

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"The machinery of power is getting out of sane control. Lost in its elaboration, even some men of good will being to forget the essential humanity this machinery should be serving. They are now so busy testing, analysing, and reporting on the bath water that they cannot remember having thrown baby out of the window."

—J. B. PRIESTLEY.

19, No. 14

April 5th, 1958

Threepence

## BAN ALL BOMBS

But it Means Banning Government, Too!

doubt the appearance of the headline above on an anarchist will bring smiles to the lips of those who think of anarchists as mere bomb-throwers with a "stupid" philosophy of social destruction.

People who to-day are as ignorant of anarchism as that are almost certainly supporters of government, necessarily of any particular government—although they usually profess their allegiance to some particular state—but at least of the idea of the necessity of government, of government, of course.

It would be foolish for us to see the bomb-throwing activity of anarchists as forerunners—although technically the only (abortive) incident of its kind in this country was the result of the action of a police provocateur. In other countries, however, anarchists have thrown bombs. So have individuals practically every religious, political and nationalist persuasion.

### Not Become Respectable

It is on anarchists alone that the 'bomb-thrower' label has been firmly fixed. Why? Primarily because every authority is united in its desire to denigrate the idea that one can get on without them. It has been demonstrated often enough that governments would rather have an enemy government in power, than the people having an opportunity to run their own affairs themselves.

Secondly, the anarchists never used force in order to establish a government based on force. Therefore they could never become respectable. When a nationalist rebellion was waged by bomb-terror, it is denounced as murderous at the time although even this depends upon who is rebelling against whom—compare Guatamala, Cyprus, Egypt,

for example: The R.A.F. bombing of Italian cities at the time of Mussolini's collapse in 1943, crushing the people's attempt at revolution while the Germans occupied the country.

Indonesia, Spain, Hungary!) but when the nationalists win and establish a government, their terrorist methods are forgotten, if mutual profit is to be made from diplomatic exchanges.

Thirdly, anarchists always aimed their bombs at the representatives of tyrannical régimes. Bomb-throwing has never been a part of the anarchist philosophy—which aims at the establishment of a society without the institutions of violence and coercion which characterise governments—but has been used as a means of social protest as a last resort in face of repressive authorities.

### Governments Aim at Genocide

The anarchist bomb-thrower (when he was not blowing himself up) aimed at tyrannicide—the killing of tyrants. Governments to-day aim at genocide—the killing of peoples. The old-time anarchist (usually an atheist) pieced together his crude, home-made bomb in garden shed or cellar, then went out himself and hurled it personally at the police chief or despot who ruled or personified a hateful social system and who was personally responsible for hangings, floggings, imprisonments, exploitation.

The governments of to-day (in the West, Christian) call upon the entire resources of their nations. They hire (and reward with honours) the most skilled scientists, spend fabulous sums upon research stations and spies to steal the knowledge of other countries, go to fantastic lengths to test out their products—which, if ever used on a war-time scale would kill outright millions and millions of ordinary people and condemn to slow, horrible death and starvation perhaps the whole of mankind—

innocent children, house-bound women and apathetic men along with whoever might be legitimately termed 'guilty'.

Yet in the popular mind it is the anarchist who appears as the enemy of society and the government as the sane arbiter of all our problems, the necessary adjunct of our civilisation, the maintainer of law and order!

This, fifty years after the end of the wave of anarchist 'propaganda by deed' in France and Russia at the end of the last century, a fifty years dominated by two world wars organised by governments, interspersed with war scares and re-armament and economic crises they have been unable to control, represents a triumph of propaganda beyond even Dr. Goebbels' wildest dreams.

### Government Strong & Efficient

The history of the twentieth century has shown us governments stronger and more efficient than ever before. Techniques of propaganda and population control have

made tremendous strides. Conditioning, advertising, mass education under the State has given government—East and West—thought control over their populations which render almost unnecessary the traditional coercive organs of the State. But these coercive organs remain, in case there is a breakdown in morale. Tanks for the streets of Budapest; police with dogs for Downing Street, London—because the British just love dogs.

Those who support the idea of government should be very pleased with the 20th century. Government is more far-reaching and all-pervasive, and efficient than the Greeks or the Romans—or even Machiavelli—ever thought possible.

And the result? Two major wars bringing death and destruction to millions, an unending series of 'minor' and colonial wars, bloody revolutions as bloodily suppressed or corrupted by power, the liquidation and deportation of entire peoples, an exile and refugee problem which grows year by year more desperate, the destruction of food

and restriction of production while half the world starves, technology making spectacular leaps in its ability to produce abundance, but in fact producing—the guided missile and the hydrogen bomb.

Anarchy? No—government!

### The Campaign Against the Bomb

Now at last one sees the stirring of a small section of the British people against the lunacy of nuclear politics. Thirteen years after the dropping of the atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, some attempt is being made to awaken the public to the nature of atom warfare and the danger it represents to them.

Over this Easter weekend a march is being organised from London to Aldermaston, the Government's nuclear weapon research station near Reading, with demonstrations en route, demanding the banning of nuclear weapons, to make nuclear warfare impossible.

This will be a laudible enough endeavour and we shall be pleased enough to see it succeed. But it is another case of too little and too late, and we must be forgiven a little cynicism about the motives of many of its supporters.

Why has the campaign for nuclear disarmament sprung up in this country? **Continued on p. 4**

### Comments on an 'Observer' Editorial

## The Real 'Central Question'

THE *Observer* published last Sunday the first of three articles on what it describes as "The Central Question", which is: "How can Wars be Avoided?" To judge by the opening paragraph of this series it seems unlikely that the oracles of Tudor Street have at last removed their blinkers and their pink spectacles and let in a little daylight:

There is no immediate danger of war. What causes the gloom in international affairs is that, while nobody can see a way of preventing wars starting in future from the same political causes that have produced them in the past, there is now the new risk that any war may spread into a catastrophe for the human race. The fact that wars are becoming ever more dangerous, even obliterative, will not of itself prevent them from starting.

We are then given brief expositions of the "new formulae" of "containment", "disengagement", "disarmament" and "contracting out or abdication" which are all found to be wanting. But we are promised for the following two Sundays "some tentative but positive proposals for a form of international administration that might be capable of maintaining peace".

In vain have we searched this first article for a clear definition of what *The Observer* means by the "political causes that have produced [wars] in the past" and threaten to do so in the future. Yet this is surely necessary if the reader is to judge in the coming Sundays how "positive" are their proposals for "maintaining peace"! We can only assume that *The Observer* takes it for granted that we all know, and are in agreement as to what are the

### Anti-Terrorist Terror

Security forces have begun "round the clock" bombardments—artillery by day, aircraft by night—to break the morale of Communist terrorists in Northern Malaya.—Reuter.

"political causes", and indeed that the causes are political. Either that, which is the most charitable explanation, or we must conclude that *The Observer* has purposely glossed over the "causes" for its own political reasons.

★

"THEORETICALLY" — we are told—"the only way of avoiding wars between nations (as between individuals) is by removing the possibility of using violence; this can be done

only by a single authority effectively possessing a monopoly of the use of violence: that is the definition of government. In other words, some kind of supranational government, strong enough to prevent individual States from making war on each other, is the pre-condition of organised peace. It is the utter remoteness of such a prospect which causes the deep dismay, confusion and demoralisation on this great issue.

Why is such a prospect so 'utterly remote'? Firstly because it is ridiculous to compare the problems of violence between individuals with the struggles between nations. And secondly because the moment the nations of the world agree to "a supra-national government" with a monopoly of the use of violence you have eliminated not only the national problems but the nations as well, and with it the need for a supra-national government! Wars, and lots of other problems, including that of government, will have been solved by the time "supranational government" could be a reality. We see therefore no reason why the remoteness of such government should, in view of the present mental climate (even in Tudor Street!) cause "deep dismay, confusion, etc."

What, as we understand it, is really troubling *The Observer*, Bertrand Russell *et alia* is that the "formula", the "policy", of "containment" which, we are told, "has

served the cause of peace well in the last twelve years" and which "envisages an indefinite maintenance of sufficient Western forces to deter the Soviet Union and its allies from making war" is a satisfactory solution *only* on the assumption that all the nations of the world are prepared to line up on one side or the other of a world-wide "Maginot Line" (why not Iron-Curtain?). Containment "will be plainly meaningless" in a world in which there are "neutral" states refusing to "co-operate", and in which, at the same time "nuclear material is widely diffused" among all nations for industrial purposes, since "it will place every country receiving a nuclear reactor in a position to make (at a price) its own atom bombs". (Our italics).

"Disengagement" without "administration" would "create as many problems as it solved". A reduction of armaments likewise, for

there would be no administrative means of preventing a "Balkan crisis", this time perhaps in Africa or Southern Asia, from precipitating the Great Powers into a world war that nobody had planned or desired.

We are not particularly interested in what *The Observer* has to offer to the politicians in its next instalments since we imagine that it will simply be a regurgitation of the policy of "containment" plus disengagement of the "neutrals" supervised by an "international administration" plus a reduction of armaments step by step with international supervision. We may be wrong, but we suspect that the word *markets* will not make its appearance in these "tentative, but positive, proposals".

★

HOW can wars be avoided? can, in our opinion, only be answered satisfactorily and realistically by

**Continued on p. 3**

## Russia Now Competing in Raw Material Markets

THE range and size of Russia's exports of primary materials is rapidly growing. The announcement on Thursday that the price of Canadian aluminium is being cut by nearly 10 per cent. to compete with the price of Russian aluminium has caused a great deal of discussion. In some metal markets, notably tin and platinum, Soviet exports have already added to the unbalance of supply and demand. A number of other metals, including even copper, are being offered from Russian sources here and there. The latest news is that some Russian asbestos has turned up in Western Europe.

Substantial exports of oil and pig iron have been coming from the Soviet Union for some time. The list could be lengthened. But only in aluminium has a deliberate effort been made to cut prices below the current Western rates. Other cases, such as the occasional marginal offers of soda ash from Russia and China on the Indian market at very low prices, do not show the marks of a steady policy.

The reason for the sales campaign in aluminium is significant—it is that Russia has very large excess capacity for producing aluminium. Other surpluses, perhaps on a smaller scale, may well be emerging in other raw materials and perhaps also in steel and certain capital goods.

It may well be, in fact, that the Soviet economy is facing a structural adjustment at least as large and difficult as that which the United States has to undertake. Whether such a drastic correction can

be made more quickly and easily by state planning or by assisted private enterprise remains to be seen. The answer is by no means certain.

Surpluses have arisen because productive capacity for raw materials, fuel, and heavy industry has been pushed well ahead of manufacturing capacity which could make use of the basic and heavy products. Perhaps Malenkov and his friends foresaw the trouble when they demanded a larger place for consumer goods industries in the plan and were defeated by Khrushchev. Things have probably come to a head through the change in the composition of armaments. The new weapons use much less steel, non-ferrous metals, and aluminium than the old, and there are no consumer goods industries which can absorb the supplies no longer wanted for defence production.

No doubt the materials and some of the productive plant will in time be used for further industrialisation but it is not easy to revise central plans, and it will take an ideological change to restore the balance by a massive expansion of consumer goods industries. In the meantime we must expect growing Russian exports of raw materials and capital goods, if necessary, financed by loans, credits, and aid. What this will mean for various commodity markets needs careful watching. And if the flow of minerals from the East should grow much stronger it may well affect plans and hopes for the future development of natural resources in countries like Canada.

Financial Editor—

Manchester Guardian 31/3/58.

Observer 16/3/58.



# THE MOTOR AGE - 3. TOWNS

THE present situation of the motor vehicle in towns, Mr. C. D. Buchanan writes in his book *Mixed Blessing*, is one which no designer in his senses, starting from first principles, would dream of instituting, any more than he would dream of putting a footway along a railway track. "It is not just the easing of traffic jams that is needed, but the re-creation of centres for civilised life". The motor vehicle which is "pulling down the whole fabric of cities about our ears... must be brought completely under control", since most of us live our lives in towns and cities. "Of the many unhappy frictions now developing, the worst is the conflict between human beings and heavy moving vehicles. This is the direct conflict that results in death and injury, and there is the continuous battering of the senses by noises and smell and vibration. It gets worse every day. It should surely be a first aim of urban reconstruction to resolve this conflict once and for all".

In discussing London's traffic problems he compares three well-known attempts to find a solution, the Bresse Report of 1936, the Lutyens R.A. plan, and Alker Tripp's *Town Planning and Road Traffic*. "Bresse the engineer thought in terms of big road schemes, Lutyens the architect was concerned with architectural effects. Tripp asked why people were being killed". Tripp's study, which had the great virtue of bringing together road planning theory and town planning theory, got to the heart of the urban planning problem:

"He quickly saw the vital point that the terrible casualty figures were primarily due to the mixture of pedestrians, cyclists and motor vehicles on the same road, and that the fundamental solution was to devise roads that would keep these basic traffic types physically separated. He saw also the difficulties of achieving this except in a few isolated cases, and deduced that whilst there were various limited applications of the theory that might be applied, there was no means of making all the roads foolproof and that therefore education in road safety and usage would have to be a permanent activity".

Tripp postulated the 'ideal' town plan

as one consisting of a spider's-web of radial and circular arterial and sub-arterial roads. The areas between these roads would contain only local roads with limited access. From his notion of a circular road enclosing the heart of the city comes the 'inner ring road' of post-war traffic direction and from his conception of the 'precincts' between the main roads in which the daily life of the city is lived and in which the shops and places of amusement are located (instead of on the main roads) comes part of the emphasis on the 'neighbourhood' in post-war town planning. "The main traffic flows," he wrote, "should be regarded as sheer poison, to be completely isolated and on no account to be allowed to seep into the precincts." Mr. Buchanan comments:

"What Tripp was really admitting was that the tremendous increase of mobility brought about by the motor car now necessitated the concept of the town area being closely carved up by a network of arterial roads which would be as rigidly exclusive of the daily humdrum criss-cross traffic of pedestrians, cyclists, delivery vans and all local movements as would a network of railways... The bold demand that shopping centres fronting on to arterials be 'turned round' to face a precinct street must have raised many an eyebrow amongst estate and valuation surveyors, for in fact this is an operation of extreme difficulty and protraction, except, and it is a very big exception, when the local authority is prepared to buy out the numerous interests and leases and assume redevelopment responsibility itself. It is when one considers carefully the full implications of Alker Tripp's theory—the searing of the town with a railway-like grid of roads and the literal turning of the place inside out—that the first qualms arise and one asks whether, if this is the price to be paid for the motor-car, it is really worth having".

★

THE two official London plans of Sir Patrick Abercrombie, the *County of London Plan* and the *Greater London Plan*, and Holden and Holford's *City of London Plan*, were all, in their planning of ring roads, radials and precincts, influenced by Alker Tripp's theory. But paradoxically their contribution to the problem of traffic congestion is unlikely to be in actual road proposals "which have all been modified beyond recognition or whittled away altogether" but in their "understanding and disclosure of the fact that the congestion is partly the result of London's own excessive growth, not merely at the perimeter, but at the centre by the intensive development of sites. Far too many people crowd into the centre to work and to shop, there are too many offices, workshops and factories all attracting more traffic than the streets can possibly carry". These conclusions were one of the reasons for the decision to build eight New Towns around London, but outside its Green

Belt, reducing the "traffic-generating potential of the centre" by tackling the problem at the other end. But

"the march of events has been remorseless. A great many people have drifted into the suburbs, whilst commercial and business employment in the centre has steadily increased with the result that congestion on road and rail in the suburban linkage is manifestly worse than it has ever been. On the present showing it seems likely that the traffic relief arising from decentralisation will be a mere drop in the ocean, quite lost in the great tide of vehicle increase and growth of the motor car habit. The principles are not invalidated, however, for it is abundantly clear that to allow London employment to expand without restriction and to take the brake off suburban development would lead to confusion unbounded".

The nearest approach that we have to the practical application of the precinct theory can be seen in Frederick Gibberd's centre for Harlow New Town and in the rebuilt centre of Coventry, but as you study in retrospect the planning reports for many cities prepared in the hopeful post-war years by Thomas Sharp and now "whittled away in the course of years of discussion", or the twenty-year Development Plans which local authorities are obliged to produce under the Town and Country Planning Act of 1937, you become painfully aware of the degree by which we are failing to come to terms with the planning problems presented by the motor age. By far the most fruitful example in the rebuilding of blitzed cities is that of Coventry, of which Mr. Buchanan writes that it

"probably represents the most that can be extracted from the precinct theory. As far as the pedestrian shopping ways are concerned the relief is complete, and here at last peace and dignity are in a fair way to being restored. Over the rest of the area it remains to be seen whether the inner ring with its frequent roundabouts will provide sufficient insulation to safeguard the network of streets against heavy traffic infiltrating as the motor habit grows. At Broadgate—the central square—there is more than a hint of familiar conflicts; yet here also, in the modest provision for separating pedestrians and vehicles by levels, is a hint of another and surer way of restoring the pedestrian to his rightful and dominant place in a city centre".

★

THIS leads to Mr. Buchanan's own offering towards a solution to the pedestrian-vehicle conflict so far as main city streets are concerned: to arrange the pedestrian and vehicle circulation at different physical levels. This is an idea which has been canvassed before, by, for example, le Corbusier, but it has never been seriously explored and consideration of it has usually been confined to the least feasible methods: roads sunk below street level with the consequent difficulties over pipes, cables, sewers, and the foundations of buildings, or roads above street level which is equally difficult because of the weight of heavy traffic, the obstruction of daylight and the fact that traffic is brought to buildings at an unsuitable level. What Mr. Buchanan would prefer is the idea of "pedestrians circulating over a whole district upon footways inset into or cantilevered out from the buildings at first floor level, and crossing the street by light bridges... the first floors would now be the important shopping and business floors and the ground floors at

FREE  
motor level would be used for passenger services and goods". He visualises treatment applied to Oxford Street, London, with the bus stops and elevated footways and the pedestrian ascending from them by escalators. The method of vertical separation, solving a problem which is fundamental to the solution of all the others who claims, "offer the hope of reasonable and decent conditions in towns, while retaining most of the advantages of motor transport".

But as he says, there are hundreds of small and medium-sized towns overwhelmed with traffic.

"where it is next to impossible to realize extensive reconstruction, and the very good reason, amongst others, that many of these places possess a character which is worth preserving. Who could visualize the rebuilding of a markedly different form of Market Hereford, Lewes, Newbury, or Durham?... Some of these towns possibly will benefit from the introduction of some through-traffic by means of passes, but they will still suffer from the boiling up of their own traffic".

The difficulty of finding any solution coping with the motor car in such towns leads "with disturbing logic to the conclusion that the deliberate control and reduction of traffic may have been invoked". Indirect restrictions—prohibitions, waiting restrictions, and unloading controls—have been in operation for many years and get more severe every day, but their purpose is the limited one of keeping the traffic moving. "There is no current of opinion yet discernible in favour of deliberate reduction of traffic to bring order and safety to the streets". But is there in fact a case for "motorless zones"?

Mr. Buchanan's answer is a cautious Yes, "for the hard fact seems to be

Continued on

## FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

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

### New Books . . .

Uncle Willy and Other Stories  
William Faulkner 15/-  
The Yoke and the Arrows  
H. L. Matthews 18/-  
Big Sur and the Oranges of  
Hieronymus Bosch Henry Miller 30/-  
My Journey Round the World  
Jean Cocteau 18/-  
My Uncle's Dream  
F. M. Dostoevsky 7/6  
Child of Communism E. Pfeiffer 18/-  
Design for Happiness  
John O'Connell 12/6  
From the Other Shore  
Alexander Herzen 15/-  
The Political Philosophy of  
Bakunin 42/-  
Pierre-Joseph Proudhon  
George Woodcock 28/-  
The London Years Rudolf Rucker 25/-  
Pioneers of American Freedom  
Rudolf Rucker 14/-  
The Guillotine at Work  
P. G. Maximoff 17/6  
Nationalism and Culture  
Rudolf Rucker 21/-  
The I.W.W. Song-Book 2/6

### Penguius . . .

Three European Plays  
Anouilh, Betti & Sartre 2/6  
Domestic Peace, etc.  
H. de Balzac 3/6  
Juan in China Eric Linklater 2/6  
Private Angelo Eric Linklater 2/6

### Second-Hand . . .

Report to the United Nations  
1951-2. U.N.E.S.C.O. 2/6  
Freedom and Catholic Power  
Paul Blanshard 12/6  
Communism, Democracy and  
Catholic Power Paul Blanshard 10/-  
The Profits of War  
Richard Lewisohn 4/6  
Sex and Civilisation  
Paul Bousfield 5/6  
Imperialism and Chinese Politics  
Hu Sheng 3/6  
Soldier to Civilian  
George K. Pratt 3/-

### Periodicals . . .

University Libertarian No. 5 1/-

We can supply ANY book required, including text-books. Please supply publisher's name if possible, but if not, we can find it. Scarce and out-of-print books searched for—and frequently found!

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

27, RED LION STREET,  
LONDON, W.C.1

## THEATRE CONTEMPORARY AMERICA

"THE KIDDERS", by Donald Ogden Stewart. (St. Martin's Theatre).

THIS play, which has recently been produced at the Arts Theatre, is a portrayal of contemporary American living seen through critical eyes. The title derives from the dominant feature of all but one of the characters, which is an obsessive tendency to laugh away any problems with which they are confronted, trying to deceive not only the people around them but also themselves. The writer's point is that this is carried to such lengths, and that kidding becomes an accepted part of life, so that even in moments of deep emotion, when a person really wants to be serious and meaningful, he is frustrated both by inability to express his feelings, and by the fact that no-one is ready to appreciate them and regard them as valuable.

## PERIODICALS LIBERTARIANS

THE UNIVERSITY LIBERTARIAN,  
No. 5. Winter, 1957

LIBERTARIAN, No. 1. September, 1957.

THE fifth issue of the University Libertarian maintains the high standard which it has established. The main article is "Authority and Sovereignty" by Geoffrey Ostergaard (which has appeared in *FREEDOM*), and the other contents include a discussion of the semantics of "Humanism" and allied ideas by J. Henry Lloyd, and an informative article about the colour situation in South African universities by Edward Roux, and a portrait of Proudhon in the series of articles on personalities of the revolutionary movement by George Woodcock. (Previous ones have dealt with Godwin and Fourier).

*Libertarian* is published by the Libertarian Society of Sydney University, and all its articles reflect what appears to be the collective attitude of that society. This is put straightforwardly by George Molnar in his article "Anarchism" which is reprinted in the *U.L.* and may be summed up as follows. It is quite mistaken to think in terms of a free society emerging some time in the future. The conflict of interests between various groups implies that there will always be some whose interest will be opposed to libertarianism, and we must think in terms of permanent struggle between libertarians and authoritarians. Molnar traces the expression of that view through the words of well-known anarchists of the past, and argues it very cogently. However, the same theme is pressed in

the introduction, all three articles, the other two being on "The Illusions of Moralism" and "The Ideology of Chastity", and in the reply to a correspondent, and this rather conveyed the impression, to an anarchist, that the writers were leaning over too far backwards in their efforts to convince us of the impossibility of a libertarian society. In past and present societies there have certainly been conflicting groups, but there has generally been a predominating ideology, and there have been several much more acceptable to libertarians than the one which predominates in Western Europe to-day! No-one expects an airy-fairy Utopia, with no quarrelling or bad people, of course there will be groups with conflicting interests and people trying to reimpose old forms of government or institute new ones.

What we are aiming at is a society where anarchism, in its various forms, is the predominant type of social organisation; where the social institutions will in general work in such a way as to assist and gratify a majority of people with libertarian attitudes and ways of life, and make it very difficult for anyone to exercise power over others, just as to-day social institutions favour the ruler-subject complex and hinder the anarchist. We needn't be too modest!

It is certainly a great benefit to the anarchist movement to have a variety of journals in the English language, expressing various points of view and making for contact between scattered groups in America, Australia and Britain, and it is to be hoped that they will continue to flourish. P.H.

The first act starts rather slowly. Agnes, who is a private secretary working on the 68th floor of the General Office of "The Company" in New York, arrives on a visit to her sister Jeanne, and brother-in-law Dan, who is employed in the Company's local branch office. Accompanying her is Chase Allen, who holds a prominent position in the Company, and this leads everyone to suspect that plans may be afoot to close down the local office. This is true, but one of Agnes' other motives is a desire to escape from the private secretary life of New York for a few days, and enjoy the hospitality of what she has been thinking of as an ideal happily married couple, with home and baby of their own, and only the problems of small town social life to concern themselves with. This picture is rudely shattered for her on closer contact with the family, and their friend Eddie, also a company employee, who is having an affair with Jeanne, and she finds that Jeanne has been harbouring a reciprocal admiration for her idealised notion of what Agnes' life contained. The one person who stands aside from the world of kidding is Steve, who is mentioned several times in conversation before he actually appears. He is a teacher, working in a poor quarter of the town. When he came home from the army, he had decided against continuing his career with the Company, promising though it was, and had chosen to teach despite the small financial reward. With his appearance, the speed of the play increases with good effect, and the element of tension between the Kidders and the Idealist, holds together the unfolding components of the drama; the fate of the branch office and its employees, the relations between Jeanne, her husband and Eddie forming one 'triangle', and Agnes, Steve and Chase forming another, and the personal troubles of Dan, completely disheartened and defeated by the life he was leading but unwilling and unable to escape from it.

All the performances are good, and convey the impression that there are good aspects of everyone's personality, which are trying to come to the top, but which are being stifled by the social surroundings.

In any play on a theme like this, another recent example being the United Artists film "No Down Payment" which had a short showing in London earlier this year, there are two aspects to the conflict portrayed. On one hand there is the antithesis between the superficial air of contentment and stability which clothes the situation and all the participants in it, and the horrible reality, which is recognized by everyone, but mentioned by no-one. On the other hand there is the more social aspect, the struggle between different characters,

some of whom represent partial solutions to the problems raised, the others who are not completely submerged, perhaps the better sides of our nature, or the complicated people, while others, who times represent the factors which are holding them back.

It seems that whatever treatment of this subject is adopted, it is necessary to build up a fairly convincing picture of the superficial side of the situation before starting to pull it to pieces, and the modern American plays criticise the hypocritical aspects of their own society have a common fault, it is that they neglect this. Any work in this field invites comparison with Ibsen, and we notice, for instance, that in "A Dolls House" and "The Pillars of the Community" the whole of the first act is devoted to portraying the apparent respectability of the situation. There are hints, whispers and gossip that indicate that all is not well, but the impact of the dramatic revelations of truth are saved up until they can be most effective. The duplicity of the kidders, however, is apparent from the start. This is not so much to claim that there is an objective fault in the play, as to express a wish that it might have been otherwise. For English audiences it is all the more important that the "appearances" should be played in fairly thoroughly, since the differences between everyday life in England and America to-day are greater than those between Norwegian and English bourgeois society in 1880, and unless this is done effectively, we are left feeling that the characters, although they appear to have come straight from the pages of the sociological or psychological books on these aspects of society, or even from an anarchist's conception of the USA, are still not quite real people, whose drama has some relevance to us.

The alternative, and very worthwhile approach which a dramatist could take would be to assume that Ibsen's work needs no repeating, that everyone realises what hypocrisy is hidden beneath respectable exteriors, and to concentrate on exploring some particular consequence or implication of this, or to suggest a solution. The character of Steve is not sufficiently refractory to have this latter effect. He is discussed as if he represented something great, a threat to the very existence of the kidders, but it is difficult to see why! The idealistic relief in "No Down Payment" is even less satisfactory. Is this because writers, while recognising faults, have not really started to look for solutions? It would be fatal if characters were always drawn in terms of black and white, but if a dramatist wishes to make an effective comment on a contemporary problem, then at least he must portray extreme aspects of some of his people in fairly extreme shades of grey.

These are long-term considerations, and apart from its initial hesitancy, "The Kidders" is an interesting and gripping play, and well worth a visit. P.H.



## The Real 'Central Question'

Continued from p. 1

... posing another question, and answering it honestly: What are the causes of war? One can no more avoid wars by seeking to regulate, reduce or re-deploy the armed forces of the world, than one can avoid adultery by decreeing that adultery is a crime. Only by understanding the causes can we hope to find a solution to the problem of war.

THE OBSERVER, to judge by its reflections on the policy of containment, takes for granted that Russia and her allies are bent on making war on the West, and that the latter is only concerned with preventing such an attack. Similarly it seems that all the neutral countries would, if they possessed nuclear reactors, busy themselves, even "at a price", to produce atomic weapons to let loose a war of annihilation. The impression one gets is that some nations, given the opportunity, would make war for its own sake. Now, politicians have never inspired us—unlike *The Observer*—with any illusions, but, however, we have never assumed that they possessed the absolute power or were so crazy as to look upon war as an end in itself, least of all nuclear war, which most scientists† seem to be agreed, means annihilation for the aggressor as well as the aggressed.

To say, as does *The Observer* that the Great Powers might, as a result of a local "crisis" be "precipitated" in a world war is a lot of nonsense. World War II was a foregone conclusion in 1938, and neither Korea nor Suez, Kenya nor Algeria, Cyprus nor Hungary, have stirred the "Great Powers" from their Kremlins or their White Houses—in spite of the fact that in each of these "crises" one of the Great Powers was directly involved.

Governments at all times have sought to justify wars with high-sounding motives. And ironically enough as the world has become more materially-minded so has war propaganda become more ideological in its appeal! Since 1939 wars, skirmishes and a war economy have been explained as necessary measures to defend a way—"our way"—of life. It has always been taken for granted that our spokesmen were referring to our spiritual and political salvation not to sordid material questions! How disappointing it must have been for those who were prepared to sacrifice their lives to defend "democracy" from the threat of Nazism in 1939 to read Sir Robert Boothby, M.P., in last week's *Sunday Times* where he declared that it was

the *laissez faire* system which led us into the greatest economic disaster known to history, and culminated in the second world war.

How disillusioning it must have been for those who joined wholeheartedly in the "war effort" following the government's revelation of the Nazi plan for whole extermination of the Jews, to read instalments from Mr. Joel Brand's book "Advo-

\*If Dr. Gallup and his scouts spent less time forecasting election results which are, anyway, more accurately determined by people putting their crosses on a ballot paper, and perhaps more in finding out what people think (or don't think) on basic questions, they would serve a valuable social function, in that their questions would encourage people to start thinking and might even reveal the abysmal ignorance which prevails on the social "life and death" questions on which *The Observer*, for one, assumes we are all agreed.

†And even most politicians who to-day are surrounded by "advisers", political, scientific, financial, religious, etc.

cate for the Dead", now being serialised in *The Observer*, and to learn that the Nazis were in fact more interested in dollars than Jews. And how much more disillusioning, if we are to believe Mr. Brand, that those outside should have been unwilling to risk a few million dollars to save a million brothers and sisters.

OF course Britain no more went to war in 1939 to save the Jews and defend democracy than did Hitler for the Aryan cause or to avenge the humiliation of Versailles. The world had been living through a ten-year financial slump, as a result of which millions of workers were unemployed and starving, and industry was bankrupt. German industrial revival in a world in which markets were shrinking could only be achieved at someone's expense and it was clear that at a certain stage, just as Germany was prepared to go to war to break through the economic iron curtain which France and Britain had erected after the first world war, so at a certain stage was Britain ready to put away the umbrellas of "peace in our time" and set to work on the construction of the weapons of war, to prevent this happening.

Neither country fought the war for its own sake; neither was motivated by high moral ideals. (British politicians, after all, had nothing but praise for Hitler's determination and drive from 1933-38 and apparently had not heard of the concentration camps and persecution of the Jews until Hitler became Enemy No. 1). Both engaged in war in the belief that the economy of their respective nations would benefit thereby: Hitler by gaining the *lebensraum* he declared the German people needed; and Britain by succeeding in holding on to what she already held. And one can only talk of the "aggressor" in such wars if one is prepared to declare that some nations have a permanent right to privileges and financial advantages denied to others.

It is also our opinion, formed from what we have read of the political biographies that have poured from the presses since the war ended, that however compelling the power lust of some individuals may be, not even the most paranoid dictator in our time has in fact been in a position to satisfy his innermost dreams of power and conquest at any price. Recourse to, or the abolition of, war is not decided at Summit talks (though even so it is in the hands of dangerously few people). The power struggle in the world to-day is the instrument which power-hungry men use to satisfy their power lust, just as some sadists join the prison service and some homosexuals become school masters. But to assume that personal power is the ends of the power struggle in international politics is as wide of the mark as maintaining that prisons exist for the satisfaction of sadists or schools for the delectation of homosexuals.

THE attempt at world domination by the two power blocs, if it were for the sake of power purely and simply would be a waste of time and energy. It only makes "sense" when related to the needs of capitalism for its survival. As Mr. Dulles so eloquently put it, when he appealed to Congress last week to continue the foreign aid programme in spite of the current recession:

[To abandon it] we would then, indeed, give away to communism "the control of a dozen or so nations with their hundreds of millions of people," he said. "We would, indeed, give away bases essential to our national peace and security. We would, indeed, give away the access which we and other nations have to essential resources and to trade on which our own well-being depends." (Our italics).

Equally war or a war economy *per se* are expensive, wasteful and pointless but have their "utility" when recessions threaten to become real depressions! Since the end of the war the United States has had three serious recessions. The first in

## The German People & Nuclear Arms

IT now appears likely that the military forces of Western Germany will be supplied with nuclear weapons. No doubt the East German army would find them quite easy to come by if an appropriate need arose. It is ironic to recall that when the development of atomic weapons by British scientists was undertaken, the government made the explicit point, to assure those scientists who felt uneasy about the consequences of their work, that it was only being done because the German forces were planning atomic weapons for use against Britain, and only if this event looked like being realised, would atomic bombs be used—against Germany.

The war in Europe ended without nuclear weapons being used, but the developed bomb was used, against already defeated Japan. Now, only thirteen years later, when Germany is again the centre of interest for nuclear-weapon-minded soldiers and politicians, the proposal is not that they should be used against the German military machine, but that they should be supplied to it.

Few people in England seem interested in this particular topic, which is perhaps just as well, since our main task must be to try and prevent nuclear development of weapons in England, and there is much to be done in that sphere, but it is heartening to see that some sections of the German people are more ready to resist the arming of their nation's forces with nuclear weapons.

It is not of great positive importance that Herr Ollenhauer, the Social Democrat leader and his colleagues, and the leaders of the Trade Union organisation

have expressed their opposition. It is important that in order to force them to such a position, there must be a certain strength of anti-nuclear feeling among the people. The basis of this feeling may be mixed: it will undoubtedly contain elements which are only concerned with the formation of a united German state, and those who are quite prepared to see the USSR and USA go to war provided Germany is not going to be hurt. However, these factors also mean that there is less inhibition against the traditional working class anti-war feeling, and to the extent to which this can operate, the German workers will have an opportunity to make their desires felt—by the equally traditional methods of direct action.

The official leaders of the "Anti atom death Campaign", backed by SPD and Trade Union leaders, are calling for a referendum, and a national political general strike. There is no constitutional provision for a referendum to decide a political question, on the Swiss model, but even so, like their counterparts in British Universities, the campaign leaders seem to feel that the referendum is a deadly political weapon! Does that mean that if a majority are in favour of nuclear weapons one should accept them like gentlemen? And what happens if a majority are opposed to nuclear weapons, since the power still lies between the government and its armed forces? A political strike to install a Social Democratic government would provoke the right to take dictatorial power. This possibility has always to be faced, but is the risk justified by the end in view? It was only three years ago when the Social Democrats were op-

posed to German rearmament in any form. Now they support it and sit on the Bundestag defence committee. They fought the last election having promised to repeal the conscription law, but the Pacifists felt that once in power, this would be another forgotten promise.

If the workers intend to take effective action, it must be independently of these official organisations. There are signs of this happening, as strikes of motor workers and dockers have already been staged in Hamburg, and an attempt was made in Brunswick. Earlier there had been a strike at Kassel, and these had been accompanied by demonstrations and marches by the workers concerned expressing their demands.

The groups which organise these strikes should federate, to form an independent association interested, not in filling in referendum forms, or voting slips, but in using their industrial power to oppose the introduction of nuclear weapons. This struggle need not finish if such weapons are introduced, as a political struggle necessarily would, but can continue, trying to hamper the factories supplying accessories to the weapons, and could broaden into an attack against all weapons and militarism.

Is it our business to be concerned about the internal affairs of Germany? Can we in fact do anything about them? Yes. Certainly all of Western Europe will be affected whoever starts using nuclear missiles. The best way of giving support to Germans who are organising direct action against their government's plans—is to organise the same thing ourselves.

## Those Summit Letters

A GREAT deal of ink has been used by the political commentators on the subject of the replies by Messrs. Krushchev and Dulles to the open letter by Bertrand Russell published in the *New Statesman*, and to the second long letter from Krushchev to Bertrand Russell answering Dulles. The most apt comment of all on all this correspondence comes from Edward Hyams, who wrote to the *New Statesman*:

"The service Lord Russell and you have done us in provoking and printing the letters from Mr. Dulles and Com-

rade Krushchev is in revealing, finally and clearly, the sort of people these two politicians are; and in making it manifest that the less we have to do with either of them, the better.

"You are probably right in saying that Mr. Dulles believes what he writes. For he is clearly a fanatic. Only a fanatic could assert that the US has never tried to force its way of life on anyone; unless, of course, he had never heard of Professor Polk, for instance, who, I have sometimes thought, may have inspired some of Hitler's war-provoking antics. Yes, I fear you are right about Mr. Dulles, I fear he is an honest man. God help us all!

"But when you claim that Comrade Krushchev believes what he wrote in his contribution to this week's *New Statesman*, you go too far. I have just struggled painfully through the whole 9,000 words. I do not suppose you have ever had the misfortune to print a slacker, sloppier, sillier farrago of drivel in the whole course of your journalistic life. That alone, however, would not be sufficient to make it certain that Comrade K. was insincere. Demagogues, and all politicians are that now, must necessarily have third-rate minds. But even so... no, it's impossible. Comrade Krushchev likes to appear as a plain, blunt man. In fact he obviously is a plain, blunt man, who has got where he is by being plain and blunt with whatever weapon, from a broken bottle to a broken pro-

1948-49 which Marshall Aid\$ and the Korean War resolved. The second in 1953-54 was largely contributed to by the ending of the Korean war and was temporarily halted by a tax cut of no less than \$7,500 million. The third is the current recession, which a writer in the *New York Times* (23/3/58) declares is a difficult situation but adds "True, the gods have once again provided a luck break—the post-sputnik increase in defence spending".

In spite of this "lucky break" however,

there is real doubt that this will be enough. Hence the widespread belief that this recession is providing much the most severe test of whether modern American governments can and will take the right actions to cure successfully a serious slump.

Will tax cuts do the trick until the next slump, or will American industrialists manufacture an even "luckier break" than the sputnik, in the shape of another Korea? They have one or two hot-spots to choose from but they need to be careful not to bite off more than they can chew; something short, sharp and conventional, which will set the shipping moving, the steel works rolling and the factory wheels turning. And it's not so easy to pick the right kind of "quarrel" when most industrial countries are watching their own depressions building up and looking for the hot-spots where perhaps they too can cool-off if it becomes "necessary" as a last resort.

§A writer in the *New York Times* (23/3/58) points to two actions "unrelated to the slump" which helped resolve it: one was a tax cut and the other was "the beginning of the Marshall Plan, in which 1949 was the first big-spending year. This created a big demand for American goods to be shipped to Europe."

mise, came to hand. That is all common form. But he must also have needed a modicum of cunning, a certain quickness and shrewdness, even a little penetration, for after all he had to survive in the world of the late J. V. Stalin, not to mention Beria and the rest. In short, plain and blunt he may be, but he is not absolutely cretinous. And nobody but a cretin could still believe that stuff about "Horthy elements" in the Hungarian revolution of 1956. We may, I think, take it that Comrade Krushchev knows the real facts as well as we do. So that what he persuaded you to print was not what he believed but what, in his experience, it is now possible to get the Orwellian sheep we all are to bleat. As we are not Russians, of course, this fails. But, sir, for how long? How long will it be before our leaders are treating us with precisely the same kind of contempt? Not long if we do not curb them at every turn.

"The lesson of these letters you have been printing is clear: the two most powerful men in the world are not fit to be trusted with a catapult, let alone an H-bomb. And this is not because they are respectively American and Russian. It is because no man, and most certainly no man of the kind who deliberately seeks and enjoys political power, is fit to be trusted with such a device. We cannot deny it to either of your eminent letter-writers, sir. But we can deny it to our own top men. Fortunately the movement to do so seems to be going well. We must keep up the pressure. You never know, the idea might spread beyond our shores."

## FREEDOM PRESS

### SELECTIONS FROM 'FREEDOM'

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

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

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

### VOLINE :

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

### E. A. GUTKIND :

*The Expanding Environment* 8s. 6d.

### V. RICHARDS :

*Lessons of the Spanish Revolution* 6s.

### GEORGE WOODCOCK :

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

### RUDOLF RÖCKER :

*Nationalism and Culture* cloth 21s.

### PETER KROPOTKIN :

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

### MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI :

*Neither East nor West* paper 7s. 6d.; cloth 10s. 6d.

### K. J. KENAFICK :

*Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx* paper 6s.

### Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications :

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

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



# Prospects for Nasser

PRESIDENT NASSER is due to visit Moscow at the beginning of May. It will be his first visit abroad since his triumphant nationalisation of the Suez Canal in July, 1956. The reason for his visit may be guessed; he wishes to negotiate further trade agreements.

There is very little to be said in favour of the Egyptian Premier, in fact nothing springs to mind at all readily, but this does not detract from his obvious ability in estimating just how far he can go with the so-called Great Powers before losing more than he hopes to gain. So far he has arranged three transactions with the Iron Curtain group, starting with arms from Czechoslovakia in 1955 and recently a low-interest loan of £62 million. During this period he has consistently suppressed all Communist tendencies in Egypt, and is now in the process of carrying out the same policy in Syria.

It is at least arguable that Nasser may eventually have to pay a high price for the luxury of considerable economic dependence on the USSR concurrently with active non-cooperation in matters which are presumed to be close to the Kremlin's heart. Although he is at present in popular demand in a number of the capitals of the world—it is expected that he will soon visit Athens,

Beirut, Rome and possibly Belgrade—his position could alter overnight if Russia changed her tune.

Nasser over-reached himself in regard to Israel, although this was his first major error, but the confidence he gained in his dealing with the West may eventually lead him to suppose that dealings with the Soviet Union are just as simple. If he reads the history books (the accurate ones), he will find that all is not necessarily as it appears to be.

Of course the fortunes of President Nasser, as such, do not concern us greatly, but on his fortunes there rests something of greater importance—the possible enlargement of the Soviet Empire, a possibility devoutly to be deplored.

## “WAR” IN CUBA

FOR fifteen months in the mountainous regions of Cuba the rebel leader Fidel Castro has been carrying on guerilla warfare against the military dictatorship of President Fulgencio Batista. On April 1st (to-morrow as we write), Castro is due to begin “total war” against the Government. Cuba has a population of 6,000,000, of which a disproportionate number are in the army or the police, even by normal standards; Castro has a force variously estimated between 400 and 1,000.

The size of the rebel force is not however any guide to its effectiveness, particularly since there is obviously considerable sympathy and support from the population. Batista is undoubtedly a worried President as well he may be, for Castro invariably succeeds in carrying out threats he makes in advance, whether they concern the burning of sugar crops, the blowing-up of trains or the disappearance of goods from storage sheds.

Not only has Castro issued an ultimatum, ignoring Batista's offer of an amnesty, but he has published a time-table of events.

On April 2nd, the population has been told to stop paying taxes, and the armed forces have been told to desert if they want to retain their present rank in the Castro army. About April 3rd or 4th there is to be a systematic scheme of widespread arson, wrecking and killing. Providing there is adequate response from the people, Castro will then set a date for a general strike.

Until now Batista has been quite unable to stop the guerrillas from carrying out their published actions, and the Army has paid heavily for its attempts to attack Castro in his redoubt. Now even the Catholic church is calling upon the President to resign; several youth and student movements have declared themselves for Castro. It is unlikely that Batista's counter-move, a 4 per cent. wage increase to the go-slow sugar workers, will have any effect.

## The Empty House

Although Marlborough House, home of Queen Mary until her death in 1953, is empty, it is going to cost the taxpayers around £250 a week in the coming year.

In the Civil Estimates for 1958-59, the expenditure on Marlborough House is estimated £13,409. This is nearly £3,000 more than for the year just ending.

The £13,409 estimate is made up as follows: salaries £3,609; new works, alterations and additions £3,000; maintenance and repairs £5,445; furniture and equipment—repair and maintenance £50; fuel, gas, electricity, water and household articles £1,960.

This is offset by £655, which comes from payments for lighting and heating by tenants in Marlborough House Mews. There are eight “grace and favour” flats there occupied by royal staff.

Caretakers now look after Marlborough House.

What is its future? The Buckingham Palace spokeswoman says: “We have no news about it.”

Evening Standard 24/3/58.

It will be interesting to see whether another dictatorship will be replaced with yet another dictatorship in the coming weeks or perhaps days. Castro's politics and aims are vague in the extreme, but it would be unusual if any great improvement were to be forthcoming from a movement dedicated to violence.

## HOPES FOR HUNGARY

ON March 27/28th a secret meeting took place between Marshal Tito and Janos Kadar, first secretary of the Hungarian Communist Party, at a hunting lodge in Yugoslavia. The talks are reported as having ended in “complete agreement” on all issues concerning relations between the Communist Parties of Yugoslavia and Hungary. It is a known fact that the meeting took place with the Kremlin's approval, for Kadar had to get permission to meet Tito from Moscow.

Amongst the advance guarantees demanded by Yugoslavia were the following:

“Normalisation” of Hungary's internal life, with the ending of persecution and repression.

Abandonment of the proposed show trial of Mr. Imre Nagy, the former Premier, and his political friends, who were abducted by the Russians from the Yugoslav Embassy in November, 1956.

An assurance that the Hungarian Communist Party would never return to the orthodox Rakosi party line.

There have been signs recently that the Kadar régime has been easing the pressure, at least in some directions. All members of the Imre Nagy group have been released from prison, except Nagy himself and two others; permission has been granted to Social Democrat members of the last Nagy Government to return to their former employment; there have been no political arrests since early in the year; the officially forecast trials of revolutionary groups have not taken place.

All this may not be much comfort to the harassed Hungarian people; nor are the motives of either Kadar or Tito necessarily any less suspect than usual, but at least there appears to be a slight trend—however slight.

## Business is Business

PARIS, FEBRUARY 23.

The fifteen-nation “Cocom” committee, which governs the embargo on trade with Communist countries, is now carrying out a comprehensive review of its strategic restrictions. Britain is the prime mover in urging freer trade with the Communist nations.—Reuter.

## Sorcerer's Apprentices?

MOUNT ISA (QUEENSLAND).  
JANUARY 27.

A team of rainmakers who flew over Mount Isa to-day succeeded so well that the river Leichhardt flooded and cut the town in two, and the rainmakers' own aircraft was reported bogged down when it landed. An inch of rain fell over the area in an hour.—Reuter.

## PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 13

Deficit on Freedom £260  
Contributions received £207  
DEFICIT £53

March 21 to March 27

Sheffield: P.L. 2/1; Farnham: D.M.B. 5/6; Hartford: M.G.A. 10/6; Cape Town: C.D.F. £2; London: P.F.\* £1; New York: S.K. £1/15/0; London: C.F. 1/-; Washington, D.C.: D.D.E. 14/-; London: J.McE. 11/-; London: Anon. 10/-; Hitchin: W.E.A. per H.E.H. £2; Greenford: B.M.E. 1/-.

Total ... 9 10 1  
Previously acknowledged ... 198 5 0

1958 TOTAL TO DATE ... £207 15 1

GIFTS OF BOOKS: London: S.E.P.; London: V.B.

\*Indicates regular contributor.

there is no other solution in the case of those towns which for various reasons we cannot alter fundamentally in character”. The aim would be to clear all motor traffic out of the whole or parts of a central urban area. “It would not be a matter of removing 50 per cent. of the traffic only to have it replaced in a few years by general traffic growth.” The difficulties are obvious. If there was any through traffic at all, an alternative route would have to be provided, with the risk that traffic congestion might be accentuated elsewhere. It would be necessary to relax restrictions at certain times to allow buildings to be serviced. Ambulances and fire engines would have to have access at all times. There would have to be facilities for public service vehicles to set down passengers close to the controlled area. On the other hand, “the construction of large car parks just outside the area is not necessarily involved, because an obvious implication of the idea of ‘motorless zones’ would be to put a check, and a very severe check, on the personal motoring habit in heavily built-up areas”.

fully drew attention to this on a poster under the heading “Room for All” which declared that “Were all private motor cars to leave their cars at home, then congestion would largely disappear, and buses would go through”.

Perhaps the most apt words on what to leave the question of cars in to are those of Sir Herbert Manzoni in a paper read at the RIBA last month:

“The present-day motor-car has developed from the horse-drawn carriage there is every evidence of this development in its form and size and it is probably the most wasteful and uneconomic contrivance which has ever appeared among our personal possessions. The average passenger load motor-cars in our streets is certainly less than two persons and in terms of portable load some 400 cubic feet of vehicle weighing over 1 ton is used to convey 4 cubic feet of humanity weighing about 2 cwt., the ratios being about 10 to 1 in weight and 100 to 1 in volume. The economic implication of this situation is ridiculous and I cannot believe it to be permanent”.

(To be continued)

## MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

### LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

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

### LECTURE - DISCUSSIONS

APRIL 6.—No meeting.  
APRIL 13.—Philip Sansom on  
ANARCHISM & THE CLASS  
STRUGGLE

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).

Monday, March 31st at 8 p.m.  
A discussion on Folk Music introduced by John Glaister, with illustration on the guitar.

## ★ Malatesta Club ★

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

### ACTIVITIES

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

## Trad Jazz at the Malatesta

Every Saturday from 7.30

### THE MALATESTA JAZZ BAND

Admission 2s. includes coffee  
MALATESTA CLUB  
32 Percy Street  
Tottenham Court Road W1

Open to Public  
Jazz Men welcome  
Organised by IAC

Every Wednesday at 8 p.m.  
BONAR THOMPSON speaks

## FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

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

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

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

### FREEDOM PRESS

27 Red Lion Street

London, W.C.1. England

Tel.: Chancery 8364