

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"Give me liberty to know, to utter, and argue freely according to conscience, above all liberties."

—JOHN MILTON.

Mrs. KNIGHT versus

THE IMMORAL MORALISTS

MORE than seven years ago the B.B.C. Governors' policy directive on religious broadcasts, which had the approval of the British Council of Churches, described as one of its functions the broadcasting of "affirmations of widely differing beliefs and unbeliefs made constructively".

In those years there have been two speakers on "scientific humanism": Alex Comfort, four years ago, and Mrs. Knight during the past three weeks. In the interval between these two talks there has been, according to a statistically-minded reader of the *Manchester Guardian* no less than two thousand hours of religious broadcasting! How ludicrous, therefore is the protest of Father Joseph Christie of Farm Street Jesuit Church, Mayfair, who declared that:

"The primary reason for uneasiness is that the B.B.C. is a monopoly which has the power to sponsor this type of anti-religious propaganda without allowing the other side to be heard."

The B.B.C. is indeed a monopoly, but only a fanatical priest could in the face of the facts declare that it favours the unorthodox to the exclusion of the orthodox.

★

THE reactions to Mrs. Knight's two talks on *Morals without Religion* can be broadly divided into four categories: (1) that of the gutter press (or should we be more discriminating, and fair to the gutter press, by creating a new category: the sewer press?) led by the *Daily Sketch*; (2) the fanatical section of the Church, a sample of whose views are quoted above; (3) the section of the Press, laymen and Churchmen who condemned the views of the speaker but not her right to express them, putting forward however, certain reservations as to the B.B.C.'s method of presenting them; (4) those sections of press, public and Church who unreservedly recognised the unqualified right of non-believers to state their views.

There can be no doubt that the press campaign has created more interest and much more embarrassment for Churchmen, than would have been aroused by Mrs. Knight's "unaided" talks. The Churchmen who have welcomed the talks because, they say, they can only benefit the faith and not harm it, are, to our minds, simply putting up a brave front. For the majority of people belief in God is not a deep intellectual or mystical experience. At its highest it is an escape from the miseries of daily life; at its lowest it is a habit acquired in childhood on a par with washing one's teeth in the morning and saying 'please' and 'thank you' at the ap-

propriate moments. For this same reason therefore, excellent as we believe Mrs. Knight's talks were, we do not for one moment think that they will shake the Churches to their foundations, spiritual or economic.

The real importance of her talks, combined with the Press hysteria, has been in the way they have exposed the intolerance of the Church hierarchy in general towards the free expression of dissenting viewpoints on religion (and by implication on all topics). An intolerance which they rightly condemn in the totalitarian countries, but which, in view of their own intolerant attitude to unbelievers here, makes a mockery of it all. There have been notable exceptions to this generalisation, such as that of the Dean of St. Paul's who declared that the broadcasts were "a welcome sign that freedom of speech is still a reality"; Canon Stopford, Moderator of the Church of England's training colleges whose remarks deserve to be quoted in full for their breadth of vision and self-criticism:

"I'm all for free and informed discussion of points on which there is disagreement. I thought the broadcast was very good, its tone admirable. Mrs. Knight is a person I'd like to meet and have a long discussion with."

He emphasised that parents must be responsible for their children's religious upbringing. It cannot just be left to the schools. And it is not a healthy sign that so many agnostics do not exercise their right to withdraw their children from the school's religious classes. It

suggests apathy rather than any considered point of view.

"There are too many 'four-wheeler' Christians in the Church," he said. "People who arrive there only in pram, car or hearse—for their christening, marriage and burial—and ignore religion in between whiles."

"They christen their children 'just in case' there's something in it, but give them no lead in religious matters. And it is ridiculous to expect a five-year-old to make up his own mind on such things. Parents who just ignore the question of what to tell their children may do far more harm than a sincere agnostic like Mrs. Knight."

And, last but not least, there is Dr. Donald Soper who was "appalled at the working up of hysteria on what seems to me to be a matter of normal procedure on the part of the B.B.C. in giving a measure of freedom in religious disagreement as it does on other issues."

"Christians will do themselves a great deal of harm if they assume that the Christian faith is a kind of hothouse

Continued on p. 3

A Job for the Army

A Royal Engineers mine disposal squad—a captain, a sergeant, and three civilians—were called from beach-mine clearance yesterday to search for the Queen's watch.

They hunted unsuccessfully for three and a half hours with mine detectors, and will search again to-day.

The party was sent to Sandringham from Mundesley, Norfolk, where they were working on the beach.

News Chronicle, 14/1/55.

GERMANY: "NEVER AGAIN"?

THE French Premier, M. Mendès-France has so far had a spectacular period in office mainly due to his apparently unusual methods in French politics of forcing his Parliament to make decisions on unpopular issues. For years the question of re-arming Germany was dodged by succeeding Premiers and their Governments (mainly for electoral and economic reasons although a personal hatred for Germany motivated not a few politicians). When therefore Mendès-France put the issue before Parliament demanding a decision largely on the grounds that the Allies would go ahead with their plans for Germany without the consent of France, opposition to him, not without prejudice, was strong. Although M. Mendès-France originally abstained from voting on the issue of German re-armament, his suggestion for a European arms pool, exemplified in the Paris agreement, appears to have been accepted by the French Parliament and is the reason for his recent visit to Italy and Germany.

According to reports from Rome 'complete identity of views had been reached on the subject of Western European Union.' The report goes on to say:

"In principle and on general lines the Italian Government viewed it with favour. The arms agency was also to be a pool for production, and new factories would be set up in the depressed areas of Southern Italy and the islands. On one head agreement had evidently not been reached. M. Mendès-France intended the armaments agency to serve for the redistribution of American and Canadian war material. The countries which were most interested in this feared that their present share of material would be diminished in the process of redistribution."

We find then that there is a conflict of interests. On the one hand

the fear that the distribution of Canadian and American war materials will interfere with the manufacture of armaments in Italy, but on the other hand, as we italicised, in the depressed areas of Southern Italy the emerging of arms factories will solve many of the unemployment problems, thus serving as a useful weapon for electoral support.

Mendès-France also had a special audience with the Pope, the details of which are unreported. A comment editorially in the *Manchester Guardian* might give us a pointer to its importance however. They remind us that after a war-time audience with the Pope, Churchill told reporters that "the talk was private, but it was not about the weather".

Conflict of Interests

Opposition to the European arms pool in Germany, although the details are still vague, and to West German re-armament generally, come from two different sources and for varying reasons. The opposition from the industrialists is purely on the grounds that at this stage in their economic development it would be foolish to switch from the profitable business of peace time engineering to armaments. Politicians who support the industrialists will of course have to keep their eyes on the voters, and since there is strong resistance on the part of the trade union rank and file to re-armament we can understand their dilemma. The *Manchester Guardian* writes that:

"The Minister of Economics is believed to have sounded German industrialists and to have found that they fully concur with a renunciation of heavy arms production. There is nothing surprising about this. A firm like Krupp's, for instance, which was once Germany's foremost producer of heavy guns, has switched to the more profitable business

of peace-time engineering. The head of the firm, Herr Alfred Krupp has stated plainly that he does not intend to manufacture arms again. German industrialists generally have no wish to start re-tooling for arms production at a time when steel firms' order books, for instance, are filled up for the next five months. It was considerations like these which induced Herr Arnold, Prime Minister of North Rhine-Westphalia, to say that the Ruhr will never again become 'the arsenal of Germany and Europe.'

Plain economic facts have inspired one of Professor Erhard's advisers, Herr von Maltzahn, to write that the industries of the Federal Republic should continue to build up their exports, and that the Federal Government can pay for imported arms out of the proceeds of an expanded export trade.

Professor Erhard has also made it plain that the Federal Republic should retain the right, which need not necessarily be exercised, to produce any arms allowed under the terms of the Paris Agreements. The sense of this is that arms other than atomic, chemical, or guided missiles may be produced in Germany."

We think that the importance of this report is contained in the last paragraph. The fact that German industrialists are finding steel production so lucrative is no safeguard against the possibility of switching to armaments. When the markets are exhausted and unemployment ensues Professor Erhard's plea for the right of the Federal Republic to produce arms makes sense because of its long term view.

They Learned the Hard Way

We discussed a few weeks ago in FREEDOM the strong feeling expressed among sections of the German youth and trade unions against re-armament. Their slogan, "without me" has been backed up this week with a campaign organised by the socialists. They plastered a hundred cities with posters showing a one-legged war victim against a background of bomb-ruined building and captioned, 'Never Again'.

Associated Press reports that: "A massive campaign is to be waged against the Paris treaties between now and mid-February, when the Lower House votes finally on ratification. Socialists will address some 6,000 public meetings. Torchlight processions and silent protest marches are planned. The eleventh-hour effort cannot directly affect ratification, as the Government forces have a safe majority."

Our own sources of information are not very frequent from Germany at the moment, but judging from reliable newspaper reports, we gather that feeling against re-armament and fear of war is strong and genuine. How could it be otherwise? We visited Germany after the war, and stood appalled among the ruins of Cologne. This writer in an attempt to explain it at the time reflected that the destruction was in a sense the result of the German people allowing Hitler to power, but no one can escape from the guilt of such destruction and brutality. The fact that politicians and interested parties can wage war is as much the fault of the apathy of the ordinary people, as the men who use them. The German people have learned the hard way. Let us hope the lesson will not be forgotten.

R.M.

THE RULE OF LAW

THE "rule of law" is a phrase as meaningless as so many other high sounding clichés which are bandied about by governments and politicians and policemen. In reality "the rule of law" is meant for the ruled and only for the rulers when it suits their convenience. When it does not they either openly flout the laws they have themselves made, or if they are anxious to give an air of legality to their illegal actions, simply declare that "a state of Emergency exists", and this justifies any excess and protects them from any legal action by the victim.

In Kenya where hundreds of such Emergency regulations have been issued—so many and so far reaching that only hypocrisy prevents the Government from simply declaring that the Africans have no rights, and can be treated just as it suits the Commander-in-Chief in carrying out his orders to clean-up the country of Mau Mau—the excesses to which the natives have been subjected can only be paralleled with the worst treatment to which victims of the totalitarian powers have been subjected. The majority of the white settlers in Kenya are unconcerned with the "rule of law". Indeed their main complaint against the Government is that any member of the Kenya police force should be made to account for taking the "law" into his own hands, and the few white men who dare to speak up against the ill-treatment of prisoners are often themselves given a taste of police medicine for their pains. Sir Henry Dalrymple Hay for instance claims that he was beaten up by the police because he reported one of them for "kicking an African prisoner in the face". Officials who have dared to criticise the administration have been dismissed and obliged to leave the country.

There are at present no less than 60,000 Africans in detention camps in Kenya, and even on General Erskine's admission 12,000 of them are not Mau Mau supporters. According to the Gene-

ral only 305 had been released, whereas 2,000 more had been detained during the past month.

Police Brutality in France and Algeria

MORE and more examples of police brutality are being exposed in the French courts. The latest is in a murder case being heard in Perpignan in which the accused woman alleges—and her charges are supported by the medical evidence—that the police used third degree methods in an attempt to extract a confession of guilt from her. It was also revealed that though not under arrest at the time she was detained by the police for four days—though the law declares that no French citizen may be detained for more than 48 hours as a "witness". She was denied a visit by a lawyer on the grounds that she was a witness and had not been charged.

Obviously there is a growing public interest in France in the methods used by the police, which is the only guarantee that their power may some day be curbed. Until a few years ago their acts of brutality were known to many, victims and observers alike, yet there existed a fatalistic attitude of helplessness in publicising cases and getting anything done. To-day there are even Frenchmen who denounce police methods in the colonies.

Only last week the novelist Francois Mauriac, in the weekly *Express* reveals the treatment of political prisoners who were arrested after the uprising in Algeria last November, and in particular of M. Moulai Merbah, a leader of the now banned M.T.L.D. party. The revelations are summarised for the *Manchester Guardian* by its Paris correspondent in these terms:

After being several days in the hands of the police, Moulai Merbah was transferred to the investigating magistrate but was still not allowed to receive a lawyer for four more days. The lawyer found his back covered with weals and open wounds. A prison warden said he had been brought to the prison in that condition (i.e., had been beaten up at the police station). It was on the basis of a report from the prison doctor that M. Moulai Merbah was in excellent health that M. Mitterrand [the French Minister of the Interior] had denied rumours to the contrary. This is only one of the four cases quoted by name to M. Mauriac by his informant.

The current methods described are sickeningly familiar—flogging, foul water pumped into prisoners' mouths, electric shocks in the armpits and between the legs, prisoners plunged repeatedly head first into baths. To these M. Claude Bourdet in the *Observateur* brings another allegation of prisoners crammed like sardines into a small cell at Tizi-Ouzou similar to that made at Oudjda in Morocco recently.

Israel: Collective Settlements & the Problems of Today

IN our last issue we reviewed Joseph Baratz's book *Village by the Jordan*, (Harvill Press 12s. 6d.), the story of Degania, the first of the Jewish co-operative settlements in Palestine, told by one of its founders. Here we mention Baratz's views on the way the Kvutzot and Kibbutzim are run, and review two other recent books about Israel.

A KVUTZA, says Baratz, "is not an organisation, not a party grouping, it is a life lived together. It is not just a question of agreeing about principles, but of give and take, of understanding, of putting aside selfishness; we learned that it wasn't easy and that it didn't suit everybody. Such a community always started with a small group of friends, people who knew each other who had worked together; it developed little by little, organically, gradually absorbing newcomers."

He emphasises that his type of settlement is only one amongst many kinds. Already, by 1920 he says, there were different kinds even apart from the 'Rothschild colonies' at one end of the scale and the Kibbutzim at the other, and to-day they vary from the village where each family owns its house and land, and they co-operate only on such things as marketing, to the kind (which were formed much later) where the system of ownership and work is the same as in a Kibbutz but the families live separately.

"I suppose you want to know just what a Kibbutz is. I can tell you how it is run, and by now we have almost a constitution—the principles have been so clearly fixed. But you won't really know without staying in one or more Kibbutzim because the Kibbutz is always made by the people who live in it. It depends on those who founded it and on those who joined them, on their personalities and on where they came from, on what experiences they have shared and on the stage the community has reached, and on where it is and what

work it does; each one has a different character.

"When the number of such settlements increased, they formed various federations. There was ours, which included most of the smaller communities, another, Hameuchad Kibbutz, made up of the largest Kibbutzim, and a third, to which belonged those whose size was somewhere in between. Besides these there grew up several smaller federations, two of them for those Kibbutzim whose members are all strictly observant in religious matters. In 1951 the Hameuchad Kibbutz Federation split up because some of its members and villages belonged to the Right-Wing Labour Party and the others to the Left, and they could not agree. The Right-wing group withdrew and united with us, and together we formed a new body called the 'Association of Kvutzot and Kibbutzim'."

Of the organisation of his own community, Baratz says: "We have never had a Head or a President—everything is decided by discussion between all the members, that is why we have so many meetings. There are people who have more responsible jobs than others but

they all have an equal voice in the common business of the Kvutza. In the beginning all the members came to all the meetings; now, when there are so many of us, we have to have committees, and a central committee—a secretariat—to co-ordinate their work. But even now a general meeting is held every week and it is this general meeting—that is, of the community as a whole—which is the real and the only governing, legislative body. The committees have to put its decisions into practice. These committees are elected usually for one year, though the members can be re-elected and quite often are; but the idea is to give everybody some experience of administrative work."

"Altogether," concludes Baratz, "there are more than 80,000 of us in the Kibbutz Movement nowadays. Our own Federation alone has about 27,000 people, or perhaps a little more—my figures are a bit out of date; that's how it is with the movement, no sooner is one set of figures given out than it is wrong—new people keep joining, more children are born, new settlements go up."

SPENDER ON ISRAEL

LEARNING LAUGHTER, by Stephen Spender. (Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 15s.).

JOSEPH BARATZ is described by his publisher as "a stocky, weather-beaten peasant, with slow movements, as though forty years of ploughing had got into his bones." He has grown up with the story he tells. Stephen Spender is a critical observer, and his account of his visit to Israel, written at the request of Youth Aliyah, the organisation which has cared for 60,000 children brought to the country from all parts of the world, is more disquieting, for if Baratz's book tells of hardships and difficulties triumphantly overcome, Spender's is a reminder of the more complicated and intractable problems which will need equal courage and hard work to solve.

Spender describes his journey to Haifa on the immigrant ship from Marseilles where at a transit centre, Jewish children from North Africa arrive, "equipped with knives, distrustful, suspicious and suffering from various diseases". They stay for three months to have their health improved and to learn "the three basic essentials of their training: politeness, cleanliness and a certain ability to co-operate with one another and with the teachers."

In the early days of Youth Aliyah, it was simply says Spender, "an organisation for getting Jewish children out of the hands of Hitler, the separation from their children was something which those parents who remained in Germany and Europe had agreed to, however reluctantly. But with the new immigration of the so-called 'Oriental' children from Africa and Asia, the parents sometimes accompany the children to Israel. They nearly always follow them there eventually. In either case they may wish to have the children back to live with them—perhaps because they intended to send the children temporarily to institutions while they themselves were settling down in their new home; or perhaps because, arriving in Israel themselves, they wish the family to be re-united.

"The reader may think that the parents should certainly have their own children. And in fact, they do often claim and get them. But in many cases there are good reasons why the educators should wish to get the children away from the 'eastern' parents. For one thing, the conditions in which the parents—through no fault of their own—have to live during the first two years after their arrival, are those of the miserable slum-like encampments called the *ma'abara*. But the main reason is that the Westernized Jews who developed the Jewish State on the soil of Palestine long before it was actually founded, regard the family life of the Eastern Jew with horror. It is all very well, they say, being sentimental about the family. But the Eastern family means the complete domination of the children by a tyrannical father. The boys are sent out to work at the age of 10 or 11; and in conditions as they are to-day this means that they are sent on to the Black Market. The girls are imprisoned within a slavish ignorance, and kept in slavish conditions.

"Moreover—and here one encounters the ambivalence which is found so often

in Israel—we need to change the attitudes of the orientals, and we can only do so by getting hold of the children. We have brought them into Israel—or encouraged them to come—but we do not want the country orientalized. If we let the children remain with their parents, they will grow up to establish the conditions of the Mellah and the Black Market."

SPENDER describes the "sorting-out centres" at Haifa, the *ma'abar*as, the children's villages, and the education of children at the various types of communal settlements. He outlines the history of Youth Aliyah and discusses the remarkable personalities of its initiators, Recha Freier, Henrietta Szold and Hans Beyth, and the activities of Hadassah, the American Women's Zionist Organisation, which "was founded in 1912 by a group of 14 women with the aim of sending two trained nurses to Jerusalem to teach mothers how to care for their babies and to combat the dreadful eye-disease, trachoma. Out of this initiative—thanks very largely to Henrietta Szold—there grew to-day's tremendous organisation which has cared for the health and education of the Jews in Palestine. Hadassah—although Zionist—is a monument to the principle of American generosity, which is based on the profound conviction of many Americans that they should share their material advantages with peoples in less fortunate circumstances". Hadassah, he points out aims at nothing less than "to support the health, education and construction of 'voluntary taxation on an immense and unprecedented scale'."

He went to Tel Aviv and Jerusalem, the Weizmann Institute at Rehovoth, to the Negev, and to visit Cochin Jews, Sephardic Jews from India, Persians, Iraqis and Yemenites. He describes in a very interesting way the problems facing the educators of children from isolated and forgotten pockets of Judaism. "It was fairly simple to raise money when the children who came to Palestine were victims of the Nazis. But no Westerner identifies himself with the Eastern children. They come from mellahs and slums where Westerners were scarcely aware of their existence; and when they do learn of it, their reaction too often is simply one of horror. Yet they have in many cases been rescued from conditions almost as horrible as those of the Concentration Camps. They also know starvation, suffer from terrible diseases and only one in ten of these children has the chance to survive beyond his twelfth year, in the conditions from which they have come."

And at the Swiss village he was told of the background of some of the children,—"children who have seen their parents killed in front of their eyes; children sent to concentration camps in Germany; children treated as pariahs in Vienna, slinking about the streets and 'forbidden to enter a public garden'; children all of whose relations have disappeared utterly off the face of the earth; children who have wandered like animals over the plains and forests, hunting for food; children who have become members of the gangs in Casablanca and Beirut; the pasts of these children in Israel form an immense catalogue, a directory of the crimes of the adults against the children in our time.

"Not just the Germans—the whole civilized world is involved in the pasts of these children. The English, who accepted a policy of shutting them out of Palestine when many might have been saved, bear a special responsibility. There is a point where Hitlerism involves all our civilisation in guilt, and that is in the failure of 'the West' to save these victims. Israel is doing something to redeem our civilisation in saving these children, and just as the guilt for their sufferings goes beyond Fascism, so surely the duty to help them goes beyond Israel, and Israel should be helped in helping them. The children are Israel's, but they are the responsibility of the world."

SPENDER visited a Moshav, one of the agricultural settlements where people live privately and buy and sell their produce collectively, and a Kibbutz, Netzer, which had been founded by former inhabitants of Buchenwald. He found it, unlike most of the Kibbutzim, a relaxed and easy-going place. Nothing could have been more different than the next Kibbutz he visited, Negbah. "It is run by the extreme left-wing party, Mapam. Some weeks previously, a group of supporters of the moderate socialist party, Mapai—followers of Ben Gurion, the [then] Prime Minister—had left Negbah and joined another Kibbutz, finding it impossible to endure any longer the atmosphere of purist extremism which characterizes this place. Such secessions in the Kibbutzim of whichever socialist group happens to be in a minority, have been a feature of life in the Collective Settlements lately, as the result of the extremely bitter divisions of the Left." Other settlements, like Kfar Hanassi, still in its pioneering stage, and Neoth Mordechai which "is non-party and is distinguished by an air of tolerance and kindness which is most impressive", he found very much more sympathetic.

"The really basic thing is that no one had money. This struck me more and more as the key fact about the Kibbutzim—that they were co-operatives of people who had agreed to produce and sell goods jointly, sharing the benefits received in the form of goods and not as money. That they received goods which can be valued in terms of money and that they belonged to an organisation actually selling and buying things with money, seems to me irrelevant. The point is that they had cut out of their lives the whole complex which makes people in modern society think that money represents freedom, because they can make more and more of it, buying security, leisure and entertainments; only to discover that it also represents slavery, since it condemns them to work harder and harder to gain the abstract currency which is then taken away in the form of taxation before they can concretize it into any of these solid benefits."

The financial crisis of the Kibbutzim, the result of inflation became obvious to Spender, but he found a graver crisis in the attitude of the new immigrants. "These immigrants have flooded into the

towns. They prefer the free-enterprise and black market of the *ma'abara* to going on the land and renouncing personal gain and property. The result of their indifference has been that the percentage of the Kibbutz population to that of the rest of Israel has sunk from six to four per cent. This means a consequent drop in the prestige of the Kibbutzim. The Kibbutz always represented a small minority, but formerly this was an effective one. Now it risks becoming ineffective. Instead of being the pioneers, the 'chosen few' who are at the head of a movement whose influence is felt by all, instead of being the fountain of purest Zionism poured over the land of the Ingathering and making it to flower, the Kibbutz population suddenly appears a monastic cult of specialists who have chosen to lead this particular kind of life. Apart from the indifference of the immigrants, the political split between the Mapai and Mapam, in addition to splitting up some of the communal settlements, has caused a good many people to leave them altogether."

BUT the crisis of the Kibbutzim is only one aspect of the crisis of the country as a whole. The disastrous economic situation, the five-fold excess of imports over exports, the fierce religious division between orthodox and unorthodox, the bitter political divisions between right and left, and between the theoreticians of the extreme left (Mapam) and the government Labour Party (Mapai), the apparent hopelessness of erasing any kind of settlement with the Arabs and the military commitments resulting from the threat of a second wave of invasion from the Arab countries. The Jewish population of Israel had increased "from 650,000 in 1948 to nearly one and a half million at the beginning of 1952, 684,275 of whom were new immigrants, most of whom came with a primitive idea in their minds that Israel would be the Promised Land where they need do no work". Their children are being brought up without sharing the mutual hostility of their parents—based on colour of skin and place of origin, but their education is being chosen for them according to the supposed qualifications of their political and religious background, so that in taking away physical barriers the Israelis set up spiritual and ideological ones.

A Battle Without War

BORN OF THE WILDERNESS by Ritchie Calder. (News Chronicle, 1s. 6d.).

RITCHIE CALDER writes about one of the problems which beset Israel, a battle he calls it, a battle without war and politics, "in which a land flowing with milk and honey can be born of the wilderness". He is referring to the Negev, the desert which comprises half the country. His journey began in the

Continued on p. 4

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

OPEN 10 a.m. to 6.30; 5.0 SATURDAYS
Our latest list of second-hand and remaindered books is now ready. Let us know if you want it. All books are now sent post free so please get your books from us. We can supply any book required, including text-books.

New Books . . .

The Soldier at the Door
Edith Pargeter 12/6
A Village by the Jordan
Joseph Baratz 12/6

Reprints . . .

Animal Farm George Orwell 6/-
God and the State
Michael Bakunin 3/-
Nineteen Eighty-Four
George Orwell 12/6

Remainders . . .

The Anarchist Prince
George Woodcock and
Ivan Avakumovic 8/6

Pamphlets . . .

New Horizons Wilfred Willock 2/6
The Camp of Liberation
A. J. Muste 6d.

Second-Hand . . .

Politics of the Unpolitical
Herbert Read 4/-
Poems Michael Lermontoff
(English and Russian) 2/6
Self-Help a Hundred Years Ago
George Jacob Holyoake 4/-
America Conquers Britain
Ludwell Denny 7/6
Orlando Virginia Woolf 3/-
Privileged Spectator
Ethel Mannin 3/6
Fascism J. S. Barnes 2/6
Prisoner of Grace Joyce Cary 3/-
Aissa Saved Joyce Cary 3/-
Charles Bradlaugh
J. M. Robertson 3/6
The Journals of George Sturt 3/6
Roads to Freedom
Bertrand Russell 3/-
Paths to Utopia Martin Buber 5/-

Periodicals . . .

Politics, various Back Numbers,
2/- and 3/6 each
Individual Action, Vol. 3, No. 2,
December 20th 3d.
London Magazine, Louis Macneice,
Joyce Cary, Augustus John 2/6
Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

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

*The best available systematic study of the collective settlements, although it was published before the establishment of the State of Israel and the vast increase in population, and uses pre-war statistics, is Dr. Henrik Infield's *Co-operative Living in Palestine*, (Kegan Paul: International Library of Sociology, 1946).

Theatre

TOAD OF TOAD HALL

KENNETH GRAHAME'S book *The Wind in the Willows* has a haunting elusive charm, and inevitably the play *Toad of Toad Hall*, adapted from it by A. A. Milne, and which is being revived again by the Shakespeare Memorial Theatre (at the Princes Theatre), coarsens the fantasy and the humour, for there is a horrid realism about the theatre from which, however hard we try, we can never quite escape.

Childhood is itself a time of wonder, of mystery, and it creates its own dreams and realities, and so it has the advantage of spontaneous enjoyment, before fear and familiarity have dulled our sense of the depth and unfathomableness of the world. We enjoy the nonsense of Lear, of Lewis Carroll, and of plays such as *Toad of Toad Hall*, because they have a superb contempt for reason, formality, gravity, these physical diseases invented to hide defects of the heart and the mind. And, anyway, what is nonsense but an opinion manifestly inconsistent with our own? It is possible to see in the character of Toad and his irresponsible life of adventure and gaiety, and his final imprisonment for calling a policeman "Fat face!" a fable of the fate which often befalls the true individualist and the free spirit. And when Toad has been sentenced to twenty years (fifteen years for the cheek) and has been told by the Judge that if he appears before them again, on any charge whatever, they

shall have to deal with him very seriously, he calls everyone in the court Fat-faces.

"I am Toad, the Terror of the Highway; Toad, the Traffic-Queller, the Lord of the Lone Trail, before whom all must give way or be smitten into nothingness and everlasting night. I am the Toad, the handsome, the popular, the successful Toad. And what are you? Just fat-faces."

Eternity is the winged horse, infinitely fast, and time is a worn-out jade; the existing individual is the driver. The very maximum of what one human being can do for another in relation to that wherein each man has to do solely with himself is to inspire him with concern and unrest. The adventures of Mr. Toad, of Alice, and the fantasies of Lear serve as hints of that higher thing than sense lying hidden in the heart of the absurd. Nonsense is shy of success, even of its own; and this shyness is perhaps due to certain delicate and even fairylike qualities which are apt to become soiled in the market place—as what thing does not? One of the inevitable results of a strenuously material era is the brushing away of the more subtle and illusive qualities of life; these suffer at the hands of a popular success as butterflies' wings suffer at the hands of him who is vandal enough to touch them.

D.M.M.

THE IMMORAL MORALISTS

Continued from p. 1

plant that needs to be protected against the weather.

★

THE Press which is also unanimous (with the exception of the *Daily Worker*) in its condemnation of the intolerance on the other side of the Iron Curtain revealed in this particular instance (with few exceptions including the *Daily Worker*) its contempt for any free discussion where established taboos are concerned. The *Daily Express* which every day professes to do its readers thinking for them is horrified by the possibility that Mrs. Knight's talks may have created "doubts" in the minds of some people.

The whole point, surely, is that if a mistake has been made, if Mrs. Knight has torn a hole of doubt in 10,000 and more beliefs by her one broadcast, then it might be impossible to patch that hole in two weeks' time, however hard Mrs. Morton might talk.

The people listening last night might not be listening in a fortnight's time.

Many people believe that the B.B.C. should have made this into a discussion and not a one-sided talk.

The *Express*' evening brother, the *Standard*, catering as it does for a different public, London at the whisky-and-soda stage instead of the nation drinking its morning cup of tea, has always been more broad-minded (after all Low supplied the cartoons for years) and always looking out for a bit of fun. First it has a tilt at the indignant bishops of Coventry and Bradford:

But have the bishops real cause for alarm? For many years churchmen had a virtual monopoly of all broadcasts touching on religion. No attacks on the principles of religion were allowed on the air.

And then allowing its too vivid imagination to run riot sees the tussle between Mrs. Knight and the Church as a kind of tournament—not an arena in which the early Christians were sacrificed to the lions by their intolerant masters—but before the TV cameras 'in a free, unscripted broadcast—one that would be watched with intense interest by millions of viewers'.

The *Daily Sketch* is less concerned with the minds of the adults than with the poor innocent little children who might have been listening prostrate in their little cots, earphones glued to their ears. Here is a sample of the slush exuding from its editorial column:

KEEP THIS WOMAN OFF THE AIR

All good little boys and girls ought to be in bed by ten o'clock. But the best of little boys and girls sometimes can't sleep even if they go dutifully to bed.

Some of them are allowed by their parents to have a small portable radio. Last night some sleepless children may have switched on their radio at ten o'clock. What might they have heard?

We all know what they heard. And what they heard was only remotely connected with the garbled reports that appeared in the sewer-press.

The *News Chronicle*, like the agnostic headmaster who nevertheless takes prayers in the school hall before lessons start each morning as a condition for holding down his job, had to seek a middle course between its professed liberal tolerance and its obligations towards its quaker proprietors. Its formula was: tolerance in spite of "our dislike for her [Mrs. Knight's] views, freedom of speech on the air but such ideas as atheism should be diluted with "a balancing exposition of Christian beliefs" (no suggestion, be it noted, that the exposition of Christian beliefs should be accompanied by a balancing exposition of atheistic views!)

We have left to the end of this review of the Press, the editorial

on *Morals* published in last Sunday's *Observer*, which is in such striking contrast to all we have quoted so far. There are no *ifs* and *buts*, and no attempt to avoid facing such unpalatable realities for religious fanatics and others that

Although Britain remains a Christian country in many public ways, it now probably contains more non-Christians than Christians, and responsible speakers for a non-Christian approach to current problems, including moral problems, should be heard.

The *Observer* refers to "the politer criticisms" of Mrs. Knight's talk as deriving largely from an "attitude fashionable in Right-wing circles today, which insists that the outward forms of religion should be respected while it sets little store on the essential Christian virtue of kindly, understanding behaviour, even towards persons held to be in the wrong.

"This attitude is also, as a rule, truculently intolerant towards most aspects of modernity; it is condescendingly critical of science and hostile towards rationalism. One ground for this attack is the contention that rationalism, by tending to deprive ethics of religious support, makes for the decline of morality. Yet it is evident that many virtuous people do not practise religion, and that church-going and ethical behaviour are not synonymous . . .

"Mrs. Knight was most certainly not preaching immorality, but rather that very severe form of morality which is practised without fear of punishment or promise of reward in an after life. This kind of morality cannot be criticised for being loose or low, but only, perhaps, for being too arduous for the generality of human beings."

★
THE *Observer* makes a few minor criticisms of the rationalist which are probably applicable in in-

dividual cases. But much more important is the following comment.

The curse of religions is their tendency to make people believe that certain systems of doctrine and certain ceremonies contain in themselves the whole secret of the universe, thus reducing the vast and wonderful to the small and childish. Unfortunately, when human nature functions without religion it makes exactly the same mistake.

If this is an allusion to Russia then whilst it is only too true that the same mistake has been made, it is not true to say that human nature functions there without religion. In Russia the "higher unseen power" which Christians call God has been replaced by the Party and by the deification of the leaders. The struggle between Church and State when it occurs is not a struggle between opposite forces, of good and evil, of love and hate. It is always between two like forces both wanting to control the minds, and thereby the lives, of the people. The empty Churches in this country cannot be explained by a mass-conversion to atheism (after all the available churches can only accommodate a small proportion of the population, certainly not all those who profess to be Christians). Rather must we find the answer in the growing power of the State—the Welfare State—which watches over your needs from the womb to the tomb as well as determining what shall be your duties. There is no further need felt for the Authority of the Church.

The problem facing enlightened parents in the education of their children in fact goes beyond religion. It is the whole question of authority, of which religion is but a part. To discard the "myths" of religion without at the same time rejecting all imposed authority is simply to jump out of the frying-pan into the fire.

Mutual Aid

WE do not enjoy always having to draw attention to the base behaviour of our fellowmen in power and would be much happier pointing only to the human acts which come to our notice. Unfortunately, owing to the misplaced values of our time it is the inventors of destruction, the bomber pilots and the 'heroic' fighting forces who generally get the applause of our society and whose deeds fill most newspaper columns. Occasionally men like Albert Schweitzer hit the headlines, but they do so because they are in the minority. If more men behaved like Schweitzer, turned their backs on the demands of the State and worked only for the good of mankind the upholders of our system would no doubt call them unpatriotic and irresponsible.

In spite of the dehumanising processes at work however, ordinary people often demonstrate that satisfaction can be had from helping others without the material gain which, it is argued by opponents of anarchism, people need before they will contribute to the good of the community. Two cases reported in the *News Chronicle* are worthy of attention

M.

★
Mr. Lucas, the toy-maker, the man they called the twentieth-century Santa Claus, is dead.

Charles Lucas was his full name. He and his wife Rose made more than 50,000 toys to give to sick and needy children at Christmas.

They started 32 years ago. Mr. Lucas, out of work, had no money for toys for his son. He made some—enough for his boy and other needy children. And when he and his wife saw the happiness they brought they vowed to be toy-makers.

Every night after Mr. Lucas had finished his work as a fitter, he and his wife turned the parlour of their council home in Wensor Avenue, Nottingham, into a little toy factory.

With a fret-saw, a hack-saw and a penknife, Mr. Lucas designed and cut out hundreds of different kinds of toys from tea chests and boxes. His wife sand-papered, stitched and painted.

They took them to children in hospitals and orphanages. And this year, 56-year-old Mr. Lucas dressed as Father Christmas when he gave them away.

The children never guessed their Santa Claus was a sick man, and had only carried on by having his tools moved to his bedside.

★

Ex-Borstal boy Michael Tillotson found a friend in a thousand when Mr. and Mrs. Metcalfe Collier took him into their home in Enfield, Middlesex.

They knew he was abandoned as a baby. They knew that in his youth he had fallen into one or two "scrapes" and might possibly do so again. That was why they took him.

The story came out yesterday when Tillotson, now a 34-year-old painter, was accused of breaking into a vicarage and stealing property worth £86 5s.

He appeared at West Riding Quarter Sessions in Wakefield, pleaded guilty, and asked for four other offences to be considered.

Beside him was Mr. Collier there to speak in his favour.

Mr. Collier, a chartered accountant, revealed that Tillotson was not the only Borstal boy he had taken into his home. Tillotson's conduct, he said, was that of one who was trying to establish himself as a Christian man. "We regard him as a member of my family."

Last night Mrs. Collier prepared for Tillotson's return—and talked of more than twenty others who have come to look on her house in Cedar Park Road as their own home.

She said: "It started when a probation officer asked us to take in a boy for a few days' holiday.

"Afterwards the boy wrote to us. We were his only friends. He came back to live."

Tillotson has been with the family 18 months. A lad now serving with the Forces in Egypt lived with them for three years.

The Golliers have two sons of their own—Philip, aged 18, and Andrew, 10.

Mrs. Collier said: "They all get on extremely well. I'm never afraid of any bad influence on my boys because I know these other lads have no real vice in them.

"It is just that they lack love and are driven to trouble by black despair.

"If they can afford it they give us a little money. Otherwise we keep them.

"I feel families should offer this hospitality—even to the worse cases."

LOOKING-GLASS WORDS

ON 6 January, President Eisenhower delivered his Message to Congress on the state of Union. We were reading the report in *The Times* of the next day when we noticed that the printed words looked rather odd. They seemed to be in the right order and they seemed to make sense and yet somehow they looked *reversed*—so we tried holding it up to a mirror. The result was interesting; below are given part of *The Times* report together with their reflection as seen in the mirror.

At the outset I believe it would be well to remind ourselves of this great fundamental in our national life; our common belief that every human being is divinely endowed with dignity and worth and inalienable rights. This faith, with its corollary—that to grow and flourish people must be free—shapes the interests and aspirations of every American.

From this deep faith have evolved three main purposes of our Federal Government: (i) To maintain justice and freedom among ourselves, and to champion them for others so that we may work effectively for enduring peace.

(ii) To help keep our economy vigorous and expanding, thus sustaining our international strength and assuring better jobs, better living, better opportunities for every citizen.

and (iii) To concern ourselves with the human problems of our people, so that every American may have the opportunity to lead a healthy, productive, and rewarding life. Foremost among these broad purposes of government is our support of freedom, justice, and peace.

In the past year there has been progress justifying hope, both for continuing peace and for the ultimate rule of freedom and justice in the world.

. . . nations of this hemisphere, in the historic Caracas and Rio conferences, have closed ranks against imperialistic Communism and strengthened their economic ties . . .

The Pacific Charter, also adopted at Manila, is a milestone in the development of human freedom and self-government in the Pacific area.

Finally, to-day the world is at peace. It is, to be sure, an insecure peace. Yet all humanity finds hope in the simple fact that for an appreciable time there has been no active major battlefield on earth . . . These developments are heartening indeed, and we are hopeful of continuing progress.

This same fact inspires us to work all the more effectively with other nations for the well-being, the freedom, the dignity, of every human on earth.

The military threat is but one menace to our freedom and security. We must not only deter aggression; we must also frustrate the efforts of the Communists to gain their goals by subversion. To this end free nations must maintain and reinforce their cohesion, their internal security, their political and economic vitality, and their faith in freedom.

We must also encourage the efforts being made in the United Nations to limit armaments and to harness the atom to peaceful use.

We must be willing to use the processes of negotiation whenever they will advance the cause of just and secure peace to which the United States and other free nations are dedicated.

We must gradually reduce certain tariff obstacles to trade.

We must facilitate the flow of capital and continue technical assistance, both directly and through the United Nations, to less developed countries to strengthen their independence and raise their living standards.

The defence of the west appears likely at last to include a free, democratic Germany participating as an equal in the councils of N.A.T.O.

In continuing to ferret out and destroy Communist subversion they would carefully preserve the traditions and basic rights of their citizens.

The past year was . . . most prosperous . . . Business activity now surges with new strength. Production is rising, employment is high. Toward the end of last year average weekly wages in manufacturing were higher than ever before. Personal income after taxes is at a record level.

It was expected that more than \$12,000m. would be expended in 1955 for the development of land, water, and other resources.

"Now ours is a planet where the greater part of the population still lacks the bare essentials of life; where even in the richest country almost a third of the population, some fifty millions, live below the margin of physical decency, with ramshackle and over-crowded housing, a poor diet, insufficient medical care, and grossly inadequate opportunities for educational development."—MUMFORD in *The Conduct of Life*.

Before the recent Supreme Court decision, racial segregation in the U.S.A. was required by law in 17 States and the District of Columbia; local option in 4 States; prohibited in 16 States; no specific laws in 11 States.

Unemployment is equal to 5.1% of the civilian labour force, that is 3,347,000 persons. (Facts given in a speech by President Eisenhower on 22 August, 1954).

Carl Braden, a white man, was fined \$5,000 and given a prison sentence of fifteen years for helping a negro to buy a house in an all-white neighbourhood of Louisville, Kentucky. He was convicted under a sedition law.

The explosive power of the H-bomb detonated on 1 March, 1954, was about 700 times greater than that of the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima in 1945.

In May 1954 arms were flown by the U.S.A. to Honduras and Nicaragua because Guatemala had purchased weapons from Poland.

"The parties . . . will maintain . . . their . . . capacity . . . to prevent . . . subversive acts . . . against their . . . political stability." From Art. 2 of the South-East Asia Collective Defence Treaty.

In the Korean War the U.S.A. casualties were 142,277 killed, wounded and missing. In Malaya up to 18 June, 1954, 5,073 'terrorists', 2,307 civilians and 1,886 members of the 'security forces' were killed. In Kenya up to 25 Sept., 1954, 6,608 'terrorists', and 476 of the 'security forces' were killed.

"Over four million Americans—service men and civilians—are on the rolls of the defence establishment." President Eisenhower in his 1955 'State of the Union' speech.

"It is now evident that the present Administration has fully embraced, for political advantage, McCarthyism . . . It is the corruption of truth, the abandonment of our historical devotion to fair play . . . It is the use of the "big lie" and the unfounded accusation against any citizen in the name of Americanism or security." Ex-President Truman on 16 Nov., 1953.

President Eisenhower's Budget proposals for 1954-55 included \$14,546,000,000 for 'major procurement and production' by the Defence Department.

"Are the . . . American prisoners killed in cold blood . . . to become forgotten men, while the blood-stained hands of the Communist murderer [China] are clasped in fraternal greeting by our allies in the U.N. . . ." Sen. Knowland.

The President withdrew his tariff reduction proposals in May 1954.

The U.S.A. spent \$151m. on air and naval bases in Spain. An oil pipe-line from Cadiz to the air-bases cost \$41m. The 'rent' alone for air-bases in Libya is \$2m. a year.

Acknowledged Nazis have for some years been occupying important government posts. The experience of German generals is proving useful to the N.A.T.O. countries.

"[No person shall] be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law." From the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

In 1952 the richest 10% of the population received 30% of the total income available. The poorest 10% received 1% of the total income. There are 2,838,000 illiterates (aged over 14) in the U.S.A. (1947 figures). 2,184,000 adults over 25 have received no schooling at all (1950 figures).

In 1952, 48.9 billion dollars were spent on national security. The 1954 appropriation for atomic energy development by the Defence Dept. was \$2,425,000,000. M.G.W.

The Ferocity of Man

THE greatest menace of our present age is war. This is a change from nineteenth century revolutionary opinion, which was more concerned with the evils of economic exploitation, regarding anti-militarism as a side issue. This may have been one of the reasons why there was not a consistent stand against the First World War. Although many revolutionaries did in fact oppose it, their voices were drowned in the patriotic tumult, to which even such men as Kropotkin and Jean Grave added their clamour. The truth of the matter is that the men of the nineteenth century barely understood what war meant, and when a really big one came along they were lost. The thing was outside their experience.

We remember Karl Marx delighting in the victory of Germany in the Franco-Prussian War, because it meant (so he thought) the triumph of his authoritarian social ideas over the more libertarian French. But Proudhon was little better. In the true style of the half-baked Darwinian he hailed war as one of the forces that had raised man from brutish conditions to civilisation. Many socialists and others, who should have known better, followed. Of course all wanted to see war go. They were full of schemes to rid the world of it, but their readiness to accept that it might have done considerable good, in the past of course, ruined their case, or at least provided it with a fatal flaw. For war refused to remain safely in the past. Along with other horrors of earlier ages, racial and religious persecution, human sacrifice, the Inquisition, and the practice of massacring the defeated enemy, it came marching into the present. The killing of a handful of peasants by the Cossacks roused a storm in the idealistic, but psychologically ignorant, nineteenth century. Nowadays such a thing would be too trivial to find its way into our sensation-loving press. It might perhaps get a paragraph at the bottom of the front page.

The common attitude of those days was that man had outgrown savage customs and behaviour. That was his natural condition, but he had raised himself (according to some by the aid of God) above all that, and such barbarous behaviour as remained was only a regrettable hangover, soon to disappear.

The last two wars, and the promise of more to come, have obliterated this facile optimism. Nowadays the reaction is to an equally facile pessimism, and a religious point of view reminiscent of our old friend, Original Sin. According to the modern idea man is naturally cruel and aggressive. What he does is therefore to be expected. The natural man is the Nazi, giving full rein to his "primitive impulses", whereas in reality the primitive man would have been bewildered by the spectacle of the death-camps, and would have regarded the makers of them as creatures of a quite different species from himself, animals of a strange and terrifying type. To suggest to him that they were his descendants would probably have made him angry. The Eskimos, the Hopi Indians, and a tribe of Australian aborigines have all in recent years made public protest against the barbarous customs of the more highly developed peoples around them, denouncing in particular the Hydrogen and Atomic Bombs, and have sent, or contemplated sending, missions to convert the white man.

In reality it would seem that man is a timid, peaceable animal. Early man, without tools or clothing, must have been absolutely defenceless but for his cunning, and his readiness to flee danger. He was not big, he was in fact usually smaller than modern man, and he had not the advantage of a thick hairy coat, like most other mammals. Instead of having a muzzle, or a monkey-like face, with deep-sunk eyes and projecting brows, he developed features that left both nose and eyes extremely exposed to injury. Since he walked upright on his hind legs his genitals were in an exposed position, instead of being tucked away behind and underneath as in animals that go on all fours.

To imagine it to be a normal part of their daily lives for such men to engage in murderous combat, either singly or in groups, seems absurd. Nor is it likely that man was more courageous against wild beasts, until he had developed weapons, for nature did not provide him with them, as it did the really savage creatures. If he were to be a ferocious creature we should expect him

to be equipped with dangerous teeth and powerful jaws, but his jaws have decreased, and still are decreasing in size and strength. He has no claws, for his nails easily break and tear, and fighting with the clenched fist appears to be a fairly recent product of civilisation.

Even when the institution of war came in we find efforts to avoid close quarter fighting. From excavations in burial mounds we can trace the development of the sword, beginning with a small knife and getting longer and longer. This sets the pattern, whether it be swords, lances, bows, guns, or atomic rockets, the range gets longer and longer, the aim being to keep the foe at a distance, and thereby avoid being killed oneself. Man is a coward in war. It is the hope of the world.

During the Napoleonic wars it sometimes happened that the ammunition ran out in the middle of the battle. Rather than charge with the bayonet the opposing regiments started to throw stones at each other, to the exasperation of their officers. Ancient prints made by artists to glorify war, and the victories of their respective princes, show phalanxes of pikemen charging each other valiantly. However, it appears that what happened usually was for one side to break and run at the critical moment. After all it

requires a lot of conditioning to be able to stand and face a line of steel points or blades hurtling full tilt at you. But this of course is not the romantic view of war, which we are still asked to accept, in which even the hated treacherous enemy must still be allowed some courage, in order that our own brave boys' heroism may shine.

Historians have noted with bewilderment how frequently even trained troops will panic. The Duke of Wellington remarked, "All soldiers run away." People will often surrender, even though they know that slavery or death awaits them. This is usually put down to "human frailty", but it may just as well be due to the fact that man's combative instincts are so weak or rudimentary that he easily becomes weary of killing, even in self-defence.

Throughout history military men, governments, priests, and educationalists have striven to condition their peoples for war. In some ways they have been very successful. Even the revolutionaries can usually only think of resisting the oppressor by violence. Unfortunately he knows how to use violence much better than they do, and has fewer inhibitions about using it, so he generally wins.

But, despite this success in imposing the violence behaviour pattern on everyone, armies still run away and nations give up the struggle, sometimes when all is far from lost. Meanwhile, as I pointed out above, so little does this ferocious animal, man, who needs a policeman to prevent him committing wholesale murder, relish fighting, that he continually tries to get further and further away from his enemy, in the vain hope (for the enemy is doing the same) that he will avoid being hurt himself, and see the consequences of his warlike deeds. Airmen are capable of bombing a town, but not of going through the streets beating out the brains of the inhabitants with clubs. But the result of their bombing is even worse than this.

"Out of sight, out of mind". This is the logical consequence of machine warfare. Our jolly "Dam-Busters" never actually saw their victims drowning, so they can rest satisfied on their laurels, and sleep soundly in their beds. Perhaps a time may come when war will be waged by robots, robot rockets, tanks, battleships, and perhaps even soldiers, while the human population, safe underground, will toil and be taxed to the hilt in order to build these machines. War may become once again what it was in the eighteenth century, a game for the amusement of the rulers, for which the

A Battle Without War

Continued from p. 2

extreme north of Israel at the Huleh Swamps, where canals are being dredged to drain the swamps to provide new land, to save water otherwise lost by evaporation, to eliminate malarial mosquitos and to provide a head of water for generating electricity. Then he went to the Kibbutz of Kfar Hanassi where four years ago he saw only a garrison-post on a desolate hillside, and where two years ago Spender saw building held up for lack of money. Now Calder saw a productive farm and industrial colony. At Rehovoth he saw and describes the importance of the scientific research carried out in the Weizmann Institute, at Revivim and Mashavim the work to trap and conserve water, around Beersheba the planting of trees, and in the south the everlasting search for oil.

At Sde Boker, the Fields of the Cattle-men—an appellation which has not been true for at least 1,500 years, Calder visited David Ben-Gurion. In Joseph Baratz's book we see Ben-Gurion as a pioneer settler. In Jon Kimche's *Seven Fallen Pillars* we see him as the trade-union boss proclaiming the State of Israel, in Stephen Spender's account, he is the Prime Minister. Now he has walked out of power at the age of 67, "not into the proverbial wilderness of the politicians but into the actual desert of the Negev, to adopt the rôle of a modern Moses inviting his people to follow him not into a land flowing with milk and honey but the wilderness of tribulation". Ben-Gurion sees the desert not only as a source of his country's material needs, food, minerals, possibly oil, but as a test for his people. He criticised the luxury settlers of the big towns, the "prosperous complacency" of older settlements, their reluctance to accept immigrants, and the immigrants themselves who become squatters and not settlers. He told his visitor of the possibilities of the naked landscape which surrounded them.

"... And we shall have trees", he said with an arm-sweep over desolation. "I hate a place without trees!"

He reminded Calder of a prophet from the Old Testament, as did his injunction to those who came to say goodbye when he resigned to retire into the wilderness: "Do not weep! Follow!"

C.W.

The Rulers and the Ruled

IN that rather astutely edited newspaper *The Observer*, there appeared last week under a "Sayings of the Week" heading a contribution by Dr. Gilbert Murray which read thus:

"The proletariat cannot rule: it is too ignorant and incompetent. It would not be the proletariat if it were otherwise."

For so gentle and so liberal a humanist as Dr. Murray this is strong talk and should make painful reading for the ruling hierarchy for it is they with their spurious hegemony, who have perpetuated society to its present state, making Dr. Murray's statement so infuriatingly true.

Of course the question the impatient anarchist asks as he finishes reading the statement is: Rule! But who—excepting masochists and psychopaths—wants to rule; wants to be top-dog; wants to indoctrinate, inculcate, liquidate. "Rule"—for the authentic anarchist—is a word which has no class-connotation or authoritative definition, although the Concise Oxford Dictionary allows almost a column to attempt such a one. It terms best and righteous 'rule' as an intransitive verb e.g. to 'rule a line'. But it is like telling the wary to be alert, to tell this to anarchists.

They do assign words their proper place, unless they are directly challenging the orthodox, then they are so impassioned they invent new ones!

One other point arises to remind one—not least of one's wandering from the starting point—it is this: that by using the word 'rule', indeed by the making of such a statement, the popular view has been cosseted once again. Anarchists should fume about this, pick up their machete of self-realisation, and hack a way through the dark claustrophobic undergrowth of bombastic dogma and re-repeated slogans, to the clear sharp incline of the different view.

Walsall, Jan. 15. HARRY BRINDLEY.

Who is Subversive?

The measures we have taken to detect traitorous accomplices of the Russian State have subverted the American Constitution more effectively than 30 years of Communist espionage and plotting . . . in the name of freedom we are rapidly creating a police state; and in the name of democracy we have succumbed, not to creeping socialism but to galloping Fascism . . . Who are the marked men and women among us today? Who are the ultimate security risks? They are the people who still retain and still cherish all their human attributes . . . People who rise as Walt Whitman commanded "against the never ending audacity of elected persons". From Lewis Mumford's In the Name of Sanity.

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.
- SELECTIONS FROM FREEDOM :**
Vol. 1, 1951, Mankind is On paper 7s. 6d.
Vol. 2, 1952, Postscript to paper 7s. 6d.
Vol. 3, Colonialism on Trial paper 7s. 6d. cloth 10s. 6d.
- JOHN HEWETSON :**
Sexual Freedom for the Young 6d.
Ill-Health, Poverty and the State cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.
- M. BAKUNIN :**
Marxism, Freedom and the State. cloth 5s.
- 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.
- TONY GIBSON :**
Youth for Freedom paper 2s.
Food Production and Population 6d.
Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.
- ERRICO MALATESTA :**
Anarchy 6d.
Vote—What For? 1d.
- RUDOLF ROCKER :**
Nationalism and Culture cloth 21s.

- 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.
The Education of Free Men 1s.
- MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI :**
Neither East nor West cloth 10s. 6d., paper 7s. 6d.
Workers in Stalin's Russia 1s.
- PHILIP SANSON :**
Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step 1s.
- GEORGE WOODCOCK :**
Anarchy or Chaos 2s. 6d.
New Life to the Land 6d.
Homes orhovels? 6d.
Railways and Society 3d.
What is Anarchism? 1d.
The Basis of Communal Living 1s.
- F. A. RIDLEY :**
The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age 2d.
- ALEX COMFORT :**
Delinquency 6d.
Barbarism & Sexual Freedom boards 3s. 6d.
- ★
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.**

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 2

Deficit on Freedom	£30
Contributions received	£59
SURPLUS	£29
January 7 to January 13	
London: R.H. 1/6; Edinburgh: A.S.L.R. £2; Warrington: J.H. 10/-; Northwood: E.H. £1; London: J.S.* 3/-; London: Anon.* 2/3; London: G.G. 3/-; Barry: V.H. 4/-; Risley: I.H. 1/6; Newton Abbot: E.D. 3/-; Sheffield: G.P. 5/-; London: A.M. 2/-; Denham: C.B. 13/-; Glasgow: R.L. 6d.	
Total	5 8 9
Previously acknowledged	53 19 6
1955 TOTAL TO DATE	£59 8 3

GIFTS OF BOOKS: Stroud: S.L.R. Nottingham: K.N. London: R.P.T.

people will pay, but not with their lives. Possibly one of the reasons for the failure of the revolutionary movements in the last century was their romantic ideas of a revolutionary war, such as took place during the French Revolution. Thus the revolutionary cause was tied to the fate of one country. This attitude even affected the anarchists. The much-denounced violence of such people as Ravachol did comparatively little harm to the cause, compared with the support given to national wars that this outlook led to.

Ferocity is not born in man. However it does not help the revolutionary cause to continue to condition people to accept it. Throughout history men have resisted injustice and tyranny by violence. Our sympathies are with them, and we rightly admire their determination to be free. At the same time it must be pointed out that most of their struggles failed, otherwise we should be living in Utopia long ago. Perhaps it is time to adopt a different and perhaps more efficient method.

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

- LECTURE-DISCUSSIONS**
Every Sunday at 7.30 at THE MALATESTA CLUB 155 High Holborn, W.C.1. (Nearly opposite Holborn Town Hall)
- JAN. 23—Rita Milton on THE FUNCTION OF THE REVOLUTIONARY PRESS
- JAN. 30—Frank Hirshfield on THE FAILURE OF PACIFISM?
- FEB. 6—Bonar Thompson on Subject to be announced.
- FEB. 13—Philip Sansom on ANARCHO-SYNDICALISM
- FEB. 20—Claudio Veliz on TYPES OF FASCISM TO-DAY
- FEB. 27—Emile Boin on TAOISM AND ANARCHISM
- INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS**
Every Thursday at 8.15.

OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting
HYDE PARK
Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

NORTH-EAST LONDON

DISCUSSION MEETINGS AT MANOR PARK
Alternate Wednesdays at 7.30 p.m.
Apply to Freedom Press for details

N.W. LONDON DISCUSSION MEETING AT HAMPSTEAD

JAN. 24th at 8 p.m.—Stan R. Parker
THE EMERGENCE OF SOCIALISM at 27 Christchurch Hill, Hampstead, N.W.3.

GLASGOW

INDOORS
at 200 Buchanan Street
Every Friday at 7 p.m.

The Malatesta Club

- 155 HIGH HOLBORN, LONDON, W.C.1.
- YOUTH GROUP ACTIVITIES**
- LECTURE**
THE WORK OF WILHELM REICH by S. Fanaroff
Wed., Jan. 26, at 8.30 p.m.
- CARTOON & POSTER COMPETITION**
Sat., Jan. 29, at 9 p.m.
- Dancing Every Saturday from 9 p.m. (Guest charge, 6d.)
- ★
LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP
Informal Discussions Every Thursday, at 8.15 p.m.
Lecture-Discussions Every Sunday at 7.45 p.m.
(See Announcements Column)
ALL WELCOME

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