

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

LABOUR: SERETSE KHAMA CONSERVATIVES: KABAKA

THEY'RE ALL THE SAME!

THE deposition of African rulers by colonial administrations continues. First there were the cases of Seretse and Tcheledi Khama. Then the French government's deposition of the Sultan of Morocco. Now Mr. Lyttelton, the Colonial Secretary has deposed the Kabaka Mutesa of Buganda—the main province of Uganda. All these cases serve to show up the rôle which imperial powers expect native rules to play, and expose the nakedness of the force which really underlies colonial rule.

Under the new governor, Sir Andrew Cohen, considerable constitutional changes have taken place recently in Buganda. These changes have followed democratic patterns in the West, and they have been regarded with suspicion by the people of Buganda. It may be easy enough for the government to defend such changes to parliament, but those who know the effect of Western legislation on African communities know how many snags there are for the general population. This has been especially clearly shown in the case of Nyasaland.

Such suspicions have been given much support by British appeasement of Malan, by events in Kenya, and by the forcing of Central African Federation on a protesting but virtually unrepresented African population. When Mr. Lyttelton referred in a recent speech to his hopes for an East African Federation which would unite Uganda with Kenya and Tanganyika, Buganda fears and suspicions came to a head. The first point of open friction with the Kabaka as head of the State was his refusal and that of his council, the Lukiko, to nominate members to represent Buganda on the Uganda Legislative Council under the new Constitution which is to come into force early next year.

Colonial Secretary's Admissions

The whole account of the government's deposition of the Kabaka shed a most revealing light on colonial government. This is what Mr. Lyttelton told Parliament:

"The House should be clear about the nature of the crisis. Quite simply, recognition has been withdrawn from the Kabaka because he had declared himself determined publicly to oppose the considered decisions and the declared policy of her Majesty's Government. What the Government sought to get from the Kabaka on this point was a declaration that he would not in the Lukiko openly oppose the policy of her

Majesty's Government on the matter of a unitary state.

Not only was the Kabaka's attitude a denial of his obligations under the agreement, (*i.e.* the agreement of 1900.—Ed.), but if he had been permitted to carry his intentions into actions the orderly and progressive administration of Uganda would have been made impossible. By the attitude which he adopted and by the persistence with which he clung to it in the face of all the Government's efforts to dissuade him the Kabaka demonstrated quite unmistakably that he was resolved to break the agreement.

Article 6 of the agreement stated that as long as the Kabaka and the chiefs co-operated loyally with the Government in the organization and administration of Buganda the Government agreed to recognize the Kabaka as the native ruler of the province under her Majesty's protection and overrule. The Kabaka had provided clear evidence of his intention no longer to co-operate with the British Government and with the Protectorate Government in the administration of Buganda, and it was upon these grounds that Government had been obliged reluctantly to withdraw recognition.

He could hardly have disclosed more clearly that the Kabaka was to act as a puppet of the British Government. The parallel with the French Government's deposition of

the Sultan of Morocco is here very close.

Buganda Resistance to Incorporation in a Larger State

It is also quite clear from Mr. Lyttelton's statement that he regarded the Buganda's unwillingness to be incorporated into a larger State as something which just had to be overridden.

"When he turned, as he must, to the demands that Buganda should be made an independent State—a demand which the Kabaka had not withdrawn, but had continually repeated—the House would see that the whole future of the protectorate of Uganda was involved; and he would go further and say the whole future of Uganda was menaced" . . .

"The prosperity and expanding national life which he predicted, and for which all would work, would receive a fatal blow if Uganda was split up into more than one State. That was the crux of the matter. Could the Kabaka be allowed to state publicly that he intended to separate from the rest of Uganda? It was on this point that the discussions, with which he had been kept constantly in touch, took place between the Governor and the Kabaka."

When the Colonial Secretary "became increasingly aware of the obdurate nature of the Kabaka's opposition", he had no alternative he implied but to depose him. The idea that his opposition might represent opposition on the part of the people, or the idea that such opposition should receive consideration, obviously played no part in the Colonial Secretary's mind.

It seems likely that the Kabaka himself knows well enough the mood and feeling of the people of Buganda, and is unwilling to compromise his own political future by acting as the unresisting stooge of the British. He will no doubt have observed the political evolution of men like Nehru in India, and nearer at hand, Nkrumah in the Gold Coast, both men who suffered imprisonment under British Imperialism, but survived and were thereby helped to become heads of their own nationalist movements. FREEDOM has suggested that such may be the political future of Kenyatta in Kenya also.

Much has been made of the declaration of loyalty made by the Kabaka last spring. It is perhaps a measure of the suspicion wrought by the Central African Federation *ukase* on African opinion that the Kabaka has moved into a position at the head of a movement of open opposition to British plans for Uganda.

Africans have little enough reason to feel confident of British paternalism. The only possible justification as a position of argument (anarchists would reject it outright) for the British method of legislation imposed from above would be (1) that

When Violence is used to reach positive ends either it fails completely or succeeds in establishing oppression and exploitation.

ERRICO MALATESTA.

they know best what the Africans' best interests are and (2) that they are concerned to give them that. In actual practice, they have shown themselves either blind or completely unconcerned about African interests. Their legislation almost invariably consolidates both the racial and economic superiority of the European settlers and traders.

Progress in Africa does not lie in Nationalism—that will-o-the-wisp that has deceived so many fighters for progress—but the deposition of rulers and the arbitrary imposition of legislative measures in whose framing Africans have no share, all show how naked is the force by which colonialism rules.

Victimisation of Engineers

THE first victimisation of engineers who took part in last week's one-day token strike has been reported.

Sixty-seven men employed by Winfray Engineering Co. Ltd. at Butts, Coventry, were sacked last Friday, being given a week's wages in lieu of notice. This number is more than half the total employed by the firm and are presumably all that came out from that works.

"This is diabolical victimisation," said Mr. George Rowley, Coventry organiser of the A.E.U.

"There might well be widespread sympathy strikes. Shop stewards of firms who sub-contract work to Winfray's have offered to declare it 'black'."

Mr. Arthur J. Hobbins, managing director of Winfray's said: "Everybody should be pulling together when we are struggling to gain and hold markets. Perhaps this will bring some of them to their senses."

The best way of course to get your men to pull together is to sack half of them. But Mr. Hobbins is really more interested in splitting the workers, and has offered to reinstate some of them on conditions.

The men have unanimously rejected the offer and trade union officials, afraid of what might happen as a result of this provocation have asked for urgent intervention by the Minister of Labour.

More Admissions on Tapping of Telephone Lines

BONN, DEC. 3

At question time in the Bundestag today, Dr. Schubert, the acting Minister for Posts and Telegraphs, replied to allegations in the Press and elsewhere that the British occupation authorities regularly tapped telephone lines and opened letters in their zone. Dr. Mende (Free Democrat), who raised the matter, asked what steps were being taken to dispel the misgivings of Hamburg exporters caused by this "supervision of their foreign trade connexions."

Dr. Schubert said that the British authorities listened in to German telephones only to a very limited extent. The Federal Government had made representations a dozen times already, but the British took the view that they could renounce their reserved right only when the treaties with the west came into force. Reasons of military security were conclusive for the tapping of lines; for the rest, it was resorted to only in cases of grave suspicion and spying. There was no question, Dr. Schubert added, of a general supervision of letters or of mail for abroad.

What has been called "the third man on the telephone" crops up periodically. Watch is naturally kept as far as possible on those who may engage in the supply of strategic materials to the Communist bloc. Similarly, the ramifications of the Naumann affair were in part established by the tapping of telephones. (Times, 4/12/53).

Policemen Goaled for False Evidence

Two Metropolitan police-constables at Kent Assizes at Maidstone yesterday were each sentenced to nine month's imprisonment.

"They were Frank William David Brown, aged 35, of Bromley, and John Morris, aged 28, of St. Paul's Cray, who had each pleaded guilty to the charge that as a witness in the trial of a charge against Timothy George Hayes he unlawfully, knowingly, and falsely swore that at about 11.20 p.m. on September 24 he saw Hayes struggling to his feet at the side of a motor cycle in Crown Lane, Bromley, and that Hayes said: You — coppers. You are all —."

"Hayes was convicted, fined £20, and was ordered £3 7s. costs, allowed 14 days to pay, and his licence was endorsed and he was disqualified for 12 months.

"Mr. Gage, for the prosecution, said that what really happened was this: Dr. and Mrs. Milner saw Hayes lying on the ground with his motor cycle partly on top of him and they stopped their car. Dr. Milner was not quite certain as to whether Hayes was injured or not. He was unconscious but the doctor was not in a position to say whether he was unconscious through drink or through a fracture of the skull. An ambulance was called and Hayes was put into the ambulance protesting. An ambulance man said he was obstreperous. A wireless call was sent from the ambulance for police aid and Brown and Morris arrived. They had Hayes transferred to a police car.

"Until that moment the accused men had never been present, and, Mr. Gage added, in the officers' notebooks there was no mention by either of them of an ambulance." (Times, 1/12/53).

If the doctor had not seen an account of the case and come forward the police would have got away with their evidence (one wonders what the ambulance drivers were doing during Hayes' trial). Usually if a defendant declares that the police are lying, the magistrates disregard him and merely treat him more harshly.

Insulting Offer to Railmen

LIKE the engineers and shipbuilders, railwaymen are asking for a wage increase of 3s. in the £—15 per cent. And like them, they had a dusty answer from their employers.

It was last July when the claim was first made, rejected in September, went to arbitration in November, and now the court of arbitration has announced its decision: 4s. a week increase!

This is the princely sum of 1d. an hour extra on the basic week of 48 hours, and still leaves for the majority of railmen the necessity of working overtime and Sundays to make a living wage.

At the time of writing, the three main unions representing 450,000 railwaymen have not met to discuss the award, but the workers are already expressing their disappointment in no uncertain terms—which is not surprising in view of the low wages paid throughout the industry.

Minimum rate for a porter is now £5. 17. 6 in the provinces, £6. 0. 6 in London—less insurance, union dues and tax. A Class I signalman's wage is £7 6s. 6d., to a top-grade driver's £8 8s. 6d.—less the same deductions. The addition of 4s. to these figures still does not lift them into reasonable proportions—especially in view of the tremendous responsibilities railwaymen carry for the safety of passengers. To say nothing of the fact that railwaywork is one of the most dangerous of occupations, with a very high rate of injury and deaths.

The unions' argument for the claim was based on the increase in the cost of living and the fact that workers were leaving the railways in search of higher wages elsewhere. The cost of living has risen 14 per cent. more than railmen's wages since 1947, and it has become increasingly difficult to find workers for the more responsible jobs on the wages prevailing.

These arguments, however, clearly did not carry much weight with the Arbitration Tribunal—Sir John Forster, Q.C., chairman, Sir Percy Mills for the British Transport Commission and Sir Luke Fawcett for the unions. But they realised that some increase simply had to be allowed, so they made it as little as possible.

More and more railway workers must be asking themselves just what has happened to all the advantages that were to come to them after nationalization. Just as the public as travellers have watched glumly as fares have gone up and up, railmen have seen their real wages going down and down.

Who benefits from nationalisation? Clearly neither the public nor the workers—it must be the management, and behind that, the State, which has completely under its control the communication system most vital in time of war. And, of course, the shareholders, guaranteed their compensation as never were their dividends under company ownership.

The railway workers are incensed by the insulting offer—but if the unions accept it, what will they do? They can resort to direct action with, if they are solid, a good chance of success—but how about trying out some methods other than simply walking out?

How about the ticket clerks and inspectors not issuing or asking for tickets? How about the porters just not carrying bags for the first-class passengers? How about working to rule? How about a boycott on certain classes of goods—say engineering products, to underline the common struggle with the engineers?

Fundamentally—how about organising to take over the railways altogether and establish workers' control?

Preparing [for Con-]scription in W. Germany

A Manchester Guardian (2/12/53) report states that:

According to Deputies of the West German Government Coalition parties the parties have agreed to submit to the Lower House a bill which would make it possible to introduce military conscription. The agreed draft would insert the following paragraph into the West German constitution:

"Conscription can be introduced by Federal law. If required for the fulfilment of defensive talks it may also be decided by Federal law to limit certain constitutional rights for members of the Armed Forces."

The bill is unlikely to come up for discussion before January. To become law it will have to be passed by a two-thirds majority in both the Lower and Upper Houses. The Coalition parties will have to muster the votes of almost all their deputies to achieve this. The bill would open the way for President Heuss to sign the ratification documents of the European Defence Treaty and the Bonn Conventions.

THE RATIONAL SUBCONSCIOUS

REPRESSION is a mental act by which an urge, either in its nudity or clothed in images and thoughts, is denied full attention or volitional adhesion. This concise and incomplete definition will become a little clearer if we recall Freud's reference to a preconscious, a zone or a movement of the psychic life in which impulses, desires, images, and thoughts reveal that they are present and available, and in which the Ego, in its censorial capacity, prevents them contact with any subject of its domain.

The Ego's function is that of interpreting the data of the external world, and to select, control, and co-ordinate the promptings of the Id in such a way as to adapt them to external reality, thus securing the preservation of the organism, and the maximum harmonic actualization of its innumerable and conflicting potentialities. Under the influence of Hobbes and Helvetius, Freud inclined to reduce it to an improved pleasure-pain principle, but this reduction is unwarranted, and insufficient to explain the complexity of the Ego. The Ego is concerned with the preservation of the organism above any consideration of pleasure and pain, and in order to account for some of its choices we should add that it is also concerned with the preservation and the maximum harmonic actualization of the potentialities of the species.

Reason is not satisfactorily accounted for in psycho-analysis. It is given as a product of adjustment to the world, while it is recognized that rational thinking is not the only possible form of thought. Irrational thinking, on the other hand, is shown to be both anthropologically and pathologically a quite satisfactory, and often a better, means of adjustment than rational thought. To explain the birth of reason, its being preferred to imagination, and the passage from magic to science, we have to assume that the world yields signs of a rational structure, and that the Ego is capable of taking an interest in reality as such, quite independent of the needs of the organism, and whether this interest proves pleasurable or painful.

This interest in reality as such we could legitimately call the metaphysical urge. It shows its presence in modern man not less than any other libidinal urge, even though traces of it may not be found in him as a child or in the imaginatively reconstructed psyche of his ancestors. Leading or led by the Ego it has supplied the mind with operational forms whose products are potentially infinite and the resources of language are inexhaustible. Owing to this unlimited potentiality there is a constant tension between the Ego and the metaphysical urge so that reason, which is the working of the Ego and the metaphysical urge in combination, may run riot as well as imagination, and prove harmful to the organism. Assent to the demands of the metaphysical urge has therefore to be often denied, even if provisionally granted. This refusal or withdrawal of assent is a repression, and the more frequently it occurs the richer, the stronger, and more disturbing is the rational subconscious.

SOME laws of thought, as enunciated by Mach, confirm the existence of a rational subconscious. When he says that a generalization which fits certain facts is stubbornly held until the amount of contradictory evidence compels its revision, he implies that contradictory evidence and the conclusions it suggests are repressed as long as the first generalization continues to pay. Awareness of facts, on the other hand, which do not fit established rational patterns is paralleled by awareness of rational patterns which do not fit the facts, and awareness that does not crystallize into knowledge is all part of the process going on in the preconscious where the Ego and the subconscious meet. Finally, frequent revisions elicit the habit of doubt which, if allowed to have its own way, will not only result in suspension of judgment but in suspension of all activity necessary

to the preservation of the organism. Repression of doubt is repression of rationality, and the holding of any rational belief is achieved by silencing the pressure of a disbelief which never lacks rational arguments even when not rationally motivated.

Rational thought is of the type described by Jung as directed thought, and to say that a train of thought has a direction is to say that either certain conclusions are there already waiting to be reached or that the Ego is already aware of them in the preconscious. All it wants is to see them clearly and confirm their acceptability by deriving them from elements and according to methods already firmly established in the readily accessible memory where it has stored and ordered the products of its previous activity. The process is that of the demonstration of a geometrical theorem whose truth must have been previously intuited to make its enunciation possible. Directed thought, of course, could be of an explorative nature, but even then the Ego must be interested in some particular conclusions, and it will renounce or confirm them in the end according to whether or not its loyalty to the method of exploration, and to all it means in terms of social participation and communication, is greater than its need for those particular conclusions.

Any rational system or piece of philosophy could serve as an example. From a first statement taken as axiomatic no second can be derived without the tacit assumption of a third, and a likely repression of a fourth and a fifth. From the Cartesian "I think" there follows "I am", but rationally, as shown by Heidegger, there could have followed "therefore I was", or, with Kiekegaardian penetration of the nature of thought, "therefore I am not". Had Descartes not had already some special conclusions in view he could equally have started by saying "I feel or I act, therefore I am", or, with the same plausibility "I am,

therefore I think, I feel, I act, etc.", the "I", moreover, being a dubious entity, pregnant with numberless possibilities. At each step of a rational movement of thought alternatives constantly arise, and in the choice of one of them a repression of the others unavoidably takes place at a more or less deeper level of the preconscious. This is so obviously the general practice that when a philosopher wants to show that another is not rational he has only to introduce an alternative which the latter has apparently overlooked, and draw different conclusions, hypocritically lamenting that the criticized philosopher has erred or implying that he was not intelligent enough to see the right alternative.

IN the course of a discussion between two people the fact of repression is even more obvious for the arguments adduced by one of the disputants could hardly be said not to reach the consciousness of the other. Yet they are ignored or, to use a French neologism, "néantisés", these arguments being considered wrong *a priori*, and therefore not allowed to enter into the rational movement that equally *a priori* is considered right. Only the opponent's self-contradictions and inconsistencies are seized upon and made use of, all the rest being an effort on both parts to force the words that are spoken to receive the content and concatenation that each separately desires.

Perhaps one day some revolutionary psycho-analyst, sharing with me the suspicion that stupidity is in many cases and to a considerable extent the result of inhibitions and repressions caused by disapproval and punishment meted out to children when their intelligence first manifests itself, will collect and co-ordinate enough evidence to make it a certainty. A theory, then, could also be advanced in which intelligence will figure as an instinct, an urge, or a special kind of libidinal energy. From disapproval

and punishment the child soon learns that intelligence does not always pay, and it is only natural that it should choose stupidity, often irrevocably as a means of getting on better in the world. The child learns, in particular, that there are truths that must not be expressed or entertained. The illuminating power of these truths leading to the discovery of other truths or to the rational interpretation of certain events is pushed back into the subconscious. The forms of reasoning, inductive, deductive, analytical, synthetical or dialectical by which the first truths are arrived at, also atrophy and finally disappear through inhibited use, and when they are later externally solicited they cannot, whatever the effort, be resuscitated or reinvigorated, and both the failure and the effort are taken as tokens of innate and incurable stupidity.

To conclude with a quotation from Franz Alexander ("Fundamentals of psycho-analysis", p. 96) "Freud assumed that repression is the normal reaction of the infantile ego, whose integrative capacity is extremely limited. Repression consists in excluding impulses and their ideational representations from consciousness. It always occurs when a wish, impulse or idea would on becoming conscious cause unbearable conflict resulting in anxiety." To be persuaded of the existence of a rational, and, let me add, an ethical subconscious, one has only to pause and think how many rational and ethical ideas are repressed precisely because the Ego's integrative capacity is extremely limited and the Ego itself infantile. My answer to the question why there are so few anarchists is that ethical and rational ideas can cause conflict and anxiety far more than do impulses and desires. Anarchism is an appeal to a more integrative capacity of the Ego, and the process of integration runs counter to the inertia principle and the homeostatic principle by which Fenichel has explained the periodicity of impacts from the subconscious, a periodicity which I dare suggest is shared by impacts from the rational zone.

GIOVANNI BALDELLI

NOTES FOR THE MALATESTA CENTENARY-2

Anarchists and the Revolutionary Struggle

TO commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Congress of the Workers' International at St. Imier which, it may be recalled (FREEDOM 5/12/53), the nineteen year old Malatesta attended as a delegate of the Neapolitan Federation, a meeting was organised in Bienne (Switzerland) in 1922 and attended by anarchists from a number of countries, among them Malatesta. At this meeting two subjects came up for discussion: "The relationship between anarchism and syndicalism" and "The action to be taken by anarchists at the outset of an insurrection." The then editor of the French anarchist journal *Le Libertaire* (Colomer) was "shocked and almost indignant" at what Malatesta and Bertoni had to say on the second

subject of discussion and he gave expression to these feelings in the columns of the French journal. To which Malatesta replied in the columns of the Italian anarchist daily *Umanità Nova* with an article entitled "La Rivoluzioni in Pratica" (Oct. 7, 1922). And as the debate was far from ended there, further contributions by Malatesta appeared: "Again on the question of Revolution in practice" (Oct. 14), "Discussing the Question of Revolution" (Nov. 25) and "Anarchism and Revolution" (Dec. 30).¹ We will attempt to summarise some of the points raised by Malatesta in these articles.

For Malatesta the problem was not how the anarchists were to bring about the revolution or how to make an anarchist revolution. There had been revolutions and there would be revolutions in the future independently of the wishes and actions of anarchists and "since anarchists represent only a minute minority of the population and anarchy is not something which can be achieved by force or by the violent imposition of a few individuals, it is clear that past revolutions as well as those of a near future have not and cannot be anarchist revolutions." The question uppermost in Malatesta's mind was: what would we anarchists have done if a revolution had swept across the country.² He put it in this way to stress the urgency for the revolutionary movement to face this all important question, the implication

being that had the revolution occurred in Italy in 1920 they would have been caught unprepared and undecided as to their rôle in a struggle which though revolutionary was not anarchist. It was also an indication of Malatesta's optimism that in spite of the rising power of authoritarianism (in Italy and Russia) revolutionary movements would arise somewhere in the world in the future, and anarchists in the countries involved in such struggles would be faced with just the same problem as might have posed itself in Italy in 1920.³

Now, Malatesta's preoccupation—one might almost call it an obsession!—with this question is more readily understood by first understanding his concepts as to how the anarchist society will come about. For him there was no question of anarchy coming into being overnight. He viewed the transformation from bourgeois capitalism to anarchy as a process of *libera evoluzione* (literally translated: "free evolution"). But to avoid misunderstandings "free development" perhaps expresses his ideas more exactly. He opposes this concept to that of the "small number" of anarchist "educationists" who, he says, "believe in the possibility of raising the masses to the anarchist ideal before the material and moral conditions in which they [the masses] live have been changed, and thus postpone the revolution until everyone is capable of living anarchistically..."

¹This last article could not be published in *Umanità Nova* which ceased publication on December 22, 1922, following the destruction of its presses and offices by gangs of fascists. It was published instead by the Swiss anarchist journal *Il Risveglio* edited by Luigi Bertoni.

²Malatesta was of course referring to the revolutionary situation that existed in Italy in 1920 in which "we [anarchists] did all we could to make it a reality, and treated as traitors of the proletariat those socialists and Trade-unionists who, at the time of the demonstrations against the increased cost of living, of the strikes in Piedmont, the disturbances in Ancona, and the occupation of the factories, halted the forward drive of the masses and saved the tottering monarchical régime."

³And of course this was the case in Spain in 1936. The vacillating policy of the C.N.T.-F.A.I. from the very beginning of that struggle can be understood in part by the lack of any discussion on this very question at the C.N.T. Congress at Saragossa in May, 1936, though the organisation was fully aware of the preparations being made by the Generals for their *coup d'état*. We should mention, in passing, that the question put by Malatesta is raised on a number of occasions in relation to Spain in *Lessons of the Spanish Revolution* (Freedom Press) and it is not without significance that in the few revolutionary periodicals in which this book has been noticed these questions have been ignored completely!

From the foregoing remarks Malatesta reveals that he believes that a revolution of the mind, from the existing extreme of authoritarianism to the opposite anarchist extreme, cannot be achieved while moral and material conditions within society remain unchanged. That is, though it is possible for some individuals to free themselves from the conditioning processes of their environment, they would always represent but a minute minority of the people.⁴

In revolutionary uprisings therefore he sees the means not for the immediate attainment of anarchy but "rather to create the conditions which will permit of a rapid development [evoluzione] is again used in this context] towards anarchy".

Malatesta's position to what one could call the "limited objectives" of any particular revolutionary struggle is further explained by examining his views on violence.

"For us violence is of use, and can only be of use, to resist violence. When instead it is used to reach positive ends

⁴Malatesta's optimism, and unswerving adherence to anarchist ideas for sixty years are the more significant because of the "realism" in his appreciation of his fellows. This passage from the last of his polemical articles with Colomer (Dec. 30, 1922) is translated because it gives the reader an idea of his trenchant style in debate and also because Malatesta's views on the revolutionary process which we are attempting to expound are necessarily influenced by his views on human behaviour.

"In every living being there exists an unconscious anarchist" says Colomer. Would it not be more in keeping with the truth to say that every human being is, by his actions or potentially, a tyrant? In every living being there is, to be sure, the desire to grow, to brush aside every obstacle; but is there also that desire to let others grow too, which should be the characteristic of the anarchist? Only an authoritarian education teaches individuals to respect the laws' says Colomer; but from where have the laws arisen, I ask, as well as the desire in some to give an authoritarian education to others, if not from the desire in the stronger, in the successful ones, to oppress the defeated and to make sure of their subjection?

The anarchist is at the culminating point of human evolution, (not at its origin.)

either it fails completely, or succeeds in establishing oppression and the exploitation of some by others. . . . Outside this struggle against governmental imposition which generates and makes capitalist exploitation possible; when we should have encouraged and helped the mass of the people to take possession of the existing wealth and, especially, of the means of production; when we should have reached the point where no-one was in a position to impose his will on others by force and no-one could with force take away from others the product of their labour, we could not longer act other than through the means of propaganda and example."—(U.N., Oct. 7, 1922).

"We must remind ourselves that violence, necessary as it undoubtedly is to resist violence, does not serve to build anything worthwhile: that it is the natural enemy of freedom, the mother of tyranny and must therefore be contained within the limits of the strictest necessity.

"The revolution serves, and is necessary, to overthrow the violence of governments and of privilege; but the constitution of a society of free people can be but the result of free development.

"And anarchists must watch over the freedom for development which, so long as there are men who thirst after domination and privilege, will be constantly threatened."—(U.N., Oct. 14, 1922).

"Insurrections will be necessary so long as there are powers which use material means to force the masses into obedience; and it is only too probable, that there will have to be many insurrections before that minimum of necessary conditions will have been obtained to permit of free and peaceful development so that mankind may proceed towards its high destinies without cruel struggles and useless sufferings.

"But now we have to give our attention to the next insurrection, which as every insurrection must last only a brief moment, preparing ourselves for what we should do whilst it lasts and in the immediate future in order to draw the maximum advantage for our ideals."—(U.N., Nov. 25, 1922).

We believe the extracts quoted above leave no room for misunderstandings about Malatesta's attitude to violence. Nowhere in his writings does one ever find him suggesting the use of force as a short-cut to the anarchist society. On the contrary. The problems of production and distribution, of the use of money are all dealt with as problems which can only be resolved in an anarchist sense by methods which exclude coercion in any shape or form.

V.R.

(To be continued)

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

OPEN 10 a.m. to 6.30; 5.0 SATURDAYS

- Reprints . . .
Lady Chatterley's Lover
D. H. Lawrence 3/6
Poetic Gems McGonagall 6/-
Reminders . . .
Commonsense and Morality
Ethel Mannin 5/-
Selected Writings Thomas Paine
ed. Gangulee 5/-
Freedom of Poetry
Derek Stanford 2/-
Second-Hand . . .
Our Old Nobility (2nd Series)
Howard Evans 5/-
What is Man? Mark Twain 3/-
Eve's Diary Mark Twain 3/-
Mutual Aid Peter Kropotkin 10/-
Dominie's Log A. S. Neill 3/6
New Books . . .
Society and the Homosexual
Gordon Westwood 9/6
The Golden Horizon (Anthology
Edited by Cyril Connolly) 25/-
Special Offer . . .
A few copies of Herbert Read's
Poetry and Anarchism (cloth-bound)
cover damp-stained, offered at 2/6
(published at 5/-).
Periodicals . . .
Poetry and Poverty 2/-
The Glass, No. 9. 2/-

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

RACE DISCRIMINATION BECOMING CRUCIAL WORLD ISSUE

EVENTS all over the world show that the problem of racial discrimination is becoming a crucial world issue. The omission of coloured people from the official banquet for the Queen and the Duke of Edinburgh at Bermuda was a solecism which set their whole tour off on the wrong foot.

A coloured lawyer, coming from the West Indies, was refused admission to the hotel which took in the other passengers when their air liner was delayed in the early stages of their flight to Bermuda. His English companion Professor Carr Saunders the population expert, refused, to his great credit to go to the hotel if the colour bar was to be applied. Arrived in Bermuda, the same dilemma recurred: but so great indignation had been aroused by the banquet episode that the hotel to which he and the other guests repaired, though it normally imposed a colour bar, saw fit to relax its regulations in the Negro lawyer's case, for fear of consequences.

This incident, or succession of incidents, shows that public opinion is increasingly hostile to racial discrimination, and that public men feel less and less inclined to remain inert about it.

As always governments lag far behind public opinion. The *ad hoc* political committee of the United Nations decided on December 5 by 37 votes to 10 to continue the United Nations Commission on racial policies in the Union of South Africa headed by Señor Santa Cruz of Chile.

"As adopted, the resolution submitted by India and 16 other nations, requests the commission to continue its study of the developments of the racial situation in South Africa and to suggest measures to help to alleviate the situation and to promote a peaceful settlement. The resolution also contains an invitation to the Government of the Union to co-operate with the commission, although South Africa's representative, Mr. Jooste, made it clear repeatedly during the debate that the Union had no such intention.

"With South Africa in voting against the Indian proposal were Britain, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Belgium, France, Greece, the Netherlands, and Colombia. With the exception of Canada, New Zealand, and the Netherlands, who abstained, the same countries, also supported South Africa's counter-proposal denying the Assembly's competence, which was lost by 42 votes.

"With 43 countries participating during 13 meetings, this was one of the longest and most heated debates during the present Assembly. The resolution adopted by the majority particularly noted the conclusion of Señor Santa Cruz's commission that it was 'highly unlikely and, indeed, improbable that the policy of apartheid will ever be willingly accepted by masses subjected to discrimination,' and that the continuance of this policy would make peaceful solutions increasingly difficult and endanger friendly relations among nations."

(Times report 7/12/53).

The voting of the British government's representative—as, indeed, of all the Colonial powers—gives solid ground for the suspicion with which British Colonial administration is increasingly regarded especially in Africa, as discussed elsewhere in this issue. If the government does change its line about racialism we may be sure that it will be from fear of the growing power of this suspicion rather than from any sincere change of heart.

But the disquiet about racial discrimination is perhaps even more significantly seen in the citadel of open repression of the Negro—in the United States itself. At the pre-

sent moment an important legal battle is in progress in the Supreme Court:

"The court has before it five test cases concerning racial segregation in American public schools (the antitheses of those found in Britain) which have been brought by Negro parents against school authorities in Virginia, South Carolina, Kansas, Delaware, and the District of Columbia. In each case Negroes are denied admission to white schools. The court's decision will also affect 13 other states where separate teaching facilities are required.

"The controversy is not new. The segregation issue has been simmering in the lower courts for some time, and much of the work in bringing it forward has been carried out by the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People. Almost a year ago the Supreme Court heard arguments in these cases, and in June this year asked the contestants to submit additional briefs giving answers to five specific questions concerning the legislative history and intent of the 14th Amendment. This amendment, which was submitted to Congress in 1866, just after the Civil War, was designed principally to guarantee the rights of Negroes and to prevent the states from denying them these rights. It was adopted in 1868."

(Times, 7/12/53).

The Court has to elucidate whether Congress in 1866 intended to abolish segregation in schools: whether it envisaged the possibility that future Congresses or Courts might abolish it: whether the Supreme Court has the power to abolish segregation in schools: and whether such abolition should take immediate effect or be brought gradually into force?

Many representatives of the Southern States have declared beforehand that if the Supreme Court abolishes segregation in public schools, then they will close such schools, and give financial aid to private schools which would choose only white pupils.

In many of the Northern States for many years white and coloured children have attended the same schools, segregation only being enforced at later stages. It is however clear that, the supporters of segregation are being thrown on the defensive substantially for the first time.

President Eisenhower is thought to favour the abolition of segregation, and the Attorney-General, Mr. Brownell, issued on Nov. 27 a 178-page brief, in which he told the Supreme Court that it was within their rights to abolish segregation in schools.

Of course, political questions begin to enter in here, and some Republicans fear that the position which Eisenhower is thought to occupy may endanger Republican gains in the South. Nevertheless, the very fact that Negro parents in Southern States have succeeded in bringing test cases to the Supreme Court is an indication of the change in public feeling. As with many other conventional attitudes, one has now sincerely supported by only a small minority and that the tide of public feeling has turned against it. Far from being a cause for relaxing however, this means that now is the decisive time for redoubled efforts against this most unpleasant of doctrines.

(Continued from col. 3)

obtain petty wage increases then they must expect the press of their exploiters to endeavour to distort and vilify their actions in this way. However much concern it may profess for the honour and motives of working class behaviour, the *Daily Mail* is in actual fact only concerned with justifying the capitalist system to those upon whose acquiescence and labour it depends. Only when the exploited class strike for the full value of their labour, thus eliminating the capitalist class altogether; only when they understand the necessity for the abolition of property and government and act upon this understanding; only then will they be free from the servile status of which this editorial is a verbal expression. Anarchy alone can assure them the beauty and dignity of free human beings in a free world. S.E.P.

DISCUSSION: "Why So Few Anarchists?"

IN his article in FREEDOM, October 24th, Arthur W. Uloth offers several answers to the question "Why so few anarchists?" I agree with his analysis and would like to extend it a little further. Much of what I will say was expressed implicitly by Uloth, but I believe that in order to facilitate fuller understanding these things must be spelled out in greater detail.

It would appear that wherever excessive social, economic and political injustice exists coupled with an awareness of such injustice by the bulk of the labouring population movements of a libertarian and revolutionary nature will tend to be popular. Such a situation existed from the late nineteenth century until the First World War. Capitalistic enterprise developed rapidly into gigantic, ruthless systems. Elsewhere, landlords continued age-old feudalistic policies. Simultaneously, a general orientation of optimism, automatic progress and evolution and the expansion of popular education implanted in even the most unsophisticated the idea that all was not right with the world. Governments, still pursuing the *laissez faire* philosophy, were not concerned with socio-economic questions—with protecting "the rights of workers". Hence, the most effective means of redress appeared to be in revolutionary activity; hence the popularity of anarchist and syndicalist movements at this time. It was so easy for the revolutionist to make his point clear when the capitalist was, in fact, the very black bearded demon he was characterized as being, and, especially when the capitalist had, apparently, no qualms about being characterized as anything else.

But certain modifications in the structure of the entrenched powers resulted from revolutionary activity. As governments yielded more and more to the immediate demands of workers, the latter found through social legislation easier methods for satisfying some of their needs. Industries gradually accepted collective bargaining with unions; they instituted personnel offices and embarked on programmes designed to keep their employees contented. Standards of living

"Daily Mail" & The ENGINEERS' STRIKE

THE *Daily Mail* is one of the more venomous press organs of the ruling class and apparently does not think it necessary to hide its blatant support for capitalism. Its editorial column does not indulge in the tactful ambiguities of such papers as the *Times* and *Manchester Guardian*. Straight-from-the-shoulder support for the status quo is its guiding principle and with such a policy it is a noteworthy example of outspoken reaction.

An instance of this comparatively 'honest' attitude is provided by the editorial on the engineers' one-day strike entitled "This Silly Strike" (2/12/53). After a few remarks concerning the difference between 'earnings' and 'wages', the writer goes on to make the following statement:

"To decide which set of figures (*i.e.* the engineers' or the employers') represent the real position is a matter for inquiry and not brute force (my italics—S.E.P.).

The use of the term 'brute force' to describe a perfectly ordinary strike (and an 'official' one at that!) makes this particular editorial of more than topical interest, since it raises issues which relate to one of the basic justifications for the capitalist system, that of the 'free' contract. According to defenders of capitalism it is based upon a 'free' contract between worker and boss. Their argument is that if a worker dislikes the conditions under which he is employed by a particular employer he can withdraw his labour from that employer and seek employment elsewhere. To ignore, for the moment, the fallacy of the 'free contracts' of capitalism (usually to accept the bosses' terms or starve), and to take this argument to its logical conclusion, it is obvious that by it workers are granted the right to withdraw their labour when they consider it to their advantage to do so. In what respect, therefore, was the engineers' strike the use of 'brute force' as the editorial implies? Did the engineers arm themselves, seize the factories, build barricades and compel the employers to grant their claims at the point of a gun? They did not. All they did was to peaceably withdraw their labour in accordance with the dictum laid down by capitalist apologists. So much for the ridiculous allegation of the mouthpiece of 'Queen and Commonwealth'.

The lesson for the workers of this editorial is plain. So long as they are content to remain wage slaves and to confine their strike action to attempts to

(Continued on col. 2)

were also raised. Thus, the sharp distinction between capitalist and worker became increasingly more blurred. The great extremes no longer existed for the bulk of workmen.

People, in general, are not revolutionists unless they are aware of grave threats to their personal security and can find no means within the existing social structure to remedy the situation. People tend to be, to use a dangerous word, opportunists. If they can be reasonably satisfied at a minimum of effort to themselves (as for instance through social legislation and collective bargaining) the revolutionary movement will have little attraction for them. Thus, to-day, people have come to believe more positively that their needs can at least be satisfied through conventional channels where once they would have aligned themselves with more radical elements.

Another fault of this problem is the significance of the "pioneer spirit" in the development of the indigenous libertarian movement in Canada and the U.S.A. Any such spirit with its emphasis on individualism, equality and "newness" grows out of the settlement of new areas and soon tends to lose its vitality once the region attains some age. Considering what has already been pointed out above, is it any wonder that the I.W.W. conceived out of a union of a dying "pioneer spirit" with a polyglot of European revolutionary ideologies, should today be reduced to a handful of "old veterans"?

Uloth's point on the fear of freedom and responsibility could, it seems to me, be extended even further. That is, twentieth century man may be characterized by a generalized kind of fear and sense of helplessness. And such a psychological pattern easily lends itself to dogmatic and messianic cults (hence, Communism, Neo-Fascism and a host of revivalist religious sects). Anarchism is not only completely out of sympathy with such approaches, but it goes to the opposite pole in insisting upon decentralization, "voluntarism" and absence of leadership. The anarchist movement becomes in the mind of 20th century man a nebulous or amorphous affair. (The looseness of the structure frightens him).

From another point of view, this very amorphousness seems to work against the persistence and continuity of the movement as a movement. Lacking conventional political organization and periodic participation in election campaigns, etc., the movement tends to fragment and hence sacrifice unity and efficiency. Such fragmentation encourages increased impotency in the political field.

I would like here, to mention briefly the relationship of the unique position of Spanish anarchism to this whole question. The persistent vitality of anarchism in Spain in the face of its general decline elsewhere seems to be in part at least dependent upon the peculiar history of that country. More specifically, Spain long suffered under the crudest of tyrannies. It was the last of the Western nations to accomplish a successful revolt against absolutism. The realities of struggle and of blatant injustice in Spain in 1935 (and to this day) were most vivid whereas they were in the process of

being blurred—and comparatively speaking they probably were never anywhere near as sharp—in the English speaking world. Furthermore the anarchist movement, established early in Spain, was able to profit by a kind of libertarian ethos prevalent there and by the relative geographic isolation of the country from the main centres of European thought. This of course is not by any means a complete picture but I believe it does give some indication of why Spanish anarchism could flourish while elsewhere it was in a state of disintegration.

To summarize, then, I have tried to point out a few additional reasons for the lack of anarchists to-day, namely:

(1) The rise of living standards, increase in legislation, a "contented cow" policy on the part of industry for labour all have tended to ease the friction between employer and employee, state and citizen. Hence, the agitation of the rebel has become less meaningful, almost irrelevant and out of place for most.

(2) The generalized anxiety and feeling of helplessness in 20th century man provides a fertile field for messianic cults.

(3) The amorphous nature of the anarchist movement tends to serve as a factor in the impotency of the movement.

(4) The Spanish situation is unique and in a sense tends to bear out my introductory remarks.

Now, it may be assumed that what I have written—especially, in point three—is in a spirit of criticism of anarchist method. It is not. Any group must decide for itself what its values will be and weigh their relative advantage and disadvantage. Traditionally, anarchism has chosen to take a chance on possibly jeopardizing the strength of its organization in favour of total decentralization. Neither should it be concluded that I consider anarchism and/or decentralization to lead "inevitably" to fragmentation and dissolution. I would, however, insist that the possibility seems more likely. And, further, whereas anarchists can have little effect upon overcoming or altering the other factors I have mentioned, they can investigate and experiment with this whole problem of how to obtain the maximum of efficiency and co-ordination of organization within the limits of voluntary co-operation and personal freedom.

As I have said, anarchists can expect to have little effect on the other factors accounting for their deficiency in number. The anarchist movement can look forward to a long period in which it will continue to remain a small, ineffective group. At the risk of becoming melodramatic and, in a sense, Spenglerian, I might make an analogy between the rôle of the 8th—10th century monks and the possible rôle of the anarchist movement. That is, while the monks preserved considerable literature and kept a dim light of a kind of scholarship glowing in the Dark Ages, the anarchists might well be among those who will preserve the values of human dignity, freedom and mutual aid through what apparently is becoming another Dark Age.

Ithaca, New York. HAROLD B. BARCLAY.

FREEDOM PRESS

- E. A. GUTKIND :**
The Expanding Environment 8s. 6d.
- V. RICHARDS :**
Lessons of the Spanish Revolution 6s.
- MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI :**
Neither East nor West cloth 10s. 6d., paper 7s. 6d.
- WORKERS IN STALIN'S RUSSIA** 1s.
- SELECTIONS FROM FREEDOM**
Vol. 1, 1951, *Mankind is One* paper 7s. 6d.
Vol. 2, 1952, *Postscript to Posterity* paper 7s. 6d.
- TONY GIBSON :**
Youth for Freedom paper 2s.
Food Production and Population 6d.
Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.
- PHILIP SANSOM :**
Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step 1s.
- ERRICO MALATESTA :**
Anarchy Vote—What For? 6d. 1d.
- M. BAKUNIN :**
Marxism, Freedom and the State. cloth 5s.
- HERBERT READ :**
Art and the Evolution of Man 4s.
Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism 3s. 6d.
Poetry and Anarchism cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d.
The Philosophy of Anarchism boards 2s. 6d., paper 1s.
- RUDOLF ROCKER :**
Nationalism and Culture cloth 21s.

- ALEX COMFORT :**
Delinquency 6d.
Barbarism & Sexual Freedom boards 3s. 6d.
- PETER KROPOTKIN :**
The State: Its Historic Rôle 1s.
The Wage System 3d.
Revolutionary Government 3d.
Organised Vengeance Called Justice 2d.
- ALEXANDER BERKMAN :**
ABC of Anarchism 1s.
- JOHN HEWETSON :**
Sexual Freedom for the Young 6d.
Ill-Health, Poverty and the State cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.
- GEORGE WOODCOCK :**
Anarchy or Chaos 2s. 6d.
New Life to the Land 6d.
Railways and Society 3d.
Homes or Hovels? 6d.
What is Anarchism? 1d.
The Basis of Communal Living 1s.
- F. A. RIDLEY :**
The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age 2d.
- ★
Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications :
Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute cloth 5s.
Journey Through Utopia cloth 16s. (U.S.A. \$2.50)
- ★
K. J. KENAFICK :
Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx paper 6s.
- 27, Red Lion Street, London, W.C.1.**

The Engineers — What Next ?

HOW much of a success, or how much of a flop, was the engineers' one-day token strike last week? It is difficult to estimate what sort of a response was actually made to the strike call, but the general reticence of the daily press to quote figures, proportions or percentages, can only be an indication that response was bigger than they liked to admit.

From the trade union side, so much confusion existed because of the differing attitudes by the various unions that no clear picture can be gained. The only thing that can safely be said is that the vast majority of the rank and file of skilled engineers and ship-building workers were behind the strike, while large numbers of unskilled workers obeyed their "moderate" union leaders and stayed at work.

Action Against Blackleg

This has of course led to conflict between the workers themselves after they went back to work, and here and there small strikes flared up again as returning strikers refused to work with those who had remained at work.

At Prestwick Airport 700 workers struck on the day following the strike demanding the dismissal of seven who had worked on the Wednesday. At Metropolitan Vickers' Manchester works, 400 men downed tools in protest against a few who had blacklegged and at Chesterfield 50 foundry workers refused to start alongside one man who had not recognised the token strike.

This sort of action is to be expected. Tempers run high when fellow-workers show such disregard for the calls of solidarity as to continue working when the majority are out.

Scabbing and blacklegging are deplorable, but we cannot feel very warm either towards demands by returning strikers for the boss to dismiss the blacklegs. In the first place it is a bit unrealistic to expect the boss to sack workers who have remained loyal to his interests, but even if the workers have the strength to enforce this, there is something distasteful in the method itself.

Far better for the workers themselves to deal with the scabs in their own way—which is the method chosen by 300 workers in the Chesterfield works already mentioned—the Staveley Iron & Chemical Co. After 50 men had refused to start

alongside crane-driver Ron Hewitt, a mass meeting of 300 decided "he wasn't worth striking about" and they declared a boycott against him—that none of them would speak to him, other than the barest instructions for his work ("Up, down, over, and stop") for six months.

Division Within Leadership

But these incidents have probably been given more publicity than their numbers warrant. The response to the strike, where instructions to come out were given by the union, was clearly very good, but the trouble lies in the fact that not all the leaders of the 39 unions in the Confederation of Shipbuilding & Engineering Unions issued strike instructions.

Sections of the Transport & General Workers' and the Municipal & General Workers' unions are affiliated to the Confederation, but they were opposed to strike action all the time, and thus conflicting instructions were issued and conflicting loyalties were appealed to. Unskilled workers, members of the "General" unions, joined their fellow workers on strike against the orders of their union executives. If they obeyed their unions, they stayed at work and became blacklegs in the eyes of the strikers.

So here we get one more example of the confusion and conflict caused among workers through the structure of their unions, through their different leaderships, and through wage-differentials.

For there is no doubt that basing the wage claim on a percentage, rather than on a fixed sum, is calculated to increase the differences between the unskilled and the skilled, the day-worker and the piece-worker. This in fact is a deliberate policy on behalf of the Amalgamated Engineering Union, which is trying to re-erect the pre-war barriers between skilled and unskilled. And things being what they are, perhaps one cannot blame the skilled worker for seeking to protect his relatively privileged position.

Divisions Among Workers

But it is precisely things as they are that the anarchist and syndicalist oppose—whereas the trade unions are content with things fundamentally as they are and seek only—at the most—to protect the sectional interests of their membership against the predatory interests of the bosses, and the general interest of the rest of the working class.

The trades unions, in fact, cannot help but throw worker against worker in exactly the same way as capitalism in general does. And even within the three-million-strong Confederation, conflicting interests exist between the different unions comprising it.

In these circumstances, how can solidarity be achieved? The answer is that it can't. Just as working classes on the

international level cannot show solidarity while paying allegiance to their national ruling classes, so on the industrial level, workers cannot help develop solidarity and true working class unity while they pay allegiance to the various leaderships which bedevil their relationships with each other.

What follows the token strike? Probably a ban on overtime and piecework—after Christmas. This in itself will be an effective measure against the employers. It will also, however, aggravate the differentials between skilled and unskilled.

Although the skilled worker will lose more by banning overtime and piecework, his basic pay will still be enough to jog along on for the period of the ban—together with what he may have saved from past earnings. But the unskilled, lower paid worker has little chance to save much, and when reduced to his minimum pay, is very hard up indeed.

Abolish the Wages System

For the wages system does not take into account the fact that the cost of living is just as high for the unskilled as for the skilled, and that differentiation between workers working side by side in the production of the same goods is a very unjust business indeed.

We are clearly at the beginning of a period of intense industrial struggle. But win or lose in wage dispute after wage dispute, it will avail the working class very little unless it realises that the wage system is a weapon in the hands of the ruling, exploiting, class, and that the real interests of the workers demands the abolition of the wage system altogether and its substitution by free production for use and free access to the means of life for all. P.S.

Roman Catholic Opposes Malan

It has been reported in the Nationalist press in South Africa that Roman Catholic priests may be preparing to defy the law prohibiting marriages between white and coloured people. The Malan government is said to be "studying closely" certain remarks said to have been made by Father Rafferty recently at a London Conference on African race relations.

Father Rafferty is alleged to have pointed out that Canonical Law contains nothing about racial discrimination in marriage. "If two people of different races insisted on marrying, despite legal difficulties," Father Rafferty is reported to have said, "it was a priest's duty to solemnize the marriage, even if it meant he had to break the law and bear the consequences."

It seems likely that Roman Catholic priests in South Africa have taken Father Rafferty's words seriously for the Nationalist press menacingly observes that if the Roman Catholic Church adheres to this standpoint, officers of the Church are bound to transgress the law, and "far reaching consequences may follow."

Christianity versus Dutch Reformed Church

From this and other reports quoted in FREEDOM it does look as if Malanism has run into the Christian conception that all men, being sons of God, are brothers. If so it shows that the more socially progressive aspects of Christian religious teaching are the ones which possess most vitality and reality for those who sincerely hold religious beliefs.

And in Kenya

This unexpected aspect of Church teaching is also shown in the statement jointly issued in 3/12/53 by leaders of the Christian churches and organizations

in Kenya. (The Church of England, the Church of Scotland, and the Presbyterian Church, Methodists, the Salvation Army, the Church Missionary Society, and the Christian Council of Kenya. Here is the text:

"We feel it our duty to record the abhorrence with which we have read the published records of evidence given before a civil court and a recent court martial. We know our feelings are widely shared. We have repeatedly expressed at the highest level our grave concern at the abuses of power by certain members of the forces of law and order.

"We know that stern directives have been issued by his Excellency the Governor and by the Commander-in-Chief forbidding such brutal illegal practices. We believe that in certain quarters there have been signs of an improvement. We are, however, still gravely concerned at the situation, and we shall continue to bring to the notice of those in authority the need for a radical change in attitude and in action on the part of many of those responsible for the re-establishment of law and order."

All these instances show how their is the moral support for the doctrines of race discrimination openly espoused by Dr. Malan, but implicit also in the actions of British administrations in Africa.

Special Appeal

November 23—December 8

Denver: R.B. £15/18/6; Newton Abbot: E.D. 10/-; Palo Alto: O.R. 14/-; Edinburgh: T.O.M. £1/6/6; Tower Hill: Sympathiser 2/6; Los Angeles: "Man Group, per J.S. £3/10/5; Cambridge: Anon* 5/-; London: W.E.D.* 5/-; Peterborough: A.W. 5/-; Graz: G.A. £2/8/8.

Total ...	25 5 7
Previously acknowledged ...	487 0 0
1953 TOTAL TO DATE ...	£512 5 7

GIFTS OF BOOKS: Preston: A.L.; Chilcompton: H.S.C.; Rochdale: J.R.
* Readers who have undertaken to send regular monthly contributions.

Graham Green's Protest on Kenya

THE following is the full text of a letter from the Catholic novelist Graham Greene to the *Times* on 4.12.53. It represents a courageous stand by a writer at a time when all too few prominent intellectuals have shown themselves willing to adopt a clear position regarding British African policy.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES

"Sir,—I spent the month of September in the Kikuyu areas of Kenya, and it was with small surprise that I read of what happened on the Nyeri-Mweiga road. Too many similar cases had already reached one's attention: three bodies exposed for days in the yard of a police station where every passer-by could see how little respect there was for a dead African: the honourable record of certain regiments like The Buffs matched by the dishonourable record of other trigger-happy units who fire first as soon as curfew falls and look at papers afterwards. (The papers, we are

told, of these dead Africans were not in order. How many Africans' papers are in order? Four or five scraps of paper have to be carried around at one time—there is no proper system of passports to include all the necessary forms from tax receipts to travel permits.)

"Those bodies at one police station were meant to impress whom? The real Mau Mau is in the forest: were they meant to terrorize our friends? There isn't a settler in this area whose life is not preserved by the loyalty of the Kikuyu, and the loyalty of Kikuyu who have taken the Mau Mau oath. The dead men at Nyeri had taken the oath. What of it? So have 90 per cent. of the Home Guard. If this were ever to become a war between white and black, it would need more than three generals to wage the campaign. It is the Kikuyu who have suffered heavy casualties, not the white settler or the soldier (casualties from Mau Mau action are fewer than casualties from accidental shootings.) There isn't even the excuse of a terrible and costly war to explain carelessness and nerves.

"The pictures of the Lari massacre have had a wide circulation, and very terrible they are, but if photographs were available of the scene on the Nyeri road it would be seen that the Bren gun can produce a result as horrible as the panga. Many of us will find it hard to forget the story of the dying African trying to crawl under the wheels of advancing cars and crying, 'Is there no God?' One accepts the decision of the court martial, but I remember one of the older settlers saying, 'There's no room in Africa for those who do not love the Africans'.

GRAHAM GREENE."

A DEMONSTRATION AGAINST EVENTS IN AFRICA

SATURDAY, 12 DEC.
9 a.m. to 4 p.m.

Details from—
Congress of Peoples Against Imperialism

8 Gayfere Street, S.W.1
(Off Gt. Peter St.)

ALL COMRADES ASKED TO TAKE PART

The Milkman Always Rings Twice

IT has long been a boast of British democracy that we were ever such nicer people than the Russians, 'if you hear a rap on the door at 4 a.m. you know it's the milkman' and not the N.K.V.D. or the Gestapo. But are we sure?

In Bacup, Lancashire, a woman was awakened at 3.30 a.m. by those non-purveyors of milk—the military police—who were searching for her son erroneously reported a.w.o.l. These intellectuals discovered a Territorial uniform belonging to another son and quick-wittedly concluded that the 'deserter' was in the house, they went upstairs and woke up the other son, finding out their error. How he managed to convince them of their error, it is impossible to imagine, perhaps Lancashire lads roused at 4 a.m. have qualities of persuasion before which even M.P.'s quail.

The liberal press regrets that such

errors should happen, putting on their horse-blinkers to the fact that this is apparently the normal routine in all cases of absenteeism. The unholy marriage of militarism and the police force produced the species labelled M.P.'s and when not seeing that your overcoat is buttoned up properly or your hat is at 75° not 60° they are engaged in early morning raids for dozing deserters—they occasionally make mistakes; they were looking for a deserter last month who had been wounded in Korea, but after all they're only human—or are they?

If there's a knock on your door at 4 a.m. it may not be the milkman even though we're not in Russia or Germany. As long as there are armies there will be deserters, as long as there's conscription there will be deserters, and as long as there are armies and conscription there will be M.P.'s to check deserters whether at 4 a.m. or more convenient hours.

J.R.

The British Guiana Debate

IN the House of Commons debate on British Guiana last Tuesday the Colonial Secretary justified the suspension of the Constitution as against the Opposition's proposal that the Governor should have dissolved the legislature on the grounds that apart from the technical difficulties attached to such action, it would have solved nothing. The exact words of the Colonial Secretary are worth quoting:

"Resuming, he said the next suggestion was that the Governor should have dissolved the Legislature and resorted to a general election, but the Governor could not have dissolved the Legislature upon the advice of his Ministers because they would not have given that advice. If he had dissolved the Legislature he would have been bound to give a reason for acting without the advice of the Ministers. What would the reason have been? It would have been that the Ministers were unacceptable to him, they were not doing their job, and were damaging the interests of the colony. 'This would have provoked a storm even in the calm atmosphere of this Chamber. The Governor would not have been descending into the arena of politics which he cannot help but into the arena of party politics which he must clearly not do. Such an action would have given an ideal rallying cry to the supporters of the P.P.P. in the impending election. Even I could have written an election manifesto for them. (Laughter). The Government would have played straight into their hands.' There was little doubt that only five months after their previous electoral victory and armed with this extra piece of electoral artillery the P.P.P. would have been elected again. What would have happened then? Was it suggested that election after election should be held until a new set of Ministers was returned?"

Of course Mr. Lyttleton is quite right, and he did well to expose the hypocrisy of the Opposition's opposition, which not being based on any moral standards of justice but simply of expediency, offered no real solution. The opposition no more believes in real democracy than the government and it was obvious that the debate should fizzle out since in fact there was no opposition to the Government's ruthless policy in British Guiana. There was only the view expressed that some face-saving method could have been adopted to achieve the same results!

Progress Report 3 ANARCHIST CLUB

SINCE I last reported, no significant progress has been made towards the securing of premises for our club.

As the list at the end shows, some more promises of money and of help have come in and I think that we should be justified in taking the plunge once suitable premises are found.

But estate agents start looking vague and unhelpful as soon as the words "social club" are mentioned. However, some comrades are assiduously searching and we hope soon to report success.

CLUB FUND COMMITMENTS — (Commitment for foundation fund first, monthly guarantee in brackets).
London: N.W.3; K.L. £2. 2s., S.W.1.: G.T. £5; W.8: A.W. £2; N.W.3: P.S. £3 (10s.); Bradford: D.R. £3; Devon: Newton St. Cyres, F.T. 10s.; Cambridge: J.W.S. 2s.

Already acknowledged:	£43 9s. (£12 14s.)
Total:	£15 14s. (10s.)
	£59 3s. (£13 4s.)

OFFERS OF HELP:
Hampstead N.W.3: A.U.; Bayswater W.2: M.P.; Kensington W.8: A.W.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting
HYDE PARK
Sundays at 3.30 p.m.
TOWER HILL
Tuesdays at 12.30 p.m.

NORTH-EAST LONDON DISCUSSION MEETINGS IN EAST HAM

Alternate Wednesdays at 7.30 p.m.
DEC. 16.—E. Priddy
THE ARTS & THE ARTISAN

GLASGOW
INDOOR MEETINGS
every Friday
at 7.30 p.m.
at 200 Buchanan Street.
Speakers: Mark Kramisch, Hugh McCutcheon and others.

FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

Postal Subscription Rates:
12 months 17/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)
6 months 8/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)
3 months 4/6 (U.S.A. \$0.75)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies
12 months 27/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)
6 months 13/6 (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