

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"There is nothing so destructive as truth. It threatens the existence of all our religions, about fifty per cent. of our institutions, and some seventy-five per cent. of our theories."

—CHAPMAN COHEN.

Vol. 15, No. 24

June 12th, 1954

Threepence

## KENYA MASSACRE

THE statement made last Monday in Nairobi by Mr. Michael Blundell, Minister without portfolio and a member of the Kenya War Council, in which he warned "Mau Mau terrorists" that "your casualties will continue and will increase till you give in" and informed them that the Government was planning operations to achieve the same results as "Operation Anvil" in which Kikuyu, Meru and Embu tribesmen in Nairobi were detained "screened and thousands sent to detention camps", is surely ample proof that the government's way of solving the problem of terrorism with terrorism has been a failure. Of course if their activities are to be measured by the number of Africans killed, executed and herded into concentration camps, then the Kenya government has many successes to its credit. But the more they shoot, the more "terrorists" appear to take the place of their fallen comrades, and there seems no end to the "Emergency" short of killing off or detaining the whole Kikuyu tribe of more than a million souls.

In his statement Mr. Blundell gave as 5,000 the number of Mau Mau terrorists killed since the beginning of the emergency, while in the British House of Commons the Colonial Secretary told Mr. Fenner Brockway that five hundred and sixty six Africans in Kenya had been sentenced to death during the past twelve months and of these 289 had actually been executed. The charges on which they were sentenced to death were Murder 268, unlawful possession of arms, ammunition and explosives 204, consorting with terrorists 58, administering unlawful oaths 37, and acting with intent to further terrorism 9.

### Krupps to Produce Steel Again?

When Von Krupp was recently awarded £55 million and a start was made in allowing him to rebuild once again his vast industrial empire, some of us thought it would not be long before the restrictions on what he could produce would be relaxed.

Clearly when it suits the Western powers, this employer of slave labour, in whose employ thousands of forced labourers were starved, beaten and worked to death, would once again be encouraged to operate in the trade he knows best—armament production.

First steps are now being taken. A *News Chronicle* report last week ran: "Berlin cable: Special pleading is now beginning in West Germany to let the former Krupps armaments firm have back its right to produce steel."

### CHAPLIN'S PEACE PRIZE

CHARLIE CHAPLIN has accepted a Peace Prize from the Communist operated World Peace Council. To describe this as unfortunate is an understatement. An ardent desire for peace is understandable and laudable, but to tie up such a desire with these Stalinist fronts is really too naive. Chaplin thereby casts his glamour and authority over the Communist cause, while at the same time he gives ammunition to the reactionaries who hated him in the U.S.A. and lends the colour of justification to the State Authorities who refused him a re-entry visa last year.

It is a serious and troubling problem to understand why men like Chaplin and Picasso fall so readily into the Communist net, when their whole life and outlook are a condemnation of Communist methods and aims.

The mentality of those at the top was revealed in a speech made by the Director of Operations in Kenya, Major-General Hinde last Monday. He said that from a soldier's viewpoint it would be a good thing to expel Kikuyu tribesmen from their reserves for the rest of their lives. General Hinde told a conference that what every soldier wanted was a kind of "swill tub" in a large area where 100,000 Kikuyu could be put out of the way on works projects and told that they were there for life. He told his audience of European settlers and business men that "if such a plan is not practical, then you must not be disappointed if things in the reserve go slower than you wish." It was "depressing" that supposedly friendly Kikuyu went back to their reserves to keep the flame of Mau Mau burning.

It is possible that enlightened public opinion will prevail in not letting the Major General and those who share his views, get away with it though with the public conscience at a low ebb anything is possible. But the point to be stressed is that a

man in a key position in Kenya, given a free hand would put into operation a campaign against the Kenya Africans which, for its ruthlessness and brutality and complete unconcern for the individual is on a par with the worse things done by the Nazis in Germany and the Stalinists in Russia. All this talk of democracy, and the values that distinguish the West from the East, is in fact just talk when it comes to "emergencies". Then one sees the face behind the democratic mask: it is called, everywhere, government and there is little to choose between them.

LIBERTARIAN.

FOOTNOTE: In a written reply Mr. Lyttelton, the Colonial Secretary stated that since 1918 gifts totalling £20,838,906 had been given or promised by this country to Kenya. He also revealed that expenditure on the emergency so far was estimated at £14 million. Thus in killing Africans almost as much has been spent in a couple of years as has been spent on their welfare in 36 years! And a lot more money is going to be spent on the killing during the next few years.

## THOSE UNION AGREEMENTS

WHENEVER a trade union Executive negotiates an agreement with an employers' association or with the Board of a nationalised industry, the newspaper headlines are likely to read: "Workers Agree . . ." to whatever it is.

It is only, we are asked to believe, when an unofficial strike occurs, that the leader-writers of the Press dimly perceive that maybe, after all, the T.U. Executive and the workers are not one and the same.

The strike of footplate men on the Western Region last month gave us an example of this. Heart-searchings then commenced, and although outraged condemnation of the strikers was the order of the day, the more intelligent leader-writers also drew attention to the glaringly obvious gap between the union leaders who had accepted the lodging turns and the men who had to carry them out.

For the majority of trade unionists this gap is a recognised and well-known feature of their organisation. The Executive is something remote, even from their Branch, let alone from their workshop, and almost the only time they expect to see a union official is when they have resorted to strike action and he comes down from his Olympian heights to drive them back to work.

### Did the Executive Know?

One cannot help feeling rather puzzled as to exactly how the Executive of the Association of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen imagined they were going to get away with their lodging-turn agreement with British Railways. The Executive must have known the extent of opposition to the re-introduction of lodging-turns—an opposition which, as the readiness of the Eastern and North-Eastern Regions to join in indicates, is widespread and determined throughout the country.

Did the Executive then, approach the men? Did the union leaders "go down" to Branch level, to discuss the matter and either persuade the footplate men to accept their (and British Transport Commission's) point of view, or, if the men would not accept, to go back to the Transport Commission and report the fact, saying that as their members would not accept lodging turns, no agreement could be made to re-introduce them?

They were not. Instead, they went ahead and signed an agreement without consulting their rank-and-file. Without, apparently, thinking it necessary for the men who would actually do the work to agree in the first place.

Against this, however, the union exe-

cutive maintain that the policy under which the new system was announced was endorsed last year at the A.S.L.E.F. annual assembly. Armed with this, the Society's representatives on the National Joint Sub-Committee has gone ahead with the agreement.

Something, however, seems very wrong somewhere. Opposition to lodging turns has been consistently expressed by footplate men since the war. What were the circumstances under which the policy of re-introduction was accepted last year? Just how far did the "policy" go?

### This Year, Last Year

For it seems rather strange that a policy should be accepted last year to which such strong opposition exists this year. And this opposition is not only manifested through the strike but, as we reported last week, a delegate conference of the Society overwhelmingly voted against the policy.

We come back to the point, then, that in fact the union leadership pushed through the agreement with the Transport Commission knowing full well the opposition among their members. If they don't know, one can only ask—why not?

It seems that the only indication of the agreement at branch level was the arrival of a circular announcing the terms of the agreement—after it had been signed!

And then, when the men quite rightly refused to accept it, and took the only action open to them—strike action—the Press, Ministry of Labour officials, members of Parliament and their own union leaders denounced them for "not honouring their agreements"! The howls went up again—the strikers were undermining the very basis of the consultative machinery so carefully built up through the years; threatening the very structure of trades unionism—and so on.

### Why Should They?

The questions none of the good solid citizens seemed to have asked themselves are: Why the hell should workers honour agreements made contrary to their wishes? Why should they be concerned about the existence of machinery which acts against their interests?

The great pity is that so far the workers will take action against their own leaders only under the greatest provocation. When the leadership is too blatantly flouting the wishes or interests of its membership, the members are stung into action, but it is of a purely temporary nature. There seems no serious attempt on the part of any sizable section of the T.U. movement to grapple with the real nature of the problem. All that such

## Beaverbrook Methods

FEW people nowadays believe "what they read in the papers", but few also regard the press, or certain sections of it, as downright liars and deceivers. The case of the Beaverbrook press' campaign against the British Council, however, shows just how far modern journalism in this country will go in deliberate disregard of the truth.

The British Council Staff Association has published a pamphlet (price 6d.) entitled "The Beaverbrook Press and the British Council", obtainable from the Association at 65, Davies Street, W.1. in order to draw public attention to this campaign. They accuse this group of newspapers of "inaccurate and misleading attacks, often persisted in after the facts have been made known to them" and of "frequent refusal to publish corrections of misstatements".

The pamphlet instances in detail a large number of cases which prove these accusations up to the hilt. A few examples will have to suffice, and they will also show the style of these press attacks.

From the *Daily Express* 28/1/52 "Here from Rangoon: U. Khin

Maung Nyunt, to take a course in doing laundry by machines . . . And who is paying all the bills? You are. Through the British Council. Lessons for Burmese laundrymen . . . What are the long-haired lads and lasses of the Council thinking of?"

The *Express* however failed to publish a letter from U Khin Maung Nyunt pointing out that the British Council were only paying a part of his expenses, that he came to study the methods of British Hospital laundries, and that he brought commissions to buy a large number of laundry machines. He added that he gave all this information to the *Express* reporter in a perfectly trusting spirit.

Here is an example therefore of deliberate twisting of the facts and refusal to correct them. When the British Council sponsored a tour by the Old Vic Company with Sir Laurence Olivier and Vivien Leigh to Australia and New Zealand, the *Evening Standard* wrote: "The Council keep on spending our money with the same uncurbed prodigality". They did not report that the tour made a large profit, of which £40,000 came to the United Kingdom and was shared between the Old Vic and the Treasury.

Continued on p. 3

incidents as the footplate men's strike will do is to make the leadership a little more cautious in its operation in future. It will not alter the nature of that leadership; it will do nothing to change the main drive behind the unions of to-day, which is the rationalisation of labour relations by collaboration with management and the disciplining of the workers in the interests of capitalism.

### Think—then Act

What the strike has shown once again is that all the decisions at the top are useless if the rank and file are determined on what they want. The trouble seems to be however that the rank and file don't really know what they want. They will

strike against something they don't want—but inevitably such actions are in themselves negative.

They can become constructive if the workers will learn from them where their strength really lies, and will then take the trouble to think out their problems and how to use that strength to solve them.

If they will only do that, they will find themselves driven to anarchist conclusions and to syndicalist methods. A formidable combination, and a winning one for an enlightened working class.

P.S.

## WHOSE RESPONSIBILITY?

A READER from Dagenham replies to our financial appeal which appeared in last week's *FREEDOM* with the suggestion that we should increase the price from 3d. to 6d. a copy, pointing out that "after all an extra 3d. per week is not a lot extra to pay if one values *FREEDOM* (equals about 1½ cigarettes a week)."

It is not a new suggestion, and is one that other minority papers have adopted not always with much success. We are not proposing to adopt it for practical and other reasons. Our principal objection at this stage is that by increasing the price of the paper we, as it were, take the responsibility of covering the £15 a week loss on the paper by imposing an all-round levy on all readers whether they are anarchists, sympathisers or just readers who, without sharing our ideals and objectives, are interested to study our point of view. Instead we feel that the present financial crisis must be tackled by those who as our correspondent says "value *FREEDOM*". If our correspondent and other comrades are prepared to pay 6d. a copy for the paper if we raise the price, why do they not take the initiative of contributing 1/- a month? Some years ago—when *FREEDOM* was passing through another "crisis" a reader suggested that comrades and sympathisers should undertake to send a regular monthly or quarterly contribution. A few readers responded,

but only an infinitesimal percentage—and at present only a handful of these stalwarts still honour their undertaking. And yet, this is the anarchist solution to our problem. Our Dagenham reader proposes that we arbitrarily impose a levy all round; he also implies that comrades will pay the extra 3d. if we charge it in the price of the paper but will not do so if it is left to their initiative to meet the £15 a week deficit by regular contributions.

We are anarchists partly because we believe in the long term advantages of voluntary co-operation as against imposition. To increase the price of *FREEDOM* to 6d. we ease our financial burden for the next year or so, but we are convinced that another financial crisis will brew up, and we shall be back where we are now. And will a reader then come forward and suggest that we increase the price to 1/-?

No, this is how we wish to present our problem: for reasons beyond our control the weekly publication of *FREEDOM* involves us in a deficit of £15 each week. Are there among our comrades and readers a sufficient number who value the continued publication enough to (a) make the effort to raise that amount each week by their contributions, (b) to reduce the deficit by obtaining new readers?

Are there?

## The Impracticability of Property

THE average person is inclined to be sceptical when the theory of free communism is presented to him. Nor is he inclined to accept that the institution of property by itself is one of the most important causes of capitalism and war. These things seem so faraway and abstract, and he has a healthy doubt of theories. He knows no other social system than the one he lives under, and very naturally finds it difficult to conceive of any other.

"But it is impractical," he says, "how could society run at all without property and money?" And it is not perhaps surprising that tribes still living in primitive communism have been known to say exactly the same to the European explorers who tried to explain the property system to them. Only they wanted to know how society could run with property and money, dividing man against man as it does.

So let us look at some of the day to day results of the system we live under, and see whether it is really practical or not. We will not deal with the more dramatic evils produced by property, the State, Capitalism, and War.

We will deal with some of the things that might, and probably will, happen to anybody reading these lines, if they have not happened to him or her already.

First of all, property is wasteful. Practically everyone who is sufficiently well-off to live in a house, part of a house, or a flat, has one room which is used to store articles of various sorts. Practically everything, do what you will, deteriorates in storage. But one has to keep them, because it is probable that you will want them again. They cannot be sold, and new ones bought later; that clearly would be a waste of money. So they have to be kept, although they are often a nuisance, in that they need constant attention and occupy space that could be put to better use.

There are also certain things which are too good to throw away but which cannot be sold, and to give them away would also be difficult. They sometimes end up in jumble sales.

The property system breeds in many people a nagging sense of insecurity that leads to hoarding. It affects even those whose wealth should secure them from any fear of poverty, and leads to the most bizarre cases. Not long ago in New York two brothers died, and had to be almost dug out of their home, which

was so full of antique furniture that they had collected that it was almost impossible to move about.

The mania of the collector no doubt has deep psychological causes, and it would be an oversimplification to ascribe it all to the property system, but nonetheless it undoubtedly is one of the most important causes. It is a mistake to plunge deep into a person's psyche and completely ignore the social system in which he lives.

But while the various articles of property lie in storage they are lost to the world. There are doubtless many who could use these things, but there they lie, waiting till their owner wants them again. So the other people who could use them have either to buy for themselves, or go without.

This means that many goods must be duplicated, and far more produced than necessary. This is of course fine for capitalism, which prefers to make goods so that they wear out soon, and have to be replaced, and which has banned the manufacture of the everlasting match, but it would not have to happen in a society based on free communism.

Quite apart from wars and unemployment, how much petty misery has property not caused? It must be limitless. Recently I read of how an elderly woman, who was revisiting England, from which she had emigrated in 1911, had her handbag blown from her grasp over the side of the ship into the sea. It contained her savings, amounting to £300, and her holiday had to be cut from three months to four weeks.

Let us put the supporters of property, and its inevitable concomitant money, for we do not wish to reintroduce trade by barter, on the defensive. They have the nerve to tell us that we are impractical visionaries. Do they consider a system practical that makes a person's life and happiness depend on a few silly slips of coloured paper, so easy to lose, or have stolen, that they cause ceaseless worry for that reason alone?

"But she could have been more careful."

Granted. But what are we to say to a system that penalises carelessness so savagely?

Consider all the worry caused by the fear of losing such things as tickets. Think of all the wasted time and energy that issuing and collecting the little nuisances entails. What about all the amount of time, energy, and trouble, that are caused by the need to store money? For, like the property that it represents, it has to be stored, and with the utmost care, lest thieves break through and steal.

## Between Reason and Madness

ACTING, implying both impersonation and depersonalization, is an adventure inducing and induced by great excitement, to be indulged calmly and cold-bloodedly only after persistent training and habituation. In view of this fact, and in spite of the scholarship displayed in corroboration of the various hypotheses on the origin of the theatre, it is not to be excluded that among certain peoples at least acting may have started as an actual case of madness. P. Janet in "The Major Symptoms of Hysteria" (pp. 29/31) tells the story of a 20-year-old girl who after having assisted her mother in her sixty days long agony of conditions of extreme poverty, destitution and strain, tried to revive her corpse by standing it upright, and had to lift it back into the bed with infinite exertion when it fell to the floor. After the funeral this girl repeatedly acted all the events that took place at her mother's death, without forgetting the least detail, sometimes adding to them in an equally realistic fashion, the scene of her own suicide she had intended to commit by lying on the rails to be run over by a locomotive. The strangeness and terribleness of a similar performance, which contains all the essential elements of drama, could easily have so impressed a primitive audience as to make them mimic and ritualize it. Because of the awe and respect madness elicits there must also have been cases in which it was calculatedly feigned as it is even nowadays in some of its milder aspects particularly by adolescents who see their mother or girl-friend not sufficiently interested in and loving their normal self.

### A BAD RISK

IT was a Jewish acquaintance who paid the fare of Pius X (canonized last week) to enable him to make the trip to Rome for the conclave after the death of Leo XII. Why should this man who was elected Pope on this visit have had to borrow his fare? He was a poor man, and the Catholic Bank in Venice refused to grant him a loan.

If all this unproductive labour were done away with, all the energy that has up till now gone into it could be turned to better purposes. In a free society the amount of office work would be very slight, and all the people now engaged on jobs connected with money and property could do something else more productive, or at least more amusing. "SMOG".

I am one of those people who frequently have images and dreams produced or, rather, prompted by, a lively horror of heights. Believing as I do that the subconscious is ruled by existential categories beside and beyond libidinal strivings, I interpret my fear of heights as the repressed counterpart of my daring to live, to be something, to exist, and a reminder of the fact that I should be nothing, that nothingness and not absolute being claims me as its own. The myth of the tower of Babel is the best known illustration of this existential category or situation, and many others will be found when psycho-analysis dares to go deeper than the power or pleasure principles. Accordingly, the fascination of madness, so much like the fascination of a precipice, is to be understood as the claim of something within us, something that is or could be us at any moment. The thought and contemplation of madness can be indulged more freely and safely than the thought and contemplation of nothingness or death not only because its objectification is more varied and complete but also because it is easier to imagine ourselves sane as long as we live than it is to subsume that we shall live for ever. I gather that at the sight of madness some people experience a sweet feeling akin to that immortalized by Lucretius of watching a shipwreck safely from the shore. Had there been some madman in the synagogue the Pharisee of the parable would have thanked God fervidly for keeping him sane.

The comparison of the human mind with its zone of consciousness and periphery of subconscious to a room only partly lit by a candle is neat and reassuring. Not so if we discover the room to be a cave, feel that winds are threatening to blow the candle out, and know that the candle may fall on some dry leaves and start a fire. That is what madness seems to be like: a tormented, agonizing consciousness or such a flare of it the human organism cannot bear long. Thence the periods of torpor, stupor and unconsciousness that in some forms of madness so strikingly alternate with its violent outbursts.

It has been said, with some apparent truth but quite uncharitably, that madness is a kind of escapism, a way out, however drastic, of an unpleasant situation. It is easily forgotten that were it not for some social precautions and institutions madness would soon, as a rule, deliver its victims to starvation or violent death. Madness may be a trick, but the madman is seldom a trickster. I am inclined to consider the case of the girl

quoted by Janet as typical of madness. If we understand madness as the breaking down of a mental balance we may be sure it comes as a result of the breaking down of some other balance, vital to the economy of the organism or to the relationship between it and its surroundings.

In drunkenness one's mental balance is temporarily upset, and one is often aware of a struggle to retain it. What happens in drunkenness is that the organism has absorbed a fluid to cope with which the energies normally used in assimilation and elimination are not sufficient. The brain in particular is overtaxed by this task, and the mental processes that result are the counterpart of a physiological disorder. In madness consequent upon great physical exertion, nervous strain, sleeplessness, exposure, hunger and thirst it looks as if the brain relinquished some of the energies needed for its normal functioning or as if it lost its relative independence and made it its chief business to interpret or disguise visceral needs and calls.

So the pink elephants of the person affected with D.T. are a brain interpretation of a real disturbance. In a society of equally affected dypsomaniacs it would be the sober man with no eyes for pink elephants who would be considered a madman: The supposition may be far-fetched, but many have found themselves in a similar quite real situation when they happened to be in the midst of a crowd affected with racial, patriotic or religious hysteria, and tried to cling to reason. They probably found it convenient, even reasonable, to feign the collective madness, and when this feigning lasted long enough they became unable to decide whether it was real or still feigned.

Reason as we know it is a luxury. It could develop its extraordinary wealth and delicate mechanisms because it so happened that the needs of the body became comparatively easy to satisfy with fair regularity. As to how it originated the chances are it was through some hypersthenia and hyperaemia of the brain, the same as take place, with their contrary, in the development of madness. Madness is not lack of intelligence, but a special form thereof. It is intelligence too keenly and too exclusively aware of some need of the organism, and since the reality of these needs is uncommunicable, and reason deals with communicable reality, its name is unreason. It is the inability of reason to cope with situations of severe bodily strain, repressed needs, isolation and danger, that causes its eclipse and the advent of madness. For reason to survive it is necessary that outside reality behaves according to a regular and well-established pattern. When a man, then, as an example, is hunted by other men as though he were a rat it is not surprising he relinquishes the reason he had in common with these other men, and makes his own the intelligence of a rat by which alone he can survive.

Madness is ceasing to be the sole concern of the psychiatrist, of charitable and government institutions, and is calling to itself the attention of the philosopher and of the man in the street. Things are

Continued on p. 3

## FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

OPEN 10 a.m. to 6.30: 5.0 SATURDAYS

### SPECIAL OFFER

For a limited period all books ordered from Freedom Bookshop (new or second-hand) will be sent post free.

### New Books . . .

Love Under Another Name  
Ethel Mannin 12/6  
Omnibus Stephen Crane 21/-  
The Joker J. Maloquis 12/6

### Reprints . . .

Brave New World (with new preface) Aldous Huxley 3/6  
Bible Handbook  
G. W. Foote & W. P. Ball 4/-

### Second-Hand . . .

An Atlas of Empire  
J. F. Horrabin (1937) 3/-  
The Rise of Modern Industry  
J. L. & Barbara Hammond 7/6  
Essays and Letters P. B. Shelley 3/-  
Mine Boy Peter Abrahams 2/-  
My Country and My People  
Lin Yutang 3/6  
McTeague (Greed) Frank Norris 2/-  
Empire in Africa  
Alexander Campbell 2/6  
Chokey 'Red Collar Man' 3/-  
Children of the Dead End  
Patrick Macgill 2/6  
Memoirs of a Revolutionist  
Peter Kropotkin 12/6  
Our Threatened Values  
Victor Gollancz 2/-  
This England (1933)  
Gerald Barry 2/6  
Salome, etc. Oscar Wilde 3/-  
Paradox of Oscar Wilde  
George Woodcock 6/-  
Ancient Man Henrick Van Loon 2/-  
Autobiography of a German Rebel  
Toni Sender 3/-  
Production for the People  
Frank Verulam 2/-  
Writing and Action:  
New Worlds for Old H. G. Wells 2/-  
Boswell's London Journal 7/6  
Jewish Youth Comes Home  
Norman Bentwich 2/6  
A Documentary Anthology 8/6

See special notice above about postage

Postage extra on all items.

Obtainable from

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

## THEATRE

### A Play of Human Tragedy

N. C. HUNTER, the author of *A DAY BY THE SEA* (Theatre Royal, Haymarket), has so clearly steeped himself in the plays of Anton Chekhov, in their atmosphere, characterisation and structure, in the deep pity and philosophy which is expressed in even apparently trivial details and remarks, that it is difficult to estimate his claim to originality and power as a dramatist. Nevertheless, there are several scenes in this play which reveal that N. C. Hunter has a wide and at the same time intensely personal view of human tragedy. There are memorable moments of pathos and the realisation of the terrible suffering human beings are continually exposed to in their struggle with the shapeless thing we call life, and which we increase so much by our submission to convention and custom and the past, by our cowardice and betrayal of our own true selves. Men exalt and seek happiness in things that can lead only to despair and futility, while they ignore and despise most of the things which could ennoble and enrich their lives. They give false meanings to life, instead of realising that one cannot begin by saying that life has or has not importance, for it depends upon us to give it importance: it is up to man to make it important to be a man, and he alone can feel his success or failure. Somehow, *A Day by the Sea* has a more pessimistic effect than any of Chekhov's plays, and this in spite of the characters' faith that some day people will lead beautiful and truly happy lives. At the end Julian Anson, who has been unsuccessful in the deepest sense in life, is talking in the garden with his mother, the doctor who drinks, and the old man asleep in his chair. He says that they can cut down the two oak trees at the front of the house, so that they will have an uninterrupted view to the sea. He suggests other improvements they can make in the garden. "There is no end to the things we can do. . . No end." This play is suffused with a gentle, melancholy, and one feels that the pre-

sent is the frontier between the garden of the future and the desert of the past. It is redrawn every moment. Julian's mother once says that "in this house we go round and round like elderly goldfish in a bowl." It is absurd to say that the dialogue of a play is "natural" because most of the things people say to each other are dreary, repetitive and false. They stifle each other with platitudes and delusions, and it is only because people have secondhand thoughts and ideas instilled into them that they talk and think as they do. They talk and think and act in an unnatural manner. Truth does not exist. Truth we have in ourselves. Truth is the representation that each of us makes of it. What we make of it may be our tragedy or itself a source of life. Megs Jenkins as Miss Mathieson, the governess of the two children of Frances Farrar who says that "she has been with me seven years and during that time I have never known her to have a single friend or admirer," and Ralph Richardson as the doctor both act superbly in the finest and most tender scene in the play. They are alone together for a few minutes on the beach where all the people in the house have gone for a picnic; Miss Mathieson asks the doctor to marry her, but he replies that he is too old that he is no longer interested in life, and that it would not be fair to her when she is still quite a young woman. "Look at me! What sort of a bridegroom would I make?" He says it half bitterly, half humorously, but underlying it all there is a terrible sadness and hopelessness. One remembers the words of Pirandello, "Ask the poet what is the saddest sight and he will reply 'It is laughter on the face of a man. Who laughs does not know'."

One wonders if ever, even in a free society, men can ever be really happy. Can we forget the cry of the victims? To N. C. Hunter what is most tragic about any ordinary life is that it is gradually worn away and impoverished. The greater part of their time men live out-

side themselves, hardly perceiving anything of themselves but their own ghost, a colourless shadow.

In *A Day by the Sea* as in Chekhov's plays, there is no force or direct progression urging on the plot; as we listen to the apparently aimless talk, each word said, each half-utterance of inarticulate thought, contribute to the meaning of the whole. Every character is important in his own right, not grouped round one or two central figures like aunts and uncles round the bride and bridegroom on a wedding photograph. In the character of Julian, the statesman and the idealist, who is so concerned with the welfare of Man that he forgets the importance of individual men and women and so preoccupied with international affairs that he disregards the problems of people's lives, is exposed as a useless meddler. Julian's mother is bored by his intense seriousness about politics, as he acts as if the fate of the world depends upon him, although he is only in a minor post. "The incompetence," she says, "of so-called statesmen is beyond belief. And to think that they get paid for their clumsiness." Julian is told that he is to be recalled from his post in Paris, he realises how futile his career has been, that he is just a faithful civil servant "much of whose work has been greatly appreciated." He has shunned much of the pleasure and joy that he might have known, and is unpopular and again, unsuccessful, and when he meets Frances Farrar, a girl who was adopted by his mother and with whom he grew up. She has been divorced and involved in tragic circumstances, so that respectable people are reluctant to meet her. She tells him that she was in love with him many years before, but he did not know it; he thinks that they can begin a new life together, and asks her to marry him now, but she refuses because she believes that she will disappoint him, that it is impossible, it is too late.

D.M.M.

## ON THE SIDE OF THE SERPENT

Before the Royal Society of New Zealand's Eighth Science Congress, Australia's top atomic physicist, Marcus Laurence Oliphant, attacked recent statements by Pope Pius XII and Labor Leader Clement R. Attlee citing the misuse of science as a menace to the world. Scientist Oliphant implied that the world's sorry state is the fault of the churches for not doing their job better. "I can find no evidence whatever," he said, "that the morality of mankind has improved over the 5,000 years or so of recorded history."

In the Garden of Eden incident, moreover, Professor Oliphant gladly ranged himself on the side of the serpent. "We are told that . . . Adam and Eve were driven from the Garden of Eden because they disobeyed the law and ate of the fruit of the tree of knowledge. It seems strange to me that the exercise of the greatest faculty with which man has been endowed should ever have been regarded as a sin . . . By a deliberate act, probably the greatest step he ever took, [Man] chose to seek knowledge, thereby setting himself apart from all living things and ensuring his ultimate dominion over the earth. What is called the Fall of Man should be known as the Ascent of Man."

—Time, May 31/54.

★  
"Meanwhile," says Billy Graham, "God is expecting great things from Britain."

## BEAVERBROOK METHODS

Continued from p. 2

At the time of the Guiana troubles when the Jagans were first arrested, the *Express* declared (3/11/53) that the Council had lent Mrs. Jagan a film on Colonial development for propaganda with the obvious intention of implying that these intellectuals were feeding Communists with anti-British propaganda at a time of crisis. In fact the film show in question took place 18 months earlier on 23/5/52 before Dr. Jagan had even become Premier, and the sponsoring organization declared itself to be purely cultural. These facts were pointed out to the *Express* but were not published.

At other times the Beaverbrook press has in fact printed corrections but has then gone on to repeat the original distortions almost immediately afterwards.

We are not here concerned with the merits of the British Council but with the methods of the Beaverbrook press. However, it is significant that these attacks are couched in terms which seek to feed that irrational fear of culture and intellectualism which distinguishes McCarthy's methods and which lead on to the Press methods of the Nazis. The *Express*' "long haired lads and lasses of the Council" are not far removed from the "egg-heads" of McCarthy.

The Beaverbrook papers circulate in millions, and if their readers like this sort of style it is significant indeed. The British Council pamphlet however will circulate in a few thousand copies only, and might well have been completely stillborn had it not been taken up by the *Observer*. Even so, the circulation of the *Observer* is trifling compared with that of the Beaverbrook press. The strength of the *Observer*'s attack lies perhaps in any effect it may have on journalists and the world of the press for the methods used against the British Council look shabby and mean indeed when matched against the facts.

It is rather frightening that such methods can be used in this country and it is salutary that they should be exposed. But we doubt if Lord Beaverbrook will be seriously worried by this exposure. A paper can deliberately distort the truth. It may refuse to print a correction, but even if it does, the damage is already done. If it goes on to continue with a similar disregard of the truth, despite a published correction, then one begins to wonder about the readers of such a paper.

This is where one's reflections begin to be rather more sinister. For the *Express* has achieved its four-million odd circulation by just these methods, and one cannot escape the impression that such bullying, unfair methods actually appeal to a very large number of people. Anti-intellectualism is a good demagogic line: a hectoring, sneering tone appeals to many who thus achieve vicarious expression for their own wish to hector and to bully. Obviously it is the same kind of psychopathological need that gave McCarthy his popularity. And in the same way, the brutal, narrow, strong-man ruthlessness of Communist methods appeal to similar irrational anti-social forces in the mass mind, induced by frustrations in individual life.

Such fascist-like mentalities are not going to be converted by these exposures, or by liberal reason. Indeed they are goaded on by them and treat them with derision. Instances such as this British Council case, like McCarthyism, bring home to one the need to tackle the emotional needs of men and women more sympathetically and realistically, and specifically to work for the rational and humane upbringing of children.

## A New Sex Morality

WORK in a revolutionary movement is apt to produce the impression that progressive ideas are the exclusive property of a tiny minority, and it is a sad fact that many people with revolutionary ideas actually enjoy feeling that they are a member of elite voices crying in the wilderness. Actually, there is much very solid work going on to-day which is absolutely revolutionary in aim and conception, though seldom in name. FREEDOM has done something to bring to the notice of its readers some of this work, but the international anarchist press in general is sadly unaware in this respect and presents an almost parochial approach to many outstanding human problems.

A remarkable article on sexual morals has recently been brought to our notice—remarkable for two reasons. First because it appears in a conventional fashionable magazine *Woman and Beauty*; and second because it is by Dr. Helena Wright, probably the leading birth control specialist in this country, and one who has done a tremendous work in spreading knowledge of birth control methods in countries such as India and Italy where it is virtually unknown.

In this article, originally contributed as one of a series entitled "Is Chastity old-fashioned?", Dr. Wright argues for a new sexual morality, pointing out that the property basis of Victorian morals has completely changed.

In what way has this basis changed? Why is it that you young people need not necessarily be bound by the rules of your parents? It is the invention of reliable, simple and cheap methods of contraception that has fundamentally altered the possibilities of sexual experience. For the first time in human history ordinary people are offered the means of separating sexual activities into two kinds. For the first time, now, we can all choose whether we will use our sexual energy as an expression of emotion, valuable for its own sake, or whether we will become parents.

"Awareness of the existence of reliable contraceptive methods is gradually spreading through all classes of the community in this country, and in many other countries, and this knowledge is an immediate challenge to behaviour. In a short article it is only possible to indicate the broadest outlines of such a huge subject. All I can do is suggest lines of thought for you to discuss and work out for yourselves.

"The freedom of choice which contraception offers is an entirely new kind of liberty, and like all other forms of freedom, brings with it a new and tremendous responsibility. If the menace of an unwanted pregnancy is removed from sexual intercourse, and if it is true

that fear was the strongest influence in limiting sexual activity before the invention of contraception, it is obvious that new and better patterns of behaviour can and must be found. No code of morals based on fear is worthy of respect. There is every hope that a chastity dictated by fear of consequences will be recognised as out of fashion because it is no longer necessary."

Dr. Wright goes on to discuss the ethical basis for a rational sexual relationship. We abridge her article, at the risk of reducing this tremendous subject to a few paragraphs, but she expresses herself so clearly that we do not feel we have unduly maimed her thought.

"In trying to find a new code of sexual morals we must first decide on our aim. What we want is no less than a description of the characteristics of a sexual relation which shall be both good and healthy for the two concerned, and do no harm to anyone else. There is only space here to touch on one of these characteristics which seems to me to be essential.

"No sex relation should be embarked upon for the sake of the physical aspect alone. Instead, the physical expression should always be a part of a well devel-

oped companionship between the two and only be allowed when time has shown that a many-sided friendship has been established and is of value to both partners. To be able to understand why this principle is supremely important, it is necessary to look into the nature of sexual emotion as deeply as we can, and to realise that different ways in which women and men are affected by their sexual feelings. A good and healthy sex relation should call on the whole capacities of the character. When a child is the wished-for result the experience is obviously creative. But when the relation is intended only to be an expression of emotion and the release of physical tension, the effects on both partners should also be creative in the development of sympathy, understanding, self-control and insight into personality. Considering that character development is the most important effect that any occupation can have, it is easy to see why casual 'affairs' are not only harmful but generally short-lived. If nothing but physical attraction is concerned, so little of either personality is involved that the attraction soon dies for lack of roots in companionship, and nothing is left but emptiness and disappointment.

## Students in Russia

AFTER all the eulogistic stuff which the expeditions to Russia quoted by crypto Communist Innocents Clubs put out, it is refreshing to read that a party of university students were not afraid to ask "awkward" questions. Fred Jarvis, President of the National Union of Students, who led the delegation, described the visit in the *Observer* (23/5/54), and the replies of Mr. Elyutin, Minister for Higher Education.

"Somebody put another question to him. 'Our students always like to have the facts,' replied Mr. Elyutin, sharply. 'They are against somebody imposing false, secondhand opinions upon them.'

"Then shall we be able to read and see pictures of Trotsky's part in the Revolution?" I asked.

"For that it is necessary to reveal the facts which show the role and quality of Trotsky in the Revolution," the Minister replied.

"One of his subordinates joined in 'Trotsky had always been a traitor. His story has already proved that,' he said, as though he were reciting a mathematical formula.

"Our students know that Trotsky was a traitor and an enemy of the people and none of them will wish to read of him," added the Deputy Minister for Higher Education, who was also present.

"Thanks to the efficiency of the Soviet education system, the Minister and his colleagues could certainly depend on their students."

"I thought that at least when discussing Beria one would get a clue, some slight hint of disbelief. But such discussions only confirmed my worst fears.

"One night in our hotel at Kharkov I asked Jiri, a thirty-year-old history post-

graduate who was attached to the delegation as a guide, if he had believed the accusations made against Beria.

"Of course," he replied. "I am convinced he was a spy."

"But do you think he was a spy for thirty years? How could he possibly escape detection for so long and reach such a powerful position?" I asked.

"Because he was a very clever spy."

"If it is possible for a spy to become a member of the Soviet War Cabinet and be appointed Deputy Prime Minister by Mr. Malenkov, do you think any of the present Government might be spies?"

"No," he replied. "They are all known and trusted by the people."

"But wasn't Beria known and trusted, too? Wasn't he a 'great leader' according to *Pravda*?"

"No. Beria was never a great leader. Only Stalin was a great leader. Beria only took office in 1938."

"Aren't you at least a little disturbed that such a thing happened?"

"No, I am glad because it shows the strength of the Party."

At the same time Mr. Jarvis relates that the Russian students were very friendly and obviously got on very well with their guests. They were upset by adverse criticisms of Soviet architecture, Soviet ways of life, Soviet Institutions.

"If one remarked on the apparent absence of political opposition and the ubiquity of political slogans, they were amused. Yet when one of our party suggested to a girl student in Leningrad that a disheartening feature of the Soviet Union was the absence of criticism of the régime, she replied, 'Nonsense. There is a Government decree asking for criticism.' 'Then what criticisms do you have?' he asked. 'None,' she replied."

But one wonders also, making due allowance for differences, whether English students would not also defend English institutions with similar zeal. The English delegation no doubt criticized Russia mainly from the standpoint of accepting British institutions. The critical habit of mind which relates criticism to what ought to be rather than what is, is much rarer. It is, in fact, the revolutionary outlook.

## NO MORALITY—THEY LOST!

The trouble with those six unfortunate German cyclists who couldn't ride fast enough was that they didn't pedal along the Party line.

That's official—the East German Government's *Neues Deutschland* to-day made a two-column bitter attack on them for failing to make any showing in the Communist Warsaw-Berlin-Prague Peace Ride.

"The reason for failure rests with the completely lacking moral education of our leading sportsmen," says *Neues Deutschland*.

The cyclists thought mostly of enjoying themselves, and "did not have the necessary consciousness."

The Soviet team were, of course, "conscious". But who won? Why, bourgeois Denmark's Mr. Eluf Dalgaard.

—*News Chronicle*, 3/6/54.

All the same, we don't remember many cracks in the British Press about "consciousness" after that smashing 7-1 football victory of the Hungarians over England last month!

Have You?  
What?  
Then read  
Whose Responsibility?

(Page 1)

## Between Reason & Madness

Continued from p. 2

happening in our time which reason is at pains to explain, let alone find remedies to. These things, monstrous as they are, are yet the making of reasonable beings. What baffles reason is that by subtle and contagious ways madness can speak its language; reason can be feigned the same as madness, and there is no telling which is which. Absurdism, which is the dominant note in some modern philosophy and literature, can be partly explained by the fact that faith in reason as a set of principles and logical rules universally valid is no longer justified. When it comes to vital situations and decisions reason is tolerated only if conforming and serving as a tool to the predominant madness.

Reason is like a boat in which different people can travel together, all rowing more or less in time, and some more vigorously than others. But the rudder can only be taken in turns, and if there are many people in the boat most of them must be contented with rowing, and trust the one at the rudder to steer the course safely to some pleasant place. There is no telling where the boat will eventually make for, certainly not to a place that will please all the passengers, and most of them will find rowing just a bit too strenuous, the journey and the company uninteresting, and the day they embarked the most foolish in their life.

There is an alienation of self in bending to reason, and impartial as reason may be theoretically in practice it favours some people and does injury to others. Those who invoke its authority have a knack of turning its decisions to their own advantage either because they have identified their advantage with reason or because they never fail to see the reasonableness of their advantage.

Things being so it is not surprising that people comparatively untrained in the exercise of reason or not fully aware of the power of its convention should mistrust and be hostile to it. They do not lack intelligence. Challenging reason is in itself an act of intelligence, and choosing unreason is quite often a reasonable choice. By and large reason is less gratifying than heeding irrational promptings, although usually providing a greater number and continuity of results. The value of reason lies in its potential universality, as a basis of peaceful convivence and co-operation among human beings. Because of the hypocritical assumption of their desirability and because of their extreme precariousness reason itself appears a doubtful value, and madness a precipice not merely exerting an uncanny fascination, but ready to open under our feet at any moment and have us irremissibly as its prey.

GIOVANNI BALDELLI

"And, moreover, a series of such 'affairs' is apt to produce a shallow cynicism and dismal impression that human relationships are not to be expected to last."

The dispiriting effects of casual sex experiences, which really represent a too low evaluation of sexual emotion, are touched on by Dr. Wright, she points out that such bad effects are worse for women.

"The hurt that a woman receives when a relation breaks is generally deeper and more painful than that it is for the man. She finds herself more involved than she had thought and the loss and the suffering is correspondingly greater than she had imagined it might be."

And she mentions also the destructive effects which a succession of such experiences can have upon women.

Throughout her article Dr. Wright relies nowhere on religious admonishments. She remarks in fact, that "we should be able to devise a code of sexual behaviour which is so well founded on the facts of psychology and physiology, and which is productive of so much health and happiness that all religions can agree with it."

Which rather puts the onus on religious teachers to face up to the situation of to-day, than looks to them for guidance. In concluding she insists that the demands made by the new situation and the opportunity created by effective birth control demand higher standards than in the past.

"For these reasons it seems to me that an essential point in a reasonable code of sexual behaviour is that the physical expression of sexual emotion must always be a part of an established friendship."

"You can see from this description of one of the items in the suggested code that the new liberty is not going to make decisions on sexual behaviour any easier than before. Instead, the demands on character are harder than they were when behaviour was based on convention and fear. We are only at the beginning of the explorations into the possibilities of human relationships, and if we are to find a way to build a sound and healthy community where every adult has the chance of a sound and happy life, we must all do our share to discover a controlled and reasonable expression for their sexual energy."

## FREEDOM PRESS

- VOLINE :**  
*Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed)* cloth 12s. 6d.
- 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 SANSON :**  
*Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step* 1s. paper 6s.
- M. BAKUNIN :**  
*Marxism, Freedom and the State.* cloth 5s.
- ERRICO MALATESTA :**  
*Anarchy* 6d.  
*Vote—What For?* 1d.  
*Railways and Society* 3d.  
*What is Anarchism?* 1d.  
*The Basis of Communal Living* 1s.
- PETER KROPOTKIN :**  
*The State: Its Historic Role* 1s.  
*The Wage System* 3d.  
*Revolutionary Government Organised Vengeance Called Justice* 2d.
- JOHN HEWETSON :**  
*Sexual Freedom for the Young* 6d.  
*Ill-Health, Poverty and the State* cloth 2s. 6d., paper 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*

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

# THE THIRD CAMP

THE "Third Camp" is the name given to the solution to world problems currently being advocated by large sections of the pacifist and allied movements in England, America and some European countries. Among its British adherents are the I.L.P., P.P.U and religious organisations.

In its barest essentials, the idea is that in order to lessen the existing tension between the forces of American capitalism and Soviet state communism, a neutral bloc of smaller states should be set up, to act as a buffer between the more powerful, and potentially warring nations on either side. The British people all get together and persuade 'our' government to initiate this great scheme, and then appeal to such diverse countries as Israel, Yugoslavia, the Arab states, Burma and India to join the neutral association. A first step towards the plan is that the British government should be asked to declare that in the event of war between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. it would remain neutral.

Unfortunately, this policy stops half-way towards the solution. Its advocates are far sighted enough to realise that peace will never be brought about by blindly following either of the major contending power blocs, but seek shelter under the wings of governments of second rate powers.

Precisely because they are only second rate, the manifestations of the essential oppressiveness of governments are not so obvious or intense in Western European countries as in other parts of the

world, and this misleads some people as to their fundamental nature. Government exists everywhere solely to protect the interests of a privileged class, although the privileges take many different forms. The economy of each country in Western Europe is a mixture of State and private capitalism, and the power of the governments are intimately linked with those of capitalist America. Even if it had the desire, which is most unlikely, the British administration could not free itself from American economic domination, and consequently, has about as much chance of joining a Third Camp as has Bulgaria.

The anarchist position is in some ways the opposite of that of the neutralists. While sharing with them a violent dislike of the rulers of the United States and the Soviet Union, anarchists maintain that the best way to work for their eventual downfall is not to look to our own governments for help, but to begin by attacking them. In order to free ourselves from domination by outside power blocs, we must first get rid of the oppressors on our doorstep. It is futile to request States to act in a sensible and humane manner, since the very nature of government makes this impossible. Instead, anarchists urge workers of all countries to take direct action against war themselves, by refusing to manufacture armaments or to serve in the fighting forces. This policy, advocated since the days of the First International, has not yet borne fruit, since it has never been put into practice, but the alternatives or governmental alliances, United

Nations, and diplomatic conferences have failed again and again.

In a period of international crisis, the group holding power in each country will throw in its lot with the side which seems most likely to benefit it, irrespective of whether it achieved power on a programme of reaction, Marxism, or morality. The only way to prevent this happening, and leading to further disaster, is to see that there is no government to declare war, or at least that large numbers of people take no notice of it when it does.

The great advantage of this approach is that anyone can start to put it into practice now. Some critics falsely believe that anarchists stand gazing towards the promised land, and doing nothing to realise their ideals, while the politicians are at least getting somewhere, passing resolutions, issuing statements, and so on. These activities do not bring peace a scrap nearer. The anarchist, on the other hand, decides personally to have nothing to do with war preparations, and by word and deed tries to spread his ideas as widely as possible. In this way, the forces of human solidarity, which are the only ones that can prevent war, are built up.

Summing up the Third Camp tendency, it is refreshing to find more people refusing to hide behind one power bloc to escape from the other one, but their analysis of the situation appears very shallow. If, as is quite probable, most of its supporters have just not heard of the anarchist alternative, then it is up to us to put it before them. P.H.

# THE GRATEFUL BOSS

IT is always interesting to hear it said that workers are incapable of running industry, and then to see how quick employers are to take advantage of the worker's practical knowledge of his industry.

The use of suggestion boxes and the similar devices that have been developed in industry in recent years, is eloquent tribute to the knowledge of the man on the job. It shows that employers know full well that the man or woman actually using any equipment knows more about the shortcomings, disadvantages and potential advantages of that equipment than anybody else.

Thus it is to the worker that the appeal is made for suggestions for improving equipment—and suggestions, many of considerable value, are never slow in coming forward when the appeal to the workers' initiative is made.

The question is, however; to whom are they of considerable value? And there is only one answer to that: the owner of the equipment.

True, most firms offer bribes for workers' suggestions, but it is interesting to note the comparative values of the bribe and of the suggestion.

### Magnificent Rewards

As an example we can look at the magnificent rewards offered by Murphy Radio Ltd. of Welwyn Garden City. Murphy's are a prosperous (£353,572 profit last year) organisation producing radio, television and electronic apparatus for domestic, industrial and military use.

The firm has a Suggestion Committee, which meets once a month to consider suggestions submitted by the workers, and allots rewards for suggestions accepted according to their value to the firm.

Last month a worker won top prize for a modification to a scan-coil jig which is to be adopted on main assembly

lines in Murphy's No. 2 Shop at Welwyn and at one of the firm's other factories in Wales.

This modification saves several hours a week and will do so for about eight months (before, presumably, needing replacement). The reward for this? £3 and a pocket knife!

Second prize was awarded to another worker who suggested a wiring change on an Army communications set. This saves no less than 120 hours before the set comes out of production. The prize? £2!

And so on. Month after month Murphy's workers supply the know-how for the firm's efficient production, and are rewarded with pittance and pocket knives (a Boy Scout touch, that! And why not? They've done the boss a good turn).

No wonder Murphy's show a fat profit. The management has learned of the tremendous amount of practical knowledge and inventive capacity that rests in the mind of the ordinary worker. And so— as our favourite outdoor speaker always puts it—now they pick the worker's brains as well as his pocket!

ANARCHO-SYNDICALIST.

## LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

### "CATHOLIC ANARCHIST" CONTROVERSY

RITA MILTON'S criticism (22/5/54) of the article in which I reviewed Ammon Hennacy's *The Autobiography of a Catholic Anarchist* is so clouded by dogmatic bitterness that, in the interests of the "objectivity" of which she makes such play I feel it necessary to answer at least a few of the distortions which have crept into her reply.

Firstly, Comrade Milton talks of my "personal sympathy" for Hennacy and the *Catholic Worker* group. The dictionary I have beside me defines sympathy as "feeling corresponding to that which another feels." My feelings are far from corresponding with those of either Hennacy or the *Catholic Worker* group. I tolerate their right to hold and express their opinions, however absurd they may seem to me, and I am willing to give them credit for the positive achievements they have made. That is all. And that is all I say in my article. I see no basis on which it would be possible to work with them, and I find it impossible to read large sections of *The Catholic Worker* because the point of view expressed on religious questions is completely foreign to my own. Indeed, I say categorically in my review: "I, like so many other people, find it impossible to accept their religious beliefs, and cannot understand how they reconcile their anarchism with their acceptance of the Catholic hierarchy." A respect for the rights and for some of the achievements of people I happen to disagree with on major points of belief does not, *pace* Milton, constitute sympathy.

Secondly, when I talked of the "one-man revolution", I was clearly explaining what Hennacy meant by his constant use of this phrase to define his own activities. In this context what R.M. means by it is irrelevant. However, I would agree with her that Hennacy did not fully achieve even his own kind of "one-man revolution", and I would also express my sympathy—real sympathy this time—for the kind of "one-man revolution" she advocates.

Thirdly, I have no objection whatever to logical criticisms of any doctrine. What I do regard as unfortunate is the fact that so often, when the question of religion comes up, the inverted piety of some writers in *FREEDOM* leads them to depart from their customary reliance on logic in the direction of emotional irritability. That I feel to be undignified, but at the same time I recognise that even illogicality has its right to be expressed—on either side of an argument.

As for R.M.'s remark about "a tendency for some pacifists to shut their eyes to all sorts of nonsense so long as the people perpetuating them are opposed to war", if she will only read my article again with the objectivity she flaunts so proudly before us, she will see that I at no time and in no way accept any of the religious dogmas (presumably this is what she means by "nonsense") which the *Catholic Worker* group put forward,

and that far from shutting my eyes to these dogmas I actually repudiate them in so many words in the sentence quoted in the second paragraph of this letter. In the paragraph in which I refer to their resistance to war I am endeavouring, not to arouse support for them, but merely to point out some of the reasons why they undoubtedly make an appeal to lost radicals. It seems to me that the very fact that so many people are being drawn into Catholic groups makes it necessary to try and understand why, and it was the object of my review to draw attention (inadequately as one is forced to do within the narrow confines of a review) to this fact. Any such understanding will certainly not be reached if we listen to rationalist pietists, who behave in much the same manner as the Catholic priests who try to keep their flocks from considering why people lose faith in dogma and fable.

Similarly, it seems to me that—while there is doubtless a great deal of church tactics about many of the things which Catholics do to help the poor—there still remains the fact that they have here and there managed to tap sources of human solidarity outside the structure of the Church, and that we have been unable to do a similar thing for quite a long time. R.M. would have scored a palpable ~~hit~~ with her request that I should "set an example" of what can be done in the way of mutual aid schemes, if I had exempted myself from the criticism I made of anarchists in general. I did not exempt myself, and I still feel that we, meaning all of us, are still running around in a squirrel's mill of theorising and have so far failed to hit on the means by which we can transmit the need for widespread mutual aid action to other people. For us to plead the excuse of "the limits of economics" is pathetic; the pence of the poor, if they felt the cause were worth while, could support a movement of liberation as well as they have—on the authority of R.M.—supported the Catholic church. We should be honest enough to admit that imagination, not money, is the commodity we lack, and that until we find it we shall continue to be regarded by people outside as a bankrupt and *passé* movement.

With regard to the last paragraph of my review, in which I say that "as long as he continues to put up a good fight against the State, I personally don't feel like being self-righteous about the eccentricity of his banner", I am ready to admit on re-reading it that this was ineptly put. But I still uphold its essence. I consider that Hennacy's fight against the State arose out of a genuine anarchist impulse in his past and is still being maintained by that impulse, despite his conflicting adherence to Catholic dogma. In other words, I believe that Hennacy, like Eric Gill, has a genuine understanding of the malignant nature of the State, without having yet realised that under its glamorous structure the Church has

a basically similar nature. And I therefore believe that there is no question of tactics of we accept his criticism of the State just as we accept those made by many other non-Anarchists. To go further on this question of tactics, it is true, as Milton suggests, that some while ago I did make some strong criticisms of the morality of the attitude of some anarchists towards the use of violence as a weapon in social struggle. But that has not prevented me from recognising that R.M. and others of my comrades are still anarchists like myself. I can see no earthly reason why I should not continue to co-operate with them, so long as the question at issue between us lies open to discussion. Similarly, I do not see why I should not express my agreement with Hennacy's criticism of the State and hope that he continues with it, and at the same time reject his Catholicism. R.M. should remember that in this case I did not even suggest co-operating with Hennacy. But I do suggest tolerating him and giving him credit where it is due.

I am afraid that the question of the personal character of religious belief—or otherwise—is not so clearly defined as R.M. and the hypothetical Catholic priest she drags in to support her in her argument seem to think. I would say that every man's religion is a personal affair so far as his own mind is concerned; when he tries to inflict it on others, then it ceases to be so. And therefore, while I detest the church militant, I have only tolerance for the personal beliefs of individual Christians and I should think myself a poor anarchist if I did not insist on their right to hold these beliefs undisturbed, as I hope to hold my beliefs undisturbed by them.

To come to Rita Milton's final paragraphs, I did not suggest in my original review that the organised churches were anything but authoritarian, and, while I think (if we remember Bach and Handel and El Greco and the sculptors of Chartres) that to call them "life-destroying" is a needless hyperbole, I agree that they are life-destroying and life-frustrating in proportion to the degree of their influence over their devotees. So, however, is any other exclusivist fanaticism. As for R.M.'s attempt to infer that I suggested that Christianity (of the

### LOCOMOTIVEMEN'S DECISION AGAINST COLOUR BAR

Mr. J. G. Baty, general secretary of the Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen, said yesterday that at the union's annual conference in London delegates had discussed the employment of coloured British subjects as railway drivers and motormen. They unanimously endorsed the union's previous policy that there should be no colour bar to such employment.

—Times, 4/6/54.

organised kind) has an "affinity to anarchism", I am sorry to have to be repetitious and draw her attention once again to my words in the original review: "I... cannot understand how they reconcile their anarchism with their acceptance of the Catholic hierarchy."

May we be preserved from bigots, whether they march under a black cassock or a black flag! For at best one is only the lesser evil than the other.

GEORGE WOODCOCK.

IN the article "The Absurdity of Catholic Anarchism" R.M. launched a boomerang which needs to be pressed home to its target.

R.M. suggests that the pacifist movement may be ineffectual partly because pacifists shut their eyes to all sorts of nonsense so long as its author is opposed to war. Substitute 'authority' for 'war' and there *mutatis mutandis*, you have a pretty fair assessment of modern British Anarchism.

As R.M.'s stricture against the pacifists suggests, to be merely anti-authoritarian is insufficient. One must remain human too. This is exemplified in R.M.'s very next paragraph where the mutual aid of Catholic priests is denigrated because of its authoritarian context and the Health Service because of its State origin.

Once agreed that every authoritarian institution is bathwater, need we be so dogmatically infanticidal about the many babies floating in it?

Living is not an idea and so cannot achieve that purity which we may claim for the latter. If we try to make it so we end, like all moralists, in becoming hypertrophied and inaccessible in some way. This absence of broad humanity, of negative capability, characterises, I fear, too many of *FREEDOM*'s contributors. When, however, it does show itself, in the writings of Woodcock and Baldelli, for instance, it is immediately castigated as a treacherous compromise. How few achieve the primary revolution!

MAX FLISHER.

### ALL ABOARD THE GLORY TRAIN

The "All Aboard the Glory Train" article was most interesting. And I was thinking all this time I was the only one who felt that way about the Graham meeting. Having heard the evangelist in America several times it was beyond me to see why he was making such a hit over here. The outward sales talk is the opposite of what we were getting in the States (until a year ago when I left) while remaining the same motivationally and maintaining the father figure rôle. Seeing Graham in his 'dual rôle' and from a psychoanalyst's perspective might make a good article. E.D.

## MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

**LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP**  
**THE MALATESTA CLUB**  
**155 High Holborn WCI**  
(Nearly opposite Holborn Town Hall)  
L.A.G. LECTURE DISCUSSIONS  
EVERY SUNDAY AT 7.30

JUNE 13—E. Peeke on  
Aspects of Anarchism (3)  
LAW & CUSTOM

Informal Discussion Every Thursday at 7.30.

### OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting  
**HYDE PARK**  
Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

### NORTH-EAST LONDON

DISCUSSION MEETINGS  
IN EAST HAM  
Alternate Wednesdays  
at 7.30 p.m.

### GLASGOW OUTDOORS

(Weather permitting)  
**MAXWELL STREET**  
Every Sunday at 7 p.m.  
Speakers: Hugh McCutcheon  
Mark Kramrisch.

### INDOORS

at Workers' Open Forum  
50 Renfrew Street, Glasgow.  
Every Thursday at 7 p.m.

### EXETER ANARCHIST GROUP

An anarchist group has been formed in Exeter. Readers in the area are invited to:

Meetings every Wednesday at 7 p.m. at 109 Portland Street, Exeter.

Correspondence to:  
Philip Holgate, U.C.S.W. Exeter.

JUNE 16.—SYNDICALISM  
P. Holgate.

JUNE 23.—DEBATE

JUNE 30.—CAN A THIRD CAMP BRING PEACE?

JULY 7.—EDUCATION

### READERS IN HERTS

If any readers residing in Herts would be interested in weekly discussion meetings, to be held in either Welwyn Garden City, Hatfield, St. Albans, or Hertford, will they contact:

G. HILBINGER,  
89 Hollybush Lane,  
Welwyn Garden City, Herts.

## 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