developing the deadliest nuclear weapons, in building their outposts of "defence", in worming their way into the economy and military forces of other nations, America and Russia have yet, at the same time each been proclaiming to the world that they are on the side of Freedom and Peace, the champions of all the wonderful things, spiritual and material, that grow in such a soil and climate.

Let us for a moment examine these contentions in the light of present developments. Both countries, so the public was led to believe, were forced to rearm after 1945 because of the aggressive intentions of the other which, coupled with the "capitalistic" or "totalitarian" social and economic structure of the would-be aggressor, made it doubly necessary to be prepared to "defend our way of life". Not only then did both countries arm to the teeth; they also erected physical barriers between their respective peoples. Nothing has changed so far as the régimes in America and Russia are concerned (bearing in mind that America discovered the "communist" nature of the Russian régime long after it had ceased to exist in fact!). Russia's intentions are, to our minds, no different from those of America (or Britain or any other minor Power which fancies its chances) in the world power struggle.

How then explain the anxiety expressed in the Bulganin letter for meetings at top level (with those "capitalistic war-mongers"?), for non-aggression pacts and withdrawal of troops from occupied countries? How explain Eisenhower's call—in his State of the Union message—from "the people of the United States to all other peoples, especially those of the Soviet Union" in which he declared:

"Our greatest hope for success lies in a universal fact, the people of the world, as people, have always wanted peace and want peace now. The problem, then, is to find a way of translating this universal desire into action. This will require more than words of peace. It requires works of peace."

For a start peoples should learn to know each other better. Recent negotiations in Washington have provided a basis in principle for greater freedom of communication and exchange of people. I urge the Soviet Government to cooperate in turning principle into practice by prompt and tangible actions that will break down the unnatural barriers.

(Incidentally if Eisenhower thinks it a good thing to encourage "greater freedom of communication" between the peoples of the two nations will he make a start by giving those of his countrymen, such as Paul Robeson, who cannot see the Russian totalitarian wood for the trees of racial equality, the right to leave and re-enter the States at will?)

Surely the fact of the matter is that what divides the rulers of Russia and America is not a question of ideologies but power. (Had Russia really represented the forces of revolutionary socialism or communism the world picture would have long ago been transformed. There has been no lack of "incidents" with revolutionary potentialities since the end of the Great War; yet in every case Russian intervention has operated in favour of reaction). The moves made by both Powers must be viewed as tactical manoeuvres to end a stalemate, rather than honest attempts to end the cold war and the threat of human annihilation.

## THE SUBJECTION OF WOMEN

CHARLES-AUGUSTE BONTEMPS, the French anarchist author and lecturer, has produced another book, called "La Femme et la Sexualité" (Les Cahiers France, 4, rue Gustave Rouanet, Paris, 18ème; 300 pages, 600 F.). Divided into three parts, it deals with the biological aspects of the sex problem, with the condition of women through history, and with love and sexuality in the monogamous system. With a style not deprived of humour, and with a lightness of touch often at odds with a fondness for learned and technical terms, it takes the uninitiated through a dazzling variety of customs, institutions and beliefs pertaining to a subject which hardly anybody is genuinely uninterested in. The impact of his impressive array of quotation and bits of information rivets Pascal's dictum: "Verite au dela des Pyrenees, erreur au dela" (what is deemed true on one side of the Pyrenees is condemned as false on the other), and it hardly serves any other purpose because, in the handling of his material, Bontemps gives no sign of that gift of sympathy and understanding which we find in the best anthropologists when dealing with people widely different from us. Yet, as he writes for the uninitiated, and mainly with a view to showing how irrational and insecure are the foundations of many sexual prejudices and conventions in our own society, he has acquitted himself well of this task, and has accordingly been praised.

When it comes, however, to suggesting practical solutions to the problems he has been discussing, he is either vague or unoriginal, at the antipodes, at any rate, of my own way of thinking. To give but one example, he says (p. 277): "A mother's task (child-bearing, upbringing and education of her children) is a social function which should carry with itself a remuneration consisting of a real and personal salary, independent of children's allowances. This salary would free the wife from her husband's tutelage, and guarantee her against the risk of desertion. This salary, transferable to a nurse, would allow a mother to carry on the exercise of her own profession, if she so wishes". Bontemps does not say who would be paying this salary nor where the money would come from to pay it with. But it sounds very much as if that is a job specially cut out for the State, and my impression is that insofar as certain States have earnestly made this job their own, women have been emancipated from the tutelage of their husbands only to join them in their slavery to the State in offices, factories and mines. And since much more is involved, I should like to contrast the above quotation with the following taken from Gabriel Marcel's "L'Homme Problematique" (pp. 53-54):

"Our experience of contemporary life shows us, truly enough, that everything is increasingly classified and assessed according to its function, so that we have been able to witness a politician ask for a remuneration for the mother *qua* mother. That the intrinsic absurdity of such a proposal should not be immediately perceived, before any explanation be given, clearly goes to show that the sense of being is on its way to disappear."

On the other hand, Bontemps shows arresting insight and originality in his treatment of the problem of the root and origin of woman's subjection to man, which is to be found, but for a few exceptions, in every country and age. He dismisses inferior physical strength and the handicaps of pregnancy and menstruation as inadequate and indecisive. For him, woman's subjection to man, in

To our minds the growing industrial potential of Russia is a greater menace to American world hegemony than her ability to successfully hurl a dog-in-a-sputnik into outer space.

The sincerity of Eisenhower's peace-mongering can surely be measured by his other State-of-the-Union utterances in which he calls for an intensification of the defence "effort" at a cost of over \$40,000 million (that is nearly £14,000 million) for the current financial year. And in spite of a further cut of 300,000 in the Soviet armed forces, we are sure Bulganin has given no orders to halt the development of production of atomic weapons.

ULTIMATELY the struggle for power is an economic struggle by expanding industrial nations in a world of shrinking markets. Thus

Continued on p. 4

all its social and economic aspects, hinges upon the hardly escapable modalities of the copulative act.

"This paroxysmal gesture," he writes, "consumed in a passionate moment when any other care, were it even of one's personal safety, is abolished, could not leave the psyche of both man and woman unfulfilled and with no repercussions. Now this gesture is such that woman's participation in it normally takes place in an attitude of subjugation. Whether we consider the position of apes and other mammals, which was also that of our ancestors, or the horizontal position which the Church accepts as the only one free from the sin of lewdness, woman suffers the man (in French: la femme y subit l'homme) with a satisfaction that extinguishes in her every idea of rebellion. After the act, she cherishes in her heart a contentment mixed with gratitude for the dispenser of her joy, and a feeling that the strength (albeit relative) he has shown in the embrace is intrinsic and not to be opposed" (pp. 84-85).

To this I should like to add a few remarks of my own. The element of suffered violence, particularly vivid in a young girl's first embrace, joined as it is to a pleasure so distinct in quality and intensity from anything she has experienced before, probably inclines her to associate that which is good with that which is violent, and does condition her generally to an acceptance of violence for the sake of a goodness that may be consequent upon it. Moreover, in the more common positions of the partners in copulation the man enjoys an advantage in what we may call "the battle of rhythms". He can more easily impart his own pulsations to the woman than she can hers to him. The woman, on the other hand, is by the very nature of her organs more sensitive to the pulsations of her partner's than he is to hers. She is also at his mercy as regards when, how often and how long the sexual pleasure is to be indulged, for she could

hardly hope to reverse the situation by a resort to violence. All she can do is to entice and allure, but allurements and enticements mean that a position of submission and dependence is already assumed, as it is clearly brought out by the humiliation suffered when they fail.

A PART from the sexual act, another situation which may explain the acceptance of violence on the woman's part, and thus account for her habits of submission, is that imposed by child-rearing. Prompted by natural, though by no means infallible, instincts, of cherishing the newly-discovered "sweetness and pride of motherhood, a woman learns to discipline her movements of impatience, aggressiveness and self-defence, and willingly yields herself to satisfying the needs and whims of her baby. And may it not be, if it were possible to read deeply in her instinctual urges, that it is for the sake of a child to come, or because she sees the child in the man who wants her, that she has helped along the ages to shape her general fate of submission to man?

Bontemps discusses the social, political, religious and economic causes usually put forward to explain this submission, but he rightly considers them secondary and derivative. In the same way as in order to understand the submission of workers to non-workers we will be well-advised to look for something in the very nature of labour which puts the worker at a disadvantage in respect of some categories of non-workers, so to explain the submission of one sex to the other the decisive factor is to be found in sex. To forget this may cause a lot of nonsense to be bandied about in many discussions on the emancipation of women, the equality of the sexes, and related subjects.

GIOVANNI BALDELLI.

## The Way to Peace

ON Sunday morning, January 5th, a discussion took place on the BBC under the title "Peace on Earth". Although the whole discussion only lasted ten minutes the most fundamental problems of war and peace were discussed.

On the question of what could each person do towards the achievement of peace, one of the speakers put the point of view that the best contribution lay in creating a happy home environment for children, because a happy and fulfilled individual was far less likely to take part in war. Later on in the discussion the development of individual friendships between people living on opposite sides of the Iron Curtain was put forward as a constructive effort worth taking part in. In both of these cases the 'realistic' point of view was also put forward in opposition; that is that happy and fulfilled people take part in war just as much as others, and that those with dear friends in the enemy country are quite as willing to fight against it when called on to do so by the government. Therefore, the only practical solution lies in negotiations, peace treaties, etc., and to secure them we must make sure of having good governments.

Happiness, fulfillment and friendship mean different things to different people. The dominant characteristic of "civilised" society is shallowness of personal relationships and hypocrisy, and the neurotic hatred and opposition which is poured out on any attempt to replace this by depth and sincerity. For many people happiness means a lack of unhappiness, fulfillment consists of not having any desires other than those approved of by the state, the army, the civil service or the church (in that order) and friendship is another word for "getting on well together".

In this context, which unfortunately is the one in which most people think, it obviously doesn't make a scrap of difference which detail of behaviour any individual follows. As the realists have it, questions of war and peace depend solely on governments, and if a way of solving these problems is to be found, let's have as many conferences and Summit talks as possible. If it is to be believed, as Bertrand Russell argues in last week's *Observer* that peace is best served neither by the arms race or by unilateral disarmament, but by a very careful adjustment by all countries of their armaments levels to some optimum, then surely we cannot be far from peace, since the study of the economic and mathematical techniques concerned in deciding which is the optimum level in questions such as these has been proceeding apace in recent years, and if the governments want peace, all they have to

do is to get the answer from an appropriately named electronic computer and act accordingly.

But governments don't want peace; they want power. In general people do want peace. The reason that warlike policies prevail is that people have not got the happiness or fulfillment which would make them strong and independent enough to refuse to comply with the designs of governments. Moreover, being filled to the teeth with the emotional substitutes handed out, they cling to them fearfully like an unloved child clinging to its parents, and for fear of losing everything, are afraid to do anything to prevent the drift towards disaster.

At the end of his article, Russell describes his two visions:

"In moments of hopeful vision, I see men throwing off the shackles of ancient fears and hates and welcoming the recognition that the welfare of each is the welfare of all and that the old hostilities and rivalries are an outworn folly.

"And then I see another picture: perhaps, in the quite near future, a sudden end to human life; or, if that is for the moment averted, fanatical groups of men taught by their Governments and their leaders of thought to view rival groups as wicked. I see science, which in itself is one of the most splendid of human achievements, perverted to become the minister of death, and the education of the young advocated with a view to increasing their skill as assassins. I see more and more of human effort put into a futile competition in death-dealing engines until the populations are reduced to bare subsistence level. And, in the end, howling hordes of fanatics exterminating each other and all bystanders in a vast orgy of murder.

"Which of these visions will the world choose?"

Whatever has the choice between them got to do with disarmament conferences, compromises and efforts to "reduce the perils of the nuclear age"?

The first vision will only be realised when we throw off for ourselves the shackles of our own governments, and refuse to learn to be skilful assassins. That can only come about when we can persuade people that they are being hoodwinked by authoritarian standards of goodness in personal life; when each person possesses himself and decides his own goals of happiness and fulfillment, and despises any pretentious authority which claims his allegiance.

To take a step in that direction oneself is doing more than joining any political party, electing any M.P. or "calling" for any agreements. To lead someone else to take a step in that direction is making a greater contribution to peace than any amount of propaganda or canvassing.

Which vision will we choose?

## Rouble Diplomacy

Continued from p. 1

There appears to be little doubt that the Soviet is making considerable progress in her bid for trade and other economic ties with countries which, in the past have been Western preserves. Despite the fact that Russian overtures are necessarily on a par with American offers so far as the motives are concerned, and although the quality and quantity of aid is inferior to the American product, it seems that the Russian approach is in certain respects more acceptable.

Dollar foreign policy may well have to adjust itself to the subtler requirements of its potential customers if it is to gain the influence it so anxiously desires, for the rouble policy of trading on advantageous terms and pay-as-you-can, is proving highly successful, and by more than pure chance will in the long run bring with it the influence which is of course the real aim.

## Postscripts and Footnotes

Continued from p. 2

of poverty and servitude to political and economic bosses."

★

### Bigness is Out of Date

THIS view of Huxley's brings us back to a theme that keeps turning up in this column—that the technical developments which people regard as making a decentralised society impossible, only appear in that light through the inertia of our thought and our worship of bigness. In last week's FREEDOM Tony Gibson quotes Bertrand Russell's doubts "whether any form of social system based on principles of anarchy would work for a technically advanced civilisation". But these very technical advances can at least make a decentralised society, the prerequisite of anarchy, possible.

Tractors and power tools used to be the argument, and because we live in a world dominated by statist, centralising and authoritarian habits of mind, the first tractors were giants fit only for prairies but now you can get one to fit your backyard. Power tools which were going to make all industry one big Dagenham are now within the grasp of every do-it-yourself handyman.

Nowadays it is automation and atomic power. But automation, as Dr. Bronowski said in the lecture we quoted last week can just as well make for "isolated compact local communities", or as Dr. Landon Goodman in his *Man and Automation* (see *Bigness In Industry* 10/8/57) puts it:

"Automation can be a force either for concentration or dispersion . . . (it) allows plants to be taken away from the large centres of population and built in relatively small centres of population . . . Rural factories, clean, small, concentrated units will be dotted about the countryside. The effects of this may be far-reaching. The Industrial Revolution caused a separation of large numbers of people from the land, and concentrated them in towns . . . The result has been a certain standardisation of personality, ignorance of nature, and lack of imaginative power . . . Now we may soon see some factory workers moving back into the country and becoming part of a rural community."

It is the same story with nuclear power stations. Commenting on the Central Electricity Authority's decision not to go on with the construction of the supergrid system, the *New Scientist* (16/5/57), remarks that it will be surprising if this 're-orientation' stops there.

... it is not difficult to predict that many of the atomic power-stations to be built after 1965 will be built near to the places at which their electricity is needed. In fact there will be a tendency to return to more or less local generation of electricity. Some kind of grid will still be needed to provide a mechanism for operating the whole system at maximum efficiency, but it ought to be a much simpler one than seemed likely a few years ago."

And the *New Scientist* concludes, "This should be a blessing for the distribution engineers, who must be appalled by some of the complexities of the present electricity distribution network". It will also make it much more difficult to see just why it is necessary to have a Central Electricity Authority. C.W.

## The Anti-Intellectual P.I.

ONE of the amusing things to notice about the proletarian intellectual is that he is fiercely anti-intellectual. Although the position he holds is a theoretical one which needs continual explanation, and current events are always explained in terms of the 'method', although the theory is readily understood only by minds trained in conceptual thought and although serious students of the theory have fiercely argued among themselves for decades on the true interpretation of it, still its adherents cannot see that it is an essentially intellectual position—whether he drops his atches or not.

The anti-intellectual attitude stems from a variety of experiences, all of which add up to a sense of inferiority. In political parties, it is certainly the ablest thinkers, or talkers or organisers who rise to the positions of respect and status—provide the leadership, in a word. These may or may not have middle-class origins, but certainly by the time they have reached the top they have accepted most middle-class values.

### Labour Lawyers Make Policy

In a large power-party, like the Labour Party, the working class rank and file has been swamped in its influence on the policies of the Party by the needs of policy-making at top level. All the Labour Party requires from its rank and file is votes. Once enough votes have been won to secure power, the function of governing has to pass into the hands of the lawyers. This is why in the parliamentary Labour Party the highest single profession represented is the law. There are more lawyers than any other occupation.

The frustration felt by the rank and file Labourite—especially if he has, or had, revolutionary aspirations—over the Party's continual compromise with capi-

talism, then expresses itself in an anti-intellectual bias, wherein the rank and file ignores completely the intellectualism of his own attitude. The same process exists in all the smaller socialist parties as well, with the difference that the rank and file members are more highly intellectual, as they think themselves the purer Marxists, and yet are, vociferously, the more anti-intellectual as they think themselves the most revolutionary advocates of the class struggle—i.e. speaking for the working class.

### The Articulate Come to the Fore

In every party, large or small, and even in the anarchist movement, persons tend to come to the fore who can write and speak—who are, in a word, articulate. Now it is unfortunate, but true, that the working class does not get an education aimed at making it articulate. It is not encouraged to express itself. The extent of his literacy is such as to make the worker capable of reading a Works Order or a Delivery Note, but not to express his ideas. Higher forms of education do aim at this, for the élite are encouraged to think and express their thoughts in order for them to remain the élite—the ruling minority.

This difference then, leads to the means of expression in an organisation tending to be operated by those able to express themselves most capably, and these tend to be those who have had education at levels higher than the average worker and who are thus liable to be denounced as an intellectual by an embittered proletarian.

I said that the articulate come to the fore in every party, and even in the anarchist movement. There is, however,

this difference: that a political party is so organised that, whatever pretence is made about democracy, effective running of the party is in the hands of an executive which rules from above; the articulate, therefore, get power over the inarticulate. But in the anarchist movement there is no apparatus of power, and no executive committee to wield it. Such influence as a good speaker or writer can wield is due purely to that ability and not to official power or pressure. And so careful are anarchists to keep an eye on anyone who looks like getting too much influence that any individual getting uppish because of his abilities is likely to be very quickly slapped down. The anarchist movement is bristling with healthy egos, which is why the unhealthy inflated or deflated ego has a rather miserable time in the movement.

### Needs and Fears

The anti-intellectual proletarian intellectual has essentially a deflated ego. This is why he needs the working class so much and fears the 'intellectual' so much. He has no faith in himself. He feels he has no strength to put into practise any aspect of the revolution in his own life, so he assumes a contempt for individual action on the part of others, and does nothing himself but seek a revolutionary mass. When there isn't one he has to invent one in his mind—a frustrating, even religious, experience. And he fears the 'intellectual' because he fears his own weakness being exposed by another, so any train of thought within the movement which does not deify the working class is denounced as mere dilettantism and intellectualism (swear-words among Marxists) and thereby destroyed without argument.

The structure of the anarchist movement is such, however, that those who can legitimately be called intellectuals within its ranks are a source of strength to the movement as a whole, through their function of continually examining our ideas and measuring them up against our increasing knowledge—particularly in the social sciences.

If we have faith in and respect for our ideas we should not be afraid of this examination and only if we have closed minds should we fear its result upon our own pre-occupied ideas. P.S.

(To be continued)

### Some Statistics from Nagasaki

OUT of 30,150 children born in Nagasaki from A-bomb explosion until the end of 1954, there were: 471 dead, 181 interrupted pregnancies, 1,046 with defective deficiencies of which 429 were born with deformed lips or tongues; 59 with deformed throats; 243 with defective inner organs; 47 with defective brains; 28 with no brains at all, and eight without eyes.

—Views and Comments (U.S.A.)

### A Note on Breakfast Foods

WHY shoppers choose to buy breakfast cereals in crumbled, crinkled, flaked, shredded, puffed or popped form is treated psycho-analytically in an article on "Supermarket Psychology" in the N.Y. *World-Telegram* (July 25) headlined "Buyer of Cereal Is Power-Hungry". Claiming that "elementary laws of supply and demand no longer apply to the American consumer," it says, "The Institute for Motivational Research stresses sex, security and status as among the chief reasons why people buy."

All of this reflects the thinking of the Madison Avenue advertising agencies, who assume that people generally are stupid or crazy or both. However, they are careful not to let the public know that the mark-ups on breakfast cereals range from a low of about 340% to 2,000% or more over what the farmer gets for the natural product in what is usually its most nutritious form. If the buyers know this, fewer of them would be willing to pay 25 cents for 9 ozs. of Kellogg's Sugar Snacks, 18½ cents for 5½ ozs. of General Foods' Sugar Krinkles or 18 cents for 4½ ozs. of Quaker's Puffed Rice "shot from a gun"—even though Junior saw it on TV.

—Facts for Farmers (U.S.A.)

## OH DEAR! What a Start!

### PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEKS 1 & 2

Deficit on Freedom	£40
Contributions received	£6
DEFICIT	£34

### January 1 to January 9

Preston: R.S.M. 5/-; New York: N.M. £1/15/9; Llanelly: L.W. 1/-; London: Anon.* 3/-; London: W.H.T.* 5/-; Donaghadee: J.T. £1; Ilford: C.S. 5/6; Wirral: G.S.G. 6/-; Monton: P.H. 10/-; Anon. 10/-; London: J.S.* 3/-; London: H.P.S. 2/-; Oxford: Anon.* 5/-; London: W.F. 5/-; London: S.B.* 2/6; London: L.C. 6/-.
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1958 TOTAL TO DATE ... £6 4 9

\*Indicates regular contributor.

### Fire Fund

Contributions during 1957 ... £393 4 0

## Reflections on Peace Mongering

Continued from p. 3

it was, and so far as we can see, it still is. These considerations were clearly behind Britain's concern that Germany should re-arm, even if it meant reversing Churchill's solemn decision that Germany should be supervised and remain disarmed for at least fifty years. It is also interesting to note in Bulganin's letter that while eight of the nine points on his proposed top-level agenda deal with matters concerned with arms and war preparations, the ninth calls for "measures for expanding international trade". Somehow we do not imagine this matter slipped in by accident.

If the problem to-day were survival of an ideology, a way of life represented either by Russia or the United States one would imagine a solid front, on both sides. Yet what we observe is a NATO rent from top to bottom, sixteen nations with sixteen conflicting interests, and a Warsaw Pact maintained by Russian

Occupation Forces armed to the teeth.

Britain's present sweet reasonableness compared with America's determination to out-sputnik Russia at any cost, does not in our opinion necessarily denote two opposed assessments of Russia's position in the power set-up. Rather do these conflicting positions stem from their particular economic problems. Without a vast armament programme America would be faced with a surplus of raw materials and manufactured goods or a slump and unemployment on a huge scale (as it is she has nearly 3,000,000 unemployed at present). Britain on the other hand imports much of her raw materials, and in proportion has much less unemployment than the U.S. Therefore a reduction of the armament programme while increasing unemployment—which is what most economists advocate for prosperity!—would reduce her imports

bill, and also, some believe, increase her exporting capacity.

Be that as it may, what we are certain of is that armaments programmes and political crises have much more to do with economics and finance than with the war-like intentions of this or that Power. The dangers of war are greatest when the chances of resolving the problems and contradictions of the capitalist system are most slender. The cold war has so far saved capitalism . . . and "peace". The present peace-mongering, coming as it does when most countries are suffering from galloping inflation, and in some cases from serious trade recessions, may be an indication that for some there is too much, and for others not enough, cold war economy, and that the time has come for adjusting the financial safety valve.

But all these proposals, these letters and messages, about disarmament, non-aggression pacts and humanity . . . it's all talk, hot air, the authors of which have not even started thinking in terms of peace!

## FREEDOM PRESS

### SELECTIONS FROM

#### 'FREEDOM'

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

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

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

### VOLINE :

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

### E. A. GUTKIND :

*The Expanding Environment* 8s.

### V. RICHARDS :

*Lessons of the Spanish Revolution*

### TONY GIBSON :

*Youth for Freedom* paper  
*Food Production and Population*  
*Who will do the Dirty Work?*

*Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications :*  
*Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949*  
*A Tribute* cloth 12s.

*Journey Through Utopia* cloth 18s. (U.S.A. 25s.)

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

## MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

### LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

Every Sunday at 7.30 at  
THE MALATESTA CLUB,  
32 Percy Street,  
Tottenham Court Road, W.1.

### LECTURE - DISCUSSIONS

JAN. 19.—Tony Gibson on  
THE PSYCHOLOGY OF  
POLITICAL BELIEF  
JAN. 26.—Arthur Uloth on  
THE YEAR 2084.  
FEB. 2.—S. E. Parker on  
WHY I AM AN ANARCHIST  
FEB. 9.—Arlo Tatum on  
INTERNATIONAL PEACEMAKING  
FEB. 16.—Max Patrick on  
LIFE OF SIGMUND FREUD  
FEB. 23.—Jack Robinson on  
FREE THOUGHT & ANARCHISM  
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 Froggnal) N.W.3. Nearest tube station: Hampstead (Northern Line).

### ★ Malatesta Club ★

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

### ACTIVITIES

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

Every Wednesday at 8 p.m.  
BONAR THOMPSON speaks

### INTERNATIONAL ANARCHIST CENTRE MEETINGS

Discussion Meetings  
every Thursday at 8 p.m.

## 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