

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

19, No. 29.

July 19th, 1958

Threepence

"A state which dwarfs its men in order that they may be more docile instruments in its hands, even for beneficial purposes, will find that with small men no great thing can really be accomplished."

—JOHN STUART MILL.

CYPRUS

IS THERE AN ALTERNATIVE?

THE British Government has been extremely fortunate in the way which events in Cyprus have worked out. For although the situation there is appalling, with a death-rate rising daily as Turk murders Greek and Greek, Turk, the emergence of this fierce fratricidal struggle provides the British with the perfect justification for staying on the island.

Everyone—except the anarchists—recognises that the maintenance of law and order is the most important function of a government. Meeting the needs of the people, whether in a material sense or in the sense of providing a régime of freedom, dignity and civil responsibility—these are idealistic matters which can be dealt with, if at all, in times of tranquility and prosperity—i.e. almost never. But the stern duty of maintaining law and order is an ever-present and continuous demand upon authority and the one in whose name all privations and repressions are justified.

The Over-riding Claim

This has been demonstrated in Cyprus during all the years of the emergency, when the demands of the Greek Cypriots for the right to choose their allegiances (surely a basic right but one always ignored in favour of patriotic duty to the place of one's birth or—as in the case of occupied territory like Cyprus and Hungary—to the ruling authority, welcome or not) have been ruthlessly denied them because the British claim to Cyprus as a military base must over-ride all pretence at democracy.

Having no alternative means of protest but violence, the Cypriots mounted a struggle to try to dislodge their foreign masters, a struggle which has provided for all those with eyes to see a wonderful illustration of just how skin-deep is the British concern for democracy.

For three years the Cypriots have carried on a struggle similar in principle to that carried on by the underground resistance movements against the Nazis in occupied Europe during the war. But the British people, who thought so highly of the dedicated courage of the fighters in those resistance movements, have not seen the parallel. Or if they have, have not cared.

British People Support British Policy

The voices raised against British policy in Cyprus have been few. The vast majority of the freedom-loving British public has identified itself with its government in its denial of freedom to the people of Cyprus—waxing indignant only over the deaths of 'our boys' and never asking what the hell 'our boys' are doing there in the first place.

They have supported a Government whose policies have brought Cyprus to the brink of civil war, setting community against community as never before and bringing rage, savagery and suffering to the homes of ordinary people whose only fault is that they live on a certain island in a certain strategically important area, and some of whom want to choose their government for themselves.

Having refused to benefit from EOKA's promised truce, having put forward suggestions which it knew full well the Turks would not accept, having stirred up a hornet's nest, the British Government can

now present itself to the world as the only body capable of restoring peace in troubled Cyprus—even though it be only the peace of the grave, the 'order' at present established in Hungary.

To this extent then can we say that the tragic march of events in Cyprus have served the British—indeed been guided by them—and that the present agony and terror on the island is discounted by our cynical Government against its own military commitments. But it is a situation which, even from the squalid point of view of the militarists, could very easily go wrong.

Weakening NATO

If the present skirmishing between Greeks and Turks in Cyprus should turn to organised combat on any scale, the already strained relations between Greece and Turkey could soon reach breaking point, with unfortunate results for the effectiveness of NATO in the Eastern Mediterranean. Even the value of Cyprus itself as a base is affected by the police duties having to be carried out by the military, but this is now to be eased by the drafting of some hundreds of British policemen to Cyprus to release the troops for their proper, 'defensive' duties.

The opportunity to go to Cyprus is appanently eagerly snapped up by young, single, ambitious policemen, who go out with the rank of acting sergeants, with increased pay and allowances and an exciting change from their humdrum duties in Britain. The dirty nature of the work they have to do never occurs to them.

But even with the good-tempered British bobby pushing the Cypriots about instead of the good-tempered British tommy, the usefulness of the island can be impaired, but not, unfortunately, enough to interfere seriously with its real function for the British Government—a stepping-off point from which mobile forces can reach the hot spots of the Middle East.

No Political Solution

Particularly tragic in the Cyprus question is the fact that there now appears to be no solution which is acceptable to the three powers—Britain, Greece and Turkey—most concerned. And while these states play their murderous game of prestige and power the Cypriots will remain pawns—albeit angry pawns—in the hands of these governments when in fact it is they, the Cypriots, who are most concerned.

But everybody still looks for political solutions acceptable to the three states. They don't look at the situation in the first place from the viewpoint of the Cypriots—whether of Greek or Turkish origin.

If one does that, one sees that, strangely enough, the anarchist solution is the only practical one—as distinct from the possible one.

We have always expressed our impatience with the cry for 'Enosis' which, we maintain will bring no more freedom or dignity to the Cypriots than they have at present. The Turkish 'solution' of partition is unacceptable to the Greeks and anyway—as Ireland demonstrates—is a ridiculous arrangement in practice. The third alternative is a continuance of British rule under present circumstances, which is obviously intolerable.

Independent, Autonomous, Federal

The anarchist solution for Cyprus is that it should not be governed by either Britain, Greece or Turkey or any amalgam of the three, but that it should become an independent island with the Cypriots, whatever their land of origin, running their affairs themselves.

Not with a Cypriot government, but through local initiatives and co-operatives, co-ordinating over the island on a federal basis. Turkish, Greek or mixed villages or parts of towns could have their own autonomous communes for the arranging of their economies and, without imposing will one upon the other, could work together in their common interests. In this way Greek would not dominate Turk nor vice versa.

Through agricultural and industrial co-operatives the wealth of the island—the fruits and wines, the minerals, the port facilities—could be produced and worked and made available for export for the mutual benefit of all. Even here and now this could be put into operation, even if a continuance of the money system would rob it of a completely anarchist nature, and initiatives which do not require large capital expenditures—like encouragement of a tourist trade, for Cyprus is a beautiful, sunny island—could bring foreign capital to the island to help its present artificially corrupted economy.

Such a decentralised, functional system could work admirably on an island like Cyprus. Its population of half-a-million (only a quarter of that of the province of Barcelona) is already organised in small communities and in the villages local affairs are already a matter of local co-operation.

What Hopes?

The anarchist alternative is therefore a practical one in Cyprus—indeed the only practical one. But is it possible? The great obstacle to any sensible solution is the presence of the British, which places a special responsibility on the anarchists in this country. The inter-communal hatred will die down when the slimy divide-and-rule tactics of the British invaders have ceased. The religious differences and political allegiances would fade in the face of common interest and communal responsibility.

But what hopes for such a solution? Your guess, dear reader, is as good as ours.

MONEY

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 28

Deficit on Freedom	£560
Contributions received	£352
DEFICIT	£208

July 4 to July 10

London T.F.* 5/-; Oxford: Anon.* 5/-;	
Detroit: J.C. 14/-; London: J.S.* 3/-;	
Nazeing: M.W. 10/-; Minneapolis: C.C. 7/-;	
Hong Kong: M.S. 4/-; Oxford: M.T. 3/-;	
Hartford: M.G.A. 2/6; Hyde Park: T.C. 1/3;	
Moline: E.J.J. 15/8; Warrington: J.H. 10/-;	
London: half B.B.C. fee, per R.M. £2/12/6;	
London: E.L.T. £1/18/0; London: W.F. 2/6;	
London: Anon. 4/9.	

TOTAL	8 18 2
Previously acknowledged	343 4 10

1958 TOTAL TO DATE ... £352 3 0

Gift of Books: London: H.S.

*Indicates regular contributor.

After 22 Years

Spain: July 19

THIS issue of FREEDOM appears on July 19, a date which for many thousands of people inside Spain and outside is still vividly linked in their minds and hearts to a struggle which inspired the socially and politically conscious world as nothing has since, East Berlin and Hungary not excluded. As Herbert L. Mathews, an editor of the *New York Times*, puts it in a book he has recently published on Spain:

Which of us from, let us say, the age of thirty-eight or forty on, can forget the Spanish conflict if we had any political or religious consciousness in those three years from 1936-1939? It had quality that war. Something in it reached deeply into our hearts as well as our minds. . . . I know, as surely as I know anything in this world, that nothing so wonderful will ever happen to me again as those two-and-a-half years I spent in Spain.

Yes, the Spanish Civil War had a special quality that the infinitely greater and more terrible World War II lacked.

Mr. Mathews, whose book seems directed at those Americans who are prepared to whitewash Franco and agree that his régime be subsidised with dollars in return for military bases, rightly stresses the fact that one has not understood the nature of the Spanish struggle in 1936, if one accepts Franco's evaluation of it as a crusade against the forces of Communism. That the Spanish C.P. was almost non-existent, that it had only sixteen deputies in a Cortes of 473 and was overwhelmed by 269 Republican and Socialist deputies in the Popular Front formed at the time of the elections in February, 1936, are facts, which however, make little impression on politicians and a guilt-ridden public continually seeking to rationalise the unprincipled policies adopted in furtherance

of the international struggle for power.

To boost Franco as a bulwark against Communism and the first national leader to actively oppose its expansionist dreams is as sure a way of opening the door of American aid and support as even the briefest flirtation with the Party is a reason for depriving an individual of a job, status, and, until recently, his passport. Governments, Mr. Mathews should know by now are not concerned that their propoganda should be based on the truth or facts; they are only concerned with it being effective.

★

NOW in this matter of the facts

Mr. Mathews as a journalist on the spot was himself guilty either of ignorance or suppression, and in his present book he makes some attempt to straighten the record, but perhaps because it is such a confused book, one is left with the impression that the author has not understood the full implications of his revaluation of some of the issues.

Not only were the Right-wing journalists misleading the public when they declared that Franco was fighting Communism, but equally wrong were the Republican sympathisers who declared that the struggle in Spain was one of "democracy versus fascism". As Mr. Mathews puts it most emphatically

let it be well understood to-day that the Republicans were no more saving Spain from what we understood as Fascism in 1936, than the Rebels were saving Spain from Communism. . . . What we all believed in 1936—I mean those who sympathised with the Republicans—was clearly wrong.

Continued on p. 3

GOD'S WILL OR Dr. FISHER'S

THE Archbishop of Canterbury has obviously allowed the Lambeth Conference of Anglicans to confuse him still further. Two weeks ago on TV he made a personal attack on a fellow Christian, Archbishop Makarios, when he described him as a 'bad character' who had been invited to the Conference only in an official capacity as head of the Greek Church. A few days later Fisher found it necessary to withdraw his observation on Makarios by stating that he, Dr. Fisher, was not really referring to his personal character! Now, Makarios may or may not be a 'bad lot' from some points of view, but Fisher is downright dishonest and guilty of the same political patriotism which motivates Makarios. The only real difference between them is that they are, at the moment, on opposite sides.

We wonder how Dr. Fisher will manage to explain away his latest statement on war which contradicts one which he made two weeks ago when he declared that:

"All war is detestable, horrible and sinful in the sight of God."

Of course, he made the usual Christian justification for war by blaming it on a sinful world and the need for 'good' people to do sinful things sometimes, but, God at any rate, was above all human beastliness. It seems however, that this week Dr. Fisher believes that it may be God's will that the human race

should destroy itself in a nuclear war. This divine backing for the H-bomb should help the political leaders in their apparent determination to destroy the human race. Dr. Fisher finds it politically convenient to remind his flock "there is no evidence that the human race is to last for ever, and plenty in Scripture to the contrary". It seems then that there is little hope for us, and even that scrap of comfort which Dr. Fisher gave us two weeks ago on God's attitude to war has been taken away by this new revelation.

The Archbishop of Canterbury is not alone in his interpretation of God's will. The Bishop of Rochester has decided on the choice we should make between H-bomb death and totalitarian domination. He says:

" . . . Total destruction and possibly a lingering death for any survivors, would be a lesser evil than serfdom under a totalitarian domination with its concentration camps, forced labour, regimentation, torture and brain-washing."

These two spiritual gents have less to fear from Soviet domination than us. The Church, as is its custom, always will, no doubt, come to terms with the temporal conqueror, while the anarchists face the choice of death by radiation or the firing squad!

We don't anticipate the Archbishop of Canterbury rushing to save us in either eventuality.

RESPONSIBILITY IN INDUSTRY

RECENT statements by employers and ministers have concentrated on pointing out that a certain amount of harm is done to an industry by militant strike action by its members. During last week the London Dock Labour Board issued a pamphlet giving some statistics of loss of trade which it presumes to have been due to the recent unofficial strike which began in sympathy with the Smithfield meat delivery workers, and was extended through the port when blackleg labour was introduced. Most of the examples quoted were of companies who were likely to choose to route their cargoes through other British ports instead of London. This, says the pamphlet, must inevitably lead to a decline in the wages of many or all of the workers in the docks.

The Minister of Transport made a similar point in a speech, saying that full employment would be endangered if strikes and stoppages were continued, and said, "This is the lesson of the dock strike, as we shall no doubt see when the next trade figures are produced—and of the bus strike too." In the same way Sir John Elliot used the loss of traffic from the bus system to the tubes, brought about by the recent seven week strike, as a threat in his negotiations.

A glance at the situation in other industries reveals, however, that loss of work and restriction of production are taking place in pretty well all of them. In the mines for instance, a speaker at the annual union conference estimated that the loss of pay due to the ending of Saturday working and restriction of overtime averaged 30s. per week, despite the fact that the cost of living had risen by 6%. This has taken place in a nationalised industry in which there exists an agreement between the union and the board which almost rules out strike action. The general secretary of the NUR said that his

members would have to accept the fact that when the railway modernisation plans had been completed there would be fewer jobs available but that this must be accepted, and that it was preferable to work in a modernised industry and be well paid, than to be in a decrepit one and be badly paid. Here again, there has only been one national strike on the railways, over three years ago, and relations between the union leaders and the Transport Commission have been exceptionally friendly.

These examples indicate that whatever truth there may be in the allegations that workers are in a sense damaging their possibilities of more work, the same general trend is taking place whether they act in a militant manner or not. It suggests also that the employers are finding it convenient to make a scapegoat out of the striking workers, when the fault of decreased production, and lower wages, lies in entirely different directions.

It is interesting nevertheless to notice the increased and more subtle appeals to the responsibility of the workers. The Dock Labour Board's pamphlet was sent to every worker in the docks, and to all employers. The NUR delegates were told that the Transport Commission wanted their co-operation in the modernisation scheme. These sort of appeals are as old as the Labour movement itself; even "The Ragged Trousered Philanthropists" contains an account of a speech in which the boss congratulated the philanthropists on realising that they, who used their hands, needed to co-operate

with the bosses who used their brains.

The effect of such propaganda on each industry is probably not very great. Despite the Dock Labour Board's warning, a national conference is to be called to discuss action to secure a substantial increase in wages. Significantly, one of the principal grounds on which this claim is based is the lack of work in the docks, which is throwing more dockers onto the "fall back" pay of £6 1s. 0d. per week. Discussions between representatives of the London bus workers and the LTE are pointing to the opinion that the busmen were mistaken in their decision to return to work without a firm promise of a definite sum of money for those excluded from the wage increase which caused the dispute. The effect of the appeals for "responsibility" are however to confuse people's attitudes to work and production. The middle class person reads about the terrible deeds of the workers and condemns them for all the economic troubles of the country, while the worker comes to the justifiable conclusion that acting "responsibly" is the quickest way of working oneself out of a job.

Perhaps however, a few people may be stimulated to think once again over the whole problem of responsibility in work. To whom or what is a person responsible? If one makes charges of irresponsibility against workers or unions, then what are the conditions which bring about this situation? Is there any reason, in view of the position of manual workers in the economic set-up, why they should work, and feel responsibility to their employers, to

the government, or to its particular economic policies?

All workers are to a greater or lesser extent regarded as cogs in the economic machine; human beings used as means to make profits for employers or to fulfil the "needs" of the nation in its nationalised undertakings, needs determined not by the producers, not by the people of England or anywhere else, but by politicians and business men. Only a few years ago, miners were being urged to spend six days at the bottom of the pits, as if five were not too much, and their leaders fully agreed with this, in the national interest. Now that the national interest has been shifted, they are forced to give up the Saturday work, and suffer a decrease in pay as a result. The men of the Welsh valleys who during the war carried on with their hand-worked tin-plated mills which were so necessary to the government, carrying on to such an age that it is difficult for them to learn another skilled trade, are thrown on the dole now that resources have become available for building the giant mills which occupy far fewer workers.

Yet the stupidity of the Labour leaders continues unabated. Hardly a word about the social problems of industry, the goods which are produced, or the fact that few people can maintain a livelihood without selling a large part of their lives to someone else. In fact the Communist, Will Paynter, giving an example of the circumstances in which he felt that industrial action would be justified could think of nothing better than an attempt to weaken nationalisation by the government.

The most sensible comments came from Mr. Sidney Greene, of the NUR:

"I do not know whether it can be made to pay or not. I am concerned with making it an efficient industry. It does not necessarily mean that to have an efficient industry it has got to pay, and it does not necessarily mean that a paying industry is efficient. I should like to see both sets

of circumstances so far as the way industry is concerned, but to the detriment of the people who work in the industry. If we have our co-operation, as I believe we do, we are prepared to give although we want all the necessary safeguards we can possibly get our members. If we get those safeguards I think we shall get greater co-operation. But when modernisation programme comes its full fruition we shall have to accept the fact that there will be fewer people working in the railway industry than there are now. We have accepted that the railway are not going to be run simply employ railwaymen. They have to be run to carry goods and passengers."

In his speech Mr. Greene is least getting away from the idea of usefulness and profit-making, true use of railways, but he is quite right, sees the need of securing safeguards against the Transport Commission. Despite co-operation, the BTC have power and the workers need to mobilise their own power in opposition.

The only situation in which one can be expected to exercise responsibility in his work is when he is free, when the work itself has definite use to the community, not tied up with someone else's profits, and when it has been freed from the bondage of economic necessity. The supreme lack of responsibility of which we are all guilty is of allowing the authoritarian social order to exist; in falling into the situation where livelihood depends on spending six days in the mines or in the docks rather than in refusing to work where the whim of a shipping company can put men out of work.

The problems of industrial workers spring from the very same source of governments as do the problems of war and the H-bomb. The solution is to recognise this and do something towards changing social conditions so that these contradictions no longer exist.

SYNDICALIST

The Other Socialism

MARX, PROUDHON AND EUROPEAN SOCIALISM by Hampden Jackson. (English Universities Press, 8s. 6d.).

THIS little book is part of the "Teach Yourself History" series in which the biography of a significant figure is used to "open up" the historical period or tendency which he represents. In the present volume the lives of Proudhon and Marx are used to set the scene of the European socialist movement in the nineteenth century. Mr. Hampden Jackson is well-known as an admirer of Proudhon (his widely-circulated essay *Proudhon: A Prophet for Our Time* was reprinted in FREEDOM for 17/11/51), and the usefulness of his book is precisely that it will remind the "general reader" at whom it is aimed, that there are other traditions of socialism besides those represented by the Kremlin and Transport House.

His assertion of the claims of the "other" socialism in the very first pages is so well and challengingly put that it is worth reprinting as an appetiser for this excellent little book:

"There are two currents in the movement known as Socialism, and no story of the rise of that movement is worth reading unless it takes account of each. Looked at from the point of view of the mid-twentieth century, it may well seem that socialism has been moving always in the same direction, always towards the centralisation of power and the increasing authority of the State. Not for nothing were the early Marxists called Authoritarians; not for nothing did Sidney and Beatrice Webb at the end of their lives find their Mecca in Moscow. All schools of Social Democracy from the Germans to the Fabians have preached centralisation, and all schools of Communist Socialists from the Russians to the Yugoslavs and the Chinese have practised totalitarianism. Looking at the world to-day, socialists may well wonder if their creed offers any alternative to the course towards the omniscient State.

"If they look back at the history of their own movement, they will find one. They will find a tradition known variously as libertarianism, individualism, mutualism, federalism, syndicalism: a tradition usually described as anarchism, which fought its first battle with the Marxists for the soul of socialism a century ago, and its latest, but surely not its last, in 1936, behind the lines of Republican Spain. They will find that the

anarchist (no-ruler) tradition was stronger than that of Marx in the First Workers' International, which Marx disbanded—or removed to New York, it comes to the same thing—because so many of the workers' delegates were anarchists. They will find that their famous Paris Commune was the creation of men who called themselves mutualists or federalists, and were for the most part no followers of Marx. They will find that the most radical section of the French working-class movement was composed of syndicalists who opposed both the Marxists and the parliamentary branch of socialism. They will find that the revolutionary socialists who bore the heat and burden of the day in Switzerland, Italy and Spain were anarchists. And they may even find that the mass of the people in Russia in 1917 cast their votes against the Bolsheviks and for the Social Revolutionaries who stood nearer to the anarchist camp.

"The father of this anarchist tradition was Proudhon, who died in 1865 when Marx had still eighteen years to live. It was Proudhon's errand disciple Bakunin, who led the majority in the First International, Proudhon's apostles—Beslay, Courbet and Gambon among them—who led the Paris Communards; Proudhon's follower Sorel whose teaching was responsible for the charter which the French trade-union movement adopted at Amiens in 1906. It was Proudhon's writings which sowed the seed of anarchist socialism in Catalonia, and Proudhon's ideas, transmitted less directly, that took root among the social revolutionaries in Russia.

"In the doctrinal hey-day of the mid-nineteenth century there was a great intellectual battle between the authoritarians and the anarchists, a battle eventually won by the former, with the result that the history of socialism, at least in continental Europe, has come to seem the history of various schools of Marxism. But if Karl Marx stands out to-day as the begetter of socialism, he is not the only begetter. Not only is there an anarchist, mutualist, anti-State tradition which is the opposite of Marxism, but there is also in the essence of the socialist creed a moral doctrine with which Marx, who professed a hearty contempt for moral preaching, had nothing to do. Socialism is an ethos as well as a policy, an attitude towards social life and an interpretation of one's duty towards one's neighbour, as well as a body of economic and political doctrine. And of this ethos Proudhon, though not the originator, was the major prophet."

Dr. Jung's Dilemma

C. G. JUNG: *The Undiscovered Self*. Routledge & Kegan Paul, London. 10s. 6d. net.

LIKE the ancient folk-tale of the father and his three sons, so Sigmund Freud had three star-pupils, who left his fold to find their own way through this neurotic world. Alfred Adler's individual psychology has to-day become part and parcel of common psychological practice and one will have to look far and wide to find somebody able to sort out the specific Adlerian ideas. Wilhelm Reich was the other. He went back to the early teachings of Freud and progressed from there. For that he died in an American prison.

And then there was C. G. Jung. Without the practitioners at Burghölzli in Switzerland, among whom Jung was to be the most well-known, Freud's teachings would have had a much harder fight. It was these Swiss followers of Freud, who made his teachings known all over the world, but especially in America. And it was after an American journey, that Jung started his own school of "Depth-psychology".

There was then no difference in his teachings and the teaching of Freud. Only the words used were different. All Jung did, was to try to make these teachings more palatable to what is commonly called the "better class". Sex had to be played down and morals up. Jung more and more turned his attention to an image of man, as he, Jung, would have liked him to be and away from man as he is. He divested himself of the doctor's white coat and put on the preacher's smock.

But even when preaching instead of healing, the problems stayed the same. The rôle of the individual in the ill society of to-day has not changed, even if you make a "God" watching over humanity in its suffering. And even if you blame all the evils of our time on the communists, how can you explain "God" just watching?

In his new book: "The Undiscovered Self", the doctor's—who became a pre-

cher-dilemma is completely unfolded. There is a lot of talk of "Christianity" and "God", of "our faith", Religion and even St. Augustine, Buddha and the Gospels are called upon as witnesses for the Christian West's reliability and against those awful people behind the "Iron Curtain". But the doctor, hiding under the cascock, is still there and the Individual, this poor tormented, subjugated, organised human being, is still here too.

And here happens the paradox: Jung, the man who wanted to make psycho-analysis presentable, lands exactly where Freud himself landed in the conflict of the first world-war. He attacks the State! The attack is not as clear and precise as Freud's was, but then, Freud was a clearer thinker and a better writer. But we have to be grateful even for little gifts. And in a time, when Sunday after Sunday we are told how badly off we would be without the State, Government and Leadership, it is refreshing to hear even from the half-hearted Doctor:

"The leaders and dictators, having weighed up the situation correctly, are therefore doing their best to gloss over the all too obvious parallel with the deification of Caesar and to hide their real power behind the fiction of the State, though this, of course, alters nothing.

"It needs only an almost imperceptible disturbance of equilibrium in a few of our rulers' heads to plunge the world in blood, fire and radio-activity."

What a good school for Analysis the doctor went to! Now let us see what the preacher prescribes:

"To counter this danger, the free society needs a bond of an affective nature, a principle of a kind like caritas, the Christian love of your neighbor."

Observe the american spelling! Dr. Jung has tried to solve his dilemma: he came down on the side of God. Now, if we only knew on which side God himself came down, perhaps we could solve our human Dilemma as well.

MAX PATRICK.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

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

Cheap Editions . . .

- Origins of Religion Lord Raglan 2/6
- Life of Jesus Ernest Renan 2/6
- Jesus—Myth or History? Archibald Robertson 2/6
- Selected Works of Voltaire 2/6
- Evolution of Society J. A. C. Brown 2/6
- Who Lie in Goal Joan Henry 2/6
- All You Young Ladies Alan Hackney 2/6

Second-Hand . . .

- War, Peace and Change John Foster Dulles (Pub. Macmillan 1939) 5/6
- Armies and the Art of Revolution K. C. Chorley 4/6
- The Testament of Christian Civilization Joseph McCabe 6/6
- The Bolshevik Myth Alexander Berkin 25/-
- Diplomacy by Conference Lord Hankey 3/6
- The Course of German History A. J. P. Taylor 4/-
- The Pendulum of Politics Aubrey Jones 3/-
- Ill Fares the Land Carey McWilliams 3/6
- Wealth, Virtual Wealth and Debt Frederick Soddy 3/6
- The Political Economy of War F. W. Hirst 4/-
- Human Nature in Politics Graham Wallis 3/6
- Atheism and the Value of Life W. H. Mallock 3/-
- A Certain Smile Françoise Segon 3/6

Pamphlet . . .

- Break Through (Universities Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament) 1/6

Periodical . . .

- Liberation June 1958 1/9

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

Postage free on all items
Obtainable from
**27, RED LION STREET,
LONDON, W.C.1**

Vol. 19, No. 29. July 19, 1958

Spain, 20 Years After

Continued from p. 1

What then was the struggle about, and why did it so profoundly move and inspire a whole generation?

For us—writes Mr. Mathews—it is the one given to the conflict by the clash of totalitarianism and democracy that is important; it is the fact that Spain became a battlefield for the ideologies of the time, that it was a rehearsal for World War II, that for three years it was the hub of the universe—these are the features that strike us to-day, as they did at the time. But Spaniards do not think of their Civil War in such terms. For them it was Spanish history that reached a tragic climax in 1936, not world history. And of course both points of view are justified.

They are justified, according to the author because "the contemporary world being what it is, and concepts being impossible to isolate, when a civil war becomes a world war Spain was the prototype, which was one reason for its historic importance". We would hazard a guess that very few of the thousands of men and women who made their way to Spain in those critical early weeks of the struggle were social democrats going to a "rehearsal for World War II", or liberals defending the sanctity of parliamentary institutions!

It should be pointed out, incidentally, that the International Brigades which Mr. Mathews describes as "forming a unique phenomenon in modern history" were in fact a creation of the communist counter-revolution, and used not only as the "prototype" in the militarisation of the militia, but politically to boost the otherwise insignificant Spanish Communist Party. The "unique phenomenon" was surely the ability of the socially conscious section of a community to improvise a successful defence against what the late Professor Allison Peers, a Franco sympathiser, described as "a military revolt carefully planned and skillfully organised by able military leaders on a nation-wide scale". Within two weeks of the uprising Franco's forces were defeated or halted in two-thirds of the Peninsula.

And second to this unique phenomenon were the international body of "irregulars"—revolutionaries, anti-fascist exiles and political refugees—who got into revolutionary Spain the hard way, and joined the columns of militiamen, the real volunteers who saw in the militarists' uprising the opening for a far-reaching social revolution. Of these men, who were in Spain before the Communists had opened their recruiting offices for the International Brigades; of those anarchist groups in France and elsewhere who were sending arms by the modest lorry-load to their comrades in Spain long before Russia had set herself up in business as arms agents (paid for in gold) on behalf of the Negrin government, Mr. Mathews hasn't a kind word to say!

★

INDEED, he is so busy rehabilitating the International Brigades, without at the same time fouling his own political nest³ that he obviously did not notice that on page 25 he refers to the struggle as a "revolution"! Of Orwell, whose views, as expressed in *Homage to Catalonia*, he discusses at some length, the trouble was that "he wanted to win the social revolution and the war at the same time". But, says Mr. Mathews:

It is the fate of all revolutions to move to the right, which Orwell knew as well as anybody, although he seems illogically to have resented the fact in Spain. He knew all the answers; they are to be found in his book; but he was personally too much of a rebel at heart to accept

the inevitable without protest. What he saw as an evil and a pity was in reality a necessity. 'As far as my personal preferences went, I would have liked to join the Anarchists', he wrote. He was the individual, the libertarian at heart, but the war could not possibly have been won by such men or such doctrines. In a sense, Orwell was one of the children that the revolution devoured; he could not be expected to like the process.

It would require more than a column or an issue of FREEDOM to adequately answer Mr. Mathews! If we are to assume that he weighs his words (and as a responsible journalist it is a matter of prime importance that he should!) then the fact that most revolutions seem to move to the right is no grounds for declaring that it is the "fate" ("what is destined to happen"—Concise Oxf. Dict.) of "all revolutions" but rather the incentive to study past revolutions and to understand why they have moved to the Right. There is in fact no more overriding reason why they should move to the Right rather than to the Left!

★

BUT Mr. Mathews, alas, is no revolutionary. He is a liberal with sentimental attachments for International Brigades when they are fighting on the right side. He even declares that "one of the most important meanings" of the struggle in Spain lies in the fact that it was "a struggle for the forces of modernism against traditionalism", but nevertheless any organisation that was not "traditional" is pure anathema to Mr. Mathews. He knows all about the Communists, but the P.O.U.M. (the anti-Stalinist Marxists) he describes as "a weird, thoroughly eccentric and untrustworthy organisation" (p. 23) (thus echoing C.P. propaganda!) and as to anarchism, well, the "Catalans [who] were Anarcho-Syndicalists... are not going to revert to that outworn philosophy"⁴ Mr. Mathews, like the Duchess of Atholl and other well-meaning democrats who sought to save Spain from Franco and the social revolution, is still the champion of the late unlamented, and in Spain, thoroughly discredited, political figure, Juan Negrin.

Yet, who in fact saved Spain from Franco's *coup d'état* on July 19, 1936? Mr. Mathews does not answer the question. He tells us that the Republican government was weak. "Had it been able to maintain law and order, there would, of course, have been no civil war". But then he admits that

this is begging the question since the real problem is why they could not keep the peace and run Spain as a democracy. The answer is long and complicated and he recommends his readers to consult Gerald Brenan's *Spanish Labyrinth!* But the question still remains, and with added force since the government was not only unable to control the army but had not enough confidence in the people when the army revolted to arm them against the army,⁵ any more than Pffimlin and his ill-assorted French workers to deal with their mutinous colonels last May. But how differently the Spanish workers reacted compared with their French counterparts!

We remember July 19 as a unique experience in our lives just because it is the most outstanding example of a people threatened by the jackboot and abandoned ("betrayed" would be more accurate since the Popular Front government had the pretence of representing the popular will—Remember the joint note of the Spanish Communist and Socialist Parties?⁶) by their so-called representatives, becoming suddenly conscious of their strength and social potentialities. The greatness of the Spanish workers in those days and weeks following the military uprising lay in the awareness that out of a situation which threatened to destroy the few freedoms which the parliamentary régime granted, a new way of life could be forged. With Orwell and the anarchists they believed that the armed struggle and the social revolution were indivisible. And in our opinion they were right. We hope that "the judgment

LETTER FROM FRANCE

Business as Usual

SOME readers of FREEDOM seem to be astonished that a whole (second rate) nation like France has been able to live for weeks under no government at all, without even a legally defined régime, etc. Was it Anarchy?

As for the lack of a cabinet, we are pretty well used to it and the Parliamentary holidays, being almost permanent, scarcely made any difference. As long as the 3,000,000 members of the New Class (the self-employed, self-directed and public-paid civil servants) function as a corporate body, nothing important is lost. Invariable routines stronger than any régime, are observed since the emergence of the state (either Gallic, Roman, Frank, Gothic, Nordic, or Corsican): "He who rules doesn't work; he who works, doesn't rule." According to current historians, we are now at the end of the Corsican era and just entering the Algerian period, that's all.

of history" will praise the quixotic "idealists" and condemn the hard-headed (and hard-hearted) "realists".

If, as Mr. Mathews admits, the struggle in Spain has not been liquidated⁷ even after 19 years it is thanks to the revolutionaries of those first few days who sparked a dream which neither the counter-revolutionary politicians of the Left nor the military régime of the Right have succeeded in dimming!

¹Herbert L. Mathews, *The Yoke and the Arrows*. A Report on Spain (Heinemann, 18s.) 1958.

²And if President Eisenhower has his way Congress will pass legislation to overrule the Supreme Court's ruling that no American citizen can be deprived of his passport because of his political views!

³"A liberal in Spain, such as I considered myself to be, has many a long and inconclusive argument with the Communists, who were, of course, proselytisers. However, it stood to reason that a liberal could not be a Communist or turn into one", etc. "Nevertheless, in the Spanish Civil War, as in the World War, the liberal and the Communist were on the same side"—Don't these liberals make you sick?

⁴Elsewhere he writes: "Anarcho-syndicalism whose centre was in Barcelona... appears just about dead. It looks as if the unique phenomenon of anarchism has run its course in Spain. It will always have some intellectual and emotional appeal, but it was too impractical even for the Spaniards" (p.82). Mr. Mathews mixes with the wrong people. Any time he wishes the writer of these lines will take him on an escorted tour of Catalonia and introduce him to as many ordinary folk as he has time to meet who in spite of the repression, the brainwashing, the Caudillo-worship fostered over a period of 19 years still believe in their anarchist ideas. And if they trust him they will even produce books and pamphlets by anarchist writers which they jealously preserve as symbols of their own sanity in a politically insane world. That they are pessimistic about the future is a fact. But who isn't? That they have lost confidence in anarchism in favour of Mr. Mathews' liberalism or what he describes as the "mildly Marxist, like the British Fabian type" ideas of Spanish socialism—that is utter nonsense or wishful thinking on his part.

⁵Indeed, like the French government last May, they first pooh-poohed the idea that the generals were in revolt and when it was obvious even to the village idiot that they were, tried to negotiate with them.

⁶"The moment is a difficult one. The Government is sure it possesses sufficient means to crush this criminal attempt. In the event that these means are insufficient the Republic has the solemn promise of the Popular Front which is decided on intervention in the struggle the moment its help is called for. The Government orders and the Popular Front obeys"—quoted in "Lessons of the Spanish Revolution" (Freedom Press). The government hadn't the means, but it never called on the people. It was too busy trying to negotiate with the generals.

⁷In fairness to Mr. Mathews we should point out that we have only commented on a small part of his book, which mainly deals with the Franco régime, and contains some interesting factual material which we may refer to on another occasion. However, while he admits that his book is "not a history of modern Spain or of the Spanish Civil War" he considers that "certain facts must be kept in mind if we are to understand the situation to-day". We have questioned his facts!

Evidently, if there had been the usual interregnum of slogans, posters, fear, menaces, meetings, demonstrations, riots, absenteeism from work, in sporting places and picture houses, a food shortage, guillotine, Carmagnole, and firing-squads, France would have numbered its glorious civil war number x; the state would have conspicuously split into pieces, with a very partial strike of the Army, Navy, Police, Air Force, Jail-keepers, Courts of Justice, and a great deal of voluntary work supplied in matters of national service by committeemen, militias, private executioners. Should even this be called Anarchy? I seriously doubt it. State-society is an invisible, everyday business, mostly a product of the will to rule (collectively) and to be ruled (individually). It can not be abolished by decree, nor can anarchy be introduced without an everyman-revolution of manners the first conditions for which are international peace and civic tolerance. So, no government, no civil war, no Anarchy. Business as usual, such is—and was—the situation in a nutshell.

The whole thing was like a bogus-repetition of the first de Gaulle setting, or baby-sitting, of the 4th Republic. From General Radio to Chief of the State, through the Empire-canvassing in Brazzaville, and Algiers (whence a prefabricated government was gently parachuted on the old hexagonal France—now the stepdaughter of her own "Empire"), the itinerary was well-known.

The main difference was that the setting of the 5th Republic was the epilogue of a tragedy, but the beginning of a farce. Instead of killing 130,000 "traitors" and marking naked girls with swastikas for "bad conduct" (to be kicked by the populace in the streets); instead of acting as political gangsters, patriotic pimps and "victorious" braggadocios, the committeemen of both ultra-"gaullist" and "communist" description behaved like decent persons, respecting each other with even an excess of scruple which could not be attributed to mutual fear, and talking a language so exquisitely moderate that it was hardly distinguishable from the silence of meditation.

Nobody was hurt, even with bad names, the most terrible slogan of the "fascist" side being "de Gaulle

au pouvoir" and on the bolshevist side "de Gaulle au musée". And what English sensational reporters insisted in mistaking for an Exodus in the great 1940 style was simply the ordinary weekend rush to picnic places, and return, with a little fancy amount of political hooting in the traffic bottle-necks in Paris.

Being stopped there with my motor-bike, I noticed that the morse slogan of the gaullists was ... (meaning "Algérie française"), and tried to supply the contradiction by using the old slogan of Spanish anarcho-syndicalism ... (meaning "Faï, Faï, Cénété"), but it soon occurred to me that the two noises amounted to exactly the same effect, when repeated, and that I could be misrepresented for a Gaullist!

I am afraid that this severe report will cause some disappointment to Arthur Moyses and other comrades who may otherwise have taken heroic first-class tickets to Paris in order to die on the barricades (a rare performance in England since the good old times of Cromwell, I am told). But what about a Revolution in England? Not a single Englishman would agree to miss it, so everybody would be at home for the special extra TV programme: "Everybody in the Street".

Paris, July. André Prunier.

THE SUPERIORITY OF VIRGINITY

The state of virginity for a Christian woman "is by its excellence superior to that of matrimony." Pope Pius XII made this statement today.

The pontiff was addressing 60,000 girls of Italian Catholic Action gathered in Rome from all over Italy.

Speaking from a throne in the vast square of Saint Peter's the Pope said: "On various occasions we have had to reprove the error of those who affirm that the Christian virgin is something mutilated, something incomplete—something that does not attain the perfection of its own being.

"On the contrary, virginity is like living as an angel. It is a state which by its excellence is superior to that of matrimony.

"But this superiority, on the other hand, in no way diminishes the beauty and grandeur of conjugal life."—*Reuter*.

News Chronicle 14/7/58.

FIVE MILLION PEOPLE SEE FREEDOM!

A SARDONIC article in FREEDOM a fortnight ago described the BBC's six-hour session at the Malatesta Club in preparation for a seven-minute appearance in the television programme 'To-night'. Was the effort worth it (from the anarchists' point of view, not the BBC's)? Would the participants feel that their views had been garbled by editing, as had happened in previous television snippets about anarchism?

Well, the film of the Malatesta Club eventually turned up on television last Wednesday week, along with interviews with bowler-hatted men and bare-footed girls in St. James's Park, and an item about a man having his hair permed. The interviewer, having described anarchists as people who don't believe in organisation descended the basement steps and asked Sid Parker the usual questions like "What will anarchists put in the place of government?" and "Who will do the dirty work in an anarchist society?" Rita Milton put him right on whether or not anarchists believe in organisation, Joan Sculthorpe answered his questions about bringing up children, and Leah Feldman told him what she thought of politicians. There were also shots of this newspaper—the only time it has been seen by five million people! (Such

shots have always been carefully excluded by the commercial television companies when they dealt with anarchism, on the principle presumably that if you're going to advertise, you might as well pay).

As was expected, the interview had been heavily cut, and several of the people interviewed did not appear in the finished product, but, looked at from the receiving end, a few minutes' exposition by question and answer, of a point of view which must be totally unfamiliar to most viewers, the programme did not distort or misrepresent the anarchist case.

Did it bring any of its viewers nearer to our point of view? Perhaps it did. It is hard to believe that with an audience as big as the five millions who are said to see 'To-night', there were not one or two who were stimulated to start thinking again about the validity of the assumptions which underly our authoritarian society. At least it must have given them some idea of what anarchism is *not*.

And there is some hope, we suppose, that a few points went home to the six technicians, the producer and assistant producer, the secretary and the interviewer, exposed for six hours to the members of the Malatesta Club!

IF my letter has done nothing else but provoke people into writing it was worthwhile, simply because it helped clarify my own feelings concerning FREEDOM. Though this was not my intention, I personally would like to see a different FREEDOM and had hoped, and still do, that people writing to the paper, who to some extent share my view, would also offer suggestions that might effect a change. On the other hand should letters continue coming in stating their preference for FREEDOM as it is, I will gladly withdraw my 'rural eulogy'.

A word or two to those who have commented on my letter:

'Reader' is afraid that I wanted to 'Jazz' up the paper; well to me Jazz is not a swear word nor has it any bad connotations, and I don't really know what he means. He can rest assured that I had no desire to add pools or racing to the back page, nor, may I add, did I wish to encroach upon that field of experience so ably covered by *The News Of The World*. 'A Reader' also feels that the function of FREEDOM is to 'reduce to a proper level', through 'Anarchist analysis', the confusing daily political news. Now the point is, does it? Can we honestly say that FREEDOM's political analysis is any more illuminating than say that of the *Manchester Guardian*, *Spectator* or *Times*?

Anarchism as far as I understand it is not a political doctrine nor even a method of analysis, it is, to coin that old and well used phrase, a way of life, and it is this way of life that I would like FREEDOM to reflect. Anarchism as an ideology can solve present-day problems within its own terms of reference only. We have as yet not evolved a community or society of our own and though we have made some valid criticisms of the world we live in we appear quite content to get rid of the grain at the same time as we do away with the chaff. This incidentally is another field I would like FREEDOM to explore. This exploration may be full of things comical, artistic, down to earth, poetic or just plain opinionated, but whichever it is, it is very much part of our world, and of value.

Reader D. Offord was perturbed by my letter insofar as he began to wonder whether his critical faculties were somewhat rusted. If one has got into the habit of thinking in one particular fashion only, the development of a FREEDOM 'mind' so to speak, as so many develop a "Times mind" or a "Daily Mirror" mind", it is somewhat disturbing to come across a negation of one's accepted ideas, but reader Offord does quite rightly ask what I had in mind regarding a different FREEDOM.

Worse Than Gangsters

I've just been talking to a man from Chicago, and he was telling about the gangs, and the roaring days of the nineteen-twenties.

It seems that Al Capone was really a great man. Surrounded by lawyers and go-betweens not a single murder was ever actually pinned on him!

Another point was that his men were famous for never killing a member of the public, or an innocent bystander. Contrary to legend, bullets never 'flew like hail' when his skilled assassins were on the job. Only the actual candidate was despatched.

When there was a killing in St. Louis, the local police knew at once it was outside, because it was done Chicago style—only the victim died—his two drinking companions were unharmed and never even heard the shots.

This may be true or untrue. Also, it may have been due to a love of virtue or merely a prudent desire on the part of Capone not to antagonise public opinion.

But in any case, how oddly it contrasts with military operations by the British and American armed forces, carpet bombing, atom bombs and so on, to say nothing of naval blockades and mass starvation weapons.

No nonsense, or prudence here about not killing innocent bystanders! When bombing cities, civilians, old people, women and children were all the victims, together with the actual soldiers, or the occasional convinced fascists, from '39 to '45 were alleged to be the real enemies.

In future anarchists must never refer to governments as gangsters. Governments are far worse!

Oxford, July 4.

J.W.S.

First of all I'd like to see the paper as the expression of the movement as a whole. Surely Anarchists practise part of their ideology in their own lives. These lives must be full of problems, ideas, insights, solutions, practical suggestions, practical suggestions, interesting experiences, poetry, humour and difficulties. This wealth of material has seldom been recorded. Haven't we beaten the political drum long enough?

Politics is, after all, only part of our lives. Do we really need that political slanting handed down to us by a body of well-meaning editors? Won't the average man who knows nothing about Anarchism be more impressed with some interesting human experience that could be part of his very own life, than to be continuously told that all his problems could be solved if only all governments suddenly disappeared. The Anarchist movement abounds in teachers, perhaps with the aid of FREEDOM, the first Anarchist school or town community?

A correspondence column perhaps to answer questions on Anarchism, an international exhibition of the work of many of the artists and craftsmen in the movement and many more ideas that readers no doubt have.

I had no 'shadow editorial board' in mind, but feel that this change must develop from the movement as a whole, the half dozen active people I had in mind whoever they may be were simply to be there for the 'donkey work', the paper itself was to become not only our baby but the movement's as well.

Arthur Uloth finds my criticism unjust, partly because he enjoys reading FREEDOM as it is and partly because he feels that my criticism is aimed at the wrong target. FREEDOM'S method of getting our message across is done with reason and rationality whereas most people are governed by their emotions. But surely our argument is not just 'reasoned argument', lacking in emotion. Has not emotional need its own good reasons? To establish functional Anarchy on a human emotional level is to render it more accessible to the average man. Good emotions have an inherent rationality and I will be presumptuous enough to assume that Anarchists are governed mostly by 'good' emotions, and it is this part of Anarchy that I would like FREEDOM to record. A.W.U. raises many interesting points in his letter but they are not really directly related to my criticism I feel.

Geoffrey Ostergaard sees the problem as one of "movement structure" rather than what FREEDOM as a paper could do to break up its narrow political orientation. What reader Ostergaard says is very true for most present day organisations but I do not think it is true in this

case; none of us when we discussed FREEDOM wanted to become part of the Oligarchy and none of us felt that the editors were an institution apart from us. I agree with reader Ostergaard that the continuous use of the same human material gives a paper a staid though often competent appearance; its expression becomes predictable and it ends up by using the same weapons to slay all its enemies. We continue to think in Anarchist orthodoxies only, and the stream has simply dried up. One cannot help thinking that either the people who read the paper are satisfied with it as it is, or are too lazy to complain and even more lazy if it comes to doing anything about it.

Politics is its most dominant theme, they have almost become the party line; theoretical articles though well written and factually true have that element of boredom found only in Company reports. I haven't as yet met one reader who has read them through to the end, never mind enjoyed them. Perhaps my circle of friends is too small and may as a result of all this get even smaller, yet one can't help feeling that there must be some true reflection in these readers' attitudes. The impression is often created that spaces are filled with anything to cover the necessary surface area. When not so long ago the format of the paper was changed there was 'universal' approval; it was like seeing the other side of the moon, nothing really new, but interesting nevertheless.

FREEDOM should be the voice of Anarchists rather than of Anarchism. Personally I would like to think of Anarchy as antithetical to structures of any kind. Structures are static while Anarchy as a way of life is dynamic, it is this that FREEDOM should reflect. Have not Anarchists anything to say about their lives, their children, their work, their problems, their experiments or the countries and places they live in? If not then it's only right that the specialisation in politics should continue.

H.F.W. makes some intelligent suggestions which I cannot accept. It must be a lot easier for the paper to make the contact with the interested people than for me as an individual. The paper simply 'knows' more people than I do. As I mentioned before I have no desire to become a 'sub Editor', only those readers who agree with the proposed change, can really effect it. Personally I don't see why a blank space in the paper could not be left, as such, when there is nothing suitable. Who knows, perhaps the response will be so great that we may need another page, let's be optimistic if not downright humorous.

London.

S.F.

Is Heroism Effective?

YOUR review of the Polish film "Kanal" by Arthur Moysé (FREEDOM 21/6/58) contains some heightened prose, and is obviously written with considerable feeling. That is probably the reason why I wish to counteract your reviewer's arguments with equal feeling. To outline all that is wrong in his point of view would go beyond the scope of a letter, but something must be said to correct the impression that pacifists are mealy-mouthed idealists, and to try and show that martyrdom is not only a psychological disease, but also a most ineffective way of getting what you, or rather your successors, want.

In the case of Spain, surely if one learns anything it is that heroism and a few machine guns are useless against a professional army. Obviously the lesson was not drawn, for exactly the same situation arose in Hungary. There it seemed that the rebels were obviously itching for a fight, and so the Russians gave them one. I should have thought that the issue would have been regarded as decided according to the rules of war, but there was a most inexplicable outcry throughout the world at what was regarded as a massacre, of innocent Hungarians by Russian brutes. Of course it was a massacre, but it was conducted on the Hungarians' own terms. They decided it was to be a physical fight, and that is what it turned out to be. Only after they had lost did they seize on the idea of non-co-operation and industrial inefficiency. Then it was too late, and the enthusiasm which should have been spent on making the Russians look silly, was spent on taking pot shots at them.

Many of these so-called heroic acts

of defiance are seen to be nothing but pathetic little kicks. The opportunities for retaliation give rise to considerable enterprise on the part of the authorities. In Holland the Germans played with sampling methods by taking one man per so many of the population of the village and shooting him. In Yugoslavia they showed unusual psychological skill, by taking the women and children instead, and thus made the would-be martyrs look foolish. It is one thing to send yourself to death, quite another to send your wife or the old lady down the street. But that is war, and presumably Mr. Moysé is prepared for it.

On the other hand, in India, contrary to your reviewer's impression, this business of laying down on the railway line was very successful, and many other examples of non-co-operation (the most subtle form of non-violent resistance) showed the British in no uncertain manner that they weren't intended to make any money out of India. In Norway during the last war, villages where sniping had taken place were razed to the ground, but where the people were more concerned with taking the wind out of the conqueror's sails, there was very little that could be done. But if you want a fight your masters will be only too willing to oblige.

I am perfectly willing to agree that the present anti-H-bomb campaign is pursuing a useless course. But I resent the implication that anyone who is willing to strive for a cause, but not to fight for it, is using "moral blackmail". In the present situation nothing more or less than a strike by building and other

Although it gives me pleasure to be called "a 'Golden Age' man" by David Macconnell (5/7/58), the term is not exact. The "Golden Age" was an expression used by poets in antiquity to signify the time when the only metal widely used was gold. It served a religious not a financial purpose, being a magical "life giver" with solar affinities. This period is always represented poetically as an age of peace, and it was probably unwarlike.

The "Golden Age" is used by H. J. Massingham, in a book of that name, to mean the primitive pre-civilised age, before agriculture. Mr. Macconnell is quite right in saying that the term is "subjective". Obviously no age has been free entirely from "plague, pestilence and famine", although these are steadily being eliminated. I believe however that "battle, murder and sudden death" (by violence) are artificial horrors which did not always exist, and are not inherent in human society. Alas, one cannot say that there is any sign of these being eliminated.

I think Mr. Macconnell is confusing me with Rousseau when he says that I hanker for "a time when each man was in himself all-sufficient". There never was such a time. Man has always been a social animal. A few primitive societies have been discovered in remote places of the world in the last few centuries, which in their social life displayed the qualities anarchists admire. I conclude from this that either man is naturally anarchistic, or at least has the capacity to live anarchistically. Most civilised societies are extremely cruel. For some reason the development of settled life in cities and villages, on an agricultural basis, seems to lead eventually to the appearance of cruel customs. The use of money was a relatively late invention. There were kings, priests and exploiters even before the invention of money. Private property existed before money, and trade took place by barter. Money merely made the private property system more workable.

In the past I would have roundly denounced the institution of property as the root cause of humanity's sorrow. I am more inclined now to consider the property institution a symptom of human alienation rather than a cause. I think that human suffering at human hands is due to man's increasing self-consciousness. That is to say that, unlike animals so far as we know, man is capable of forming a picture in his mind of himself, and hence he can form an ideal which does not correspond to reality, but is more attractive than reality, and consequently he strives after it. From this flows art and creativity, to some extent, but also religious cruelties, wars and persecutions, the alienation of man from society and from himself. The solution, if one is possible, lies in a greater development of consciousness so that this division in man's soul is healed.

The solution is not a return to primitivism, though a simpler way of living

workers on construction work, or mass desertion from the Armed Services would be effective, and these are very unlikely. Nevertheless, I am willing to suffer hardship for something I believe to be right, but I am not going out to die on the barricades for a movement that has lost its head. By looking through history we will see that the only successful revolts have been those which have been well organised. These to be effective have to have leadership. Lessons of the Russian Revolution!

One last fling. Does Mr. Moysé know that "kanal" is also Polish slang for a let-down, a stab in the back? Polish audiences would have borne this in mind, asking themselves what the "Russian allies" were doing outside the gates of Warsaw while the rebels were being slaughtered. The implied moral to those who are aware of the circumstances is something rather different from a glorification of heroism.

Blackburn, July.

PETER HITCH.

Wanted: Beds and Tents

Accommodation required, July 25th—August 2nd for comrades attending a conference in London. Please write S. E. Parker, c/o Freedom Press, stating languages spoken. Loan of tents also required—has anyone got one, the larger, the better.

would be healthier and happier than present over-complex and over-artificial one. But this "simple life" is not itself enough. Indeed, modern man in many ways living here and now a simpler healthier life than he did in the Victorian age, when Edward Carpenter advocated the "simplification of life". He wears easier and simpler clothes, does not fear to expose himself to sun and air, he dwells in houses that are better aired and lighted, and are not too full of furniture, he is freer from sexual taboos. But society is just as barbaric now as it was then.

I am apt to feel depressed when I see the inhumanity of man to man now in the past. Throughout the ages efforts have been made to bring all this crying to an end, but none of them have begun to look like succeeding. I should be happy if I could see some way inaugurating a course of social change which would lead to a free society, do not think this way can be through concentrating one's attack only on symptoms; money, authority, government, private property, obscurantism, nationalism and militarism. All these are symptoms of a disease, and must be dealt with of course, but they are not the disease itself.

Yours fraternally,

London. ARTHUR W. ULOTH

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

JULY 20—Laurens Otter on CATHOLICISM AND ANARCHISM. Questions, Discussion and Admission all free.

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP 1958 SUMMER SCHOOL August 2nd—4th.

Subject: "WAR AND PEACE" Speakers to be announced

Bookings are requested as soon as possible. Write: JOAN SCULTHORPE, c/o Freedom Press.

★ 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 Friday and Saturday from 7.30

THE MALATESTA JAZZ BAND

Members(1/6) and their guests (2/-) only. MALATESTA CLUB 32 Percy Street Tottenham Court Road W1

Jazz Men welcome Organised by IAC

Every Wednesday at 7.30 (prompt) BONAR THOMPSON speaks

FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

Postal Subscription Rates: 12 months 19/- (U.S.A. \$3.00) 6 months 9/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50) 3 months 5/- (U.S.A. \$0.75) Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies 12 months 29/- (U.S.A. \$4.50) 6 months 14/6 (U.S.A. \$2.25)

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

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