

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

PILLAR OF BRITISH  
IMPERIALISM

The local hangman was among those who were presented to Princess Margaret during her visit to St. Vincent.

—Press Reports.

Vol. 16, No.8

February 19th, 1955

Threepence

## KRUSHCHEV v. the PEASANTS?

WHEN the news of Malenkov's resignation came through the Soviet Embassy declared that it had no information in this matter. It relied for its news not on the news agencies but on a special receiver on the Embassy roof which received radio intelligence direct from Moscow. Readers of FREEDOM may well take the tip and also distrust sources of news that come through western news agencies and Moscow radio alike. Malenkov's fall has been reported in the press in the same way as Stalin's death—simply in terms of the palace revolution, and without any concern for the larger questions involved. Let us not, therefore, concern ourselves overmuch with the precise moves which Krushchev or Malenkov have made during the last few months or years, but instead stand back, as it were, and view the whole pattern of the Bolshevik counter-revolution.

The great potential power in Russia has always been the peasants. In the pre-revolutionary years the Russian orthodox Marxists felt completely helpless in having to place their hopes on the minute proletariat, and Lenin boldly flouted orthodox Marxism by proclaiming the revolutionary alliance of workers and peasants. When the revolution of the peasants overthrew Tsarism, the task of the Bolshevik party set itself was to subdue them once more. The period of War Communism with the famines of 1921, the period of the New Economic Policy (N.E.P.) and its reversal in the 5 year plans (whose real aim was to attempt to industrialize agriculture, to transform the peasant into a wage worker, and which also resulted in the ghastly famines of 1932 and 1933) all reflect this perennial struggle of the State *versus* the peasants.

### Stalin as Party Builder

Stalin's rôle in this struggle was the building of the "monolithic" party with ruthless dictatorial powers. He built up the power of the political police, of the army, and of the party, and he prevented any one of these "States within the States" from challenging his own power by playing them off one against the other. The numerous purges which, since Lenin's death, have made Russian internal history of an unexampled bloodiness, had also the effect of diverting popular discontent with "traitors" who could be blamed for every aspect of Soviet life that was uncongenial.

When Stalin died FREEDOM was less concerned with who was to succeed him than with the larger question of whether the removal of Stalin as the balancing agent would

unloose rivalries which would weaken the dictatorship in its perennial struggle with the Russian people. Would Stalin, we asked, in acting as the gravedigger of the revolution also have dug the grave of his successors?

Malenkov had for years been identified with Stalin's policies. Obviously the change in policy, the apparent softening of the harshness of Soviet rule, did not represent his personal attitude as many political journalists still seem to think. It reflected the need of a weakened governing power to placate the populace and gain time. Stalin himself became by indirect implication a scapegoat after his death. Beria also, as head of the hated M.V.D., the political police, could be eliminated as a rival, while at the same time he could be blamed for every matter of popular discontent.

### Dog Bites Dog

The Beria affair also showed that the battle for survival at the head of the Soviet State was in full swing, just as had been anticipated the moment Stalin was out of the way. The Malenkov-Krushchev struggle shows that this tendency is being bitterly carried on.

Political commentators say that Krushchev's "victory"—we give it inverted commas for it may well be short-lived—represents an assertion of power by the Party. But it seems likely that the Party has only been able to depose Malenkov by making

substantial concessions to the Army. The rôle of the other great State-within-the-State, the M.V.D. is still somewhat obscure.

But again we have to remember that all this internal struggle among the ruling class in Russia, which must have a weakening effect, is only significant in terms of the great revolutionary question, the struggle between rulers and ruled, between the government and the peasants. Yet another weakening factor emerges in the steady growth of Russian capitalism which provides all the problems which face capitalism elsewhere—notably the disparity between the production of heavy industrial products and the real wealth of the populace expressed in terms of consumer goods. This is the very question in which Malenkov and Krushchev are supposed to differ but which really represents a dilemma of all capitalist régimes. The policy allegedly favoured by Krushchev—that of increasing heavy industry at the expense of consumer goods is likely to meet with the greatest opposition and discontent from the Soviet populace.

### The Weakness of Dictatorship

This brings us to another point—that of the weakness or strength of a dictatorship. Anarchists have always pointed out that where governments erect a powerful instrument for the suppression of discontent, one may safely infer that considerable discontent exists. A dictatorship there-

fore always covers up a sharp struggle between rulers and ruled. This is why the weakening which these palace revolutions cause to the governing power is of such potential revolutionary significance. If these struggles continue without the emergence of a stable tyranny such as Stalin uneasily wielded, then the

whole position of the Bolshevik Party may be in danger. A new revolution at the heart of the Soviet empire would have incalculable results far beyond the borders of Soviet influence. The vast figure looming up on the world scene is not Krushchev but the Russian peasant.

## The Fascist Government of S. Africa

THE Nationalist South African Government has gone ahead with its plans for the resettlement of Africans from Sophiatown, one of the Western Areas of Johannesburg. At the time of writing, no organised resistance has shown itself, and the presence in the area of 3,000 armed police has apparently had the desired effect.

The pretext used by the Government for its Native Resettlement Scheme is that it is part of the general slum-clearance policy of this progressive administration. But, as our Johannesburg Correspondent showed us a fortnight ago (FREEDOM, 5/2/55) there are many districts of the Western Areas which are far worse than Sophiatown, and should be cleared first, if the desire to remove plague-spots is what motivates the Government.

As an example of this, our correspondent mentioned Orlando Township to which the Bishop of Johannesburg drew attention in a speech attacking the Government's actions. In 1944, said the Bishop, Orlando became so terribly overcrowded that the people "spilled over" into the temporary shelters provided in the city, each one 10ft. square, without doors, windows, or floors. One room was let to each family. There were only some 580 foul and disgusting latrines to meet the needs of 34,000 people. To-day, ten years later, those

people were still living there, although the Johannesburg municipal officer of health placed this area as "priority number one" in slum clearance in 1950.

Sophiatown, however, is one of the areas where Africans hold freehold rights, and it is clearly part of the Nationalists' racial policy to dispossess Africans completely of any property rights. Sophiatown is also a desirable location for a European residential area; so the Kaffirs must be kicked out.

### Apartheid Equals Fascism

Shifting the inhabitants of Sophiatown out to their new location, 'Meadowlands' (a pleasant-sounding name!) is in fact an implementation of the Nationalist Party's Apartheid Policy. It is nothing more than a sop to world opinion that the Nationalists even pretend that it is anything else.

Thus we see going into operation, in one of the countries of the British Commonwealth, a government policy on classic fascist lines. No longer can we feel that to describe the South African Government as 'fascist' is to exaggerate, or to use a political swear-word. It is an exact description.

What arises in this emergence of South African fascism, however, is a clearer picture of the psychopathic nature of this kind of régime. The Marxist analysis of fascism as purely an expression of capitalism in crisis, yet another result of the economic factor, is even less adequate as an explanation in this instance than it was for Germany, Italy or is for Spain.

In these other fascist countries, a revolutionarily conscious working class represented a threat to the capitalist ruling class. The measures the latter had to take in its self-defence were extreme. Even that, however, did not alone explain the lengths to which Hitler's lunatic racial theories were stretched. There was clearly a strong psychopathic force at

Continued on p. 4

## HANGING REPRIEVED

IN the debate on Capital Punishment in the House of Commons last week, one of the three arguments used by the Home Secretary in opposing Mr. Sidney Silverman's amendment to the Government motion that it "takes note" of the Report of the Royal Commission, in which Mr. Silverman called for the suspension of the death penalty for a period of five years, was one which is only too familiar to those who have followed these debates over the years. He said that irrespective of other considerations

the Government has no doubt that it would be entirely wrong to abolish capital punishment unless there were clearly overwhelming public sentiment in favour of this change. The Government have no reason to think that public opinion is in favour of abolition, or of suspension. Indeed they believe that the contrary is true.

In 1948, when a similar motion was debated, and Mr. Chuter Ede was the Labour Home Secretary, he opposed suspension of the death penalty on similar grounds.

"We believe . . . that the time is not ripe for undertaking this particular reform. I do not myself believe that public opinion in the country is in favour of this Clause at this time".

It may not be considered without significance that whereas Major Lloyd George (the present Home Secretary) supported abolition in 1948 and Mr. Ede opposed it, in 1955 when their rôles are reversed (Mr. Ede being on the Opposition benches and Major Lloyd George at the Home Office), their views on abolition have also been reversed.\*

\*The same change took place in the case of Sir Samuel Hoare who defended hanging when he was Home Secretary but who now (as Lord Templewood) is one of the most outspoken advocates of abolition!

Neither of them, when in opposition, took into account this burning question of "public opinion"!

★

WE have on more than one occasion expressed our views in these columns on so-called "public opinion", not to have to repeat that so long as the mass circulation newspapers do the public's thinking for them, there is no such thing as "public opinion"; rather should it be called "public prejudice". But if one observes how the government has gone about the present debate one gets an idea of how much, or how little, they are concerned with this "public opinion" behind which they hide when it suits them to do so. The Royal Commission's Report on Capital Punishment† was presented to Parliament in September, 1953. No government pronouncement was made for nearly eighteen months. Then on February 3rd, the first indication the public had of something happening was the publication in the press of an announcement that a Government motion "taking note" of the Report would be debated on February 10th; that is one week's notice, hardly time for Members of Parliament, if they are so inclined, to discuss the issues with their constituents and to form an opinion as to the state of "public opinion". Indeed, the Opposition met only on the eve of the debate to decide what their attitude would be!

In the debate, as the *News of the World* points out "Nothing that either side could possibly say remains unsaid", and we would add, with the exception of Mr. Chuter Ede's revelation on the Evans case, that was not said in the 1948 debate. But to assume that the "average man

and woman are as well informed on the issues as their M.P.'s" is an assumption which a newspaper with less of a vested interest in crime than the *News of the World* might hesitate to make. However, the "public opinion" to which that Sunday journal appeals, to express itself once for all on the issue of hanging, is less concerned with questions of "deterrents" or statistics and comparisons with countries where the death penalty has been abolished. Their astronomical circulation of over eight million copies every week is achieved by the exploitation of crime and murder. One can well imagine the *News of the World* explaining away their policy with some such argument as that it is by giving such publicity to crime that they are discouraging would-be criminals from committing similar crimes. Yet if this were so, it is difficult to understand the need for all the gory details. After all would it not be sufficient simply to give a brief report of the case and of the sentence passed by the judge? Why the photographs of the scene of the crime, and portraits of the murderers? And why last week for instance, when there was only one reportable local murder, did the *News of the World* find it necessary to splash over two pages the stories of two murders which took place in New Zealand and in Versailles respectively? The fact of the matter is, as the *Observer* points out:

"We . . . like reading about crime; the amount of space given to it in our newspapers astonishes visitors from the Continent. In this case, however, there is a vicious circle: murder reports would be much less exciting if they were not a prelude to the gallows. The death penalty may well be stimulating a dubious

Continued on p. 3

## STRUGGLING ALONG ON £2,600 A YEAR

A recent article in *The Manchester Guardian* gives details of how a man spends his income of £2,600 a year and which 'may help to illustrate the living standards open to middle-class families in comparable circumstances'.

Altogether his income exceeded expenditure by £44 and after listing all the items he is compelled to pay out on—such as domestic help £156, food and housekeeping items £350, holidays £105, entertainment £120, etc., etc.—he concludes 'But there is no need to be despondent. We ended the year with a comfortable margin and what was it that Mr. Micawber said about such an enviable situation? Besides, the Budget is in sight, and the short season of hope is upon us.'

Life is certainly hard for some of us.

†Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London 1953, 12/6d.



## Freedom's Book Choice for February Orwell's Heart & Mind

\***GEORGE ORWELL** by John Atkins. (John Calder, 18s.)

FOLLOWING closely after Laurence Brander's book about George Orwell, which we reviewed last November, comes this longer study by John Atkins,\* who was Orwell's predecessor as literary editor of *Tribune*. It is a better book than Mr. Brander's partly because Mr. Atkins shows so much more understanding of Orwell's political and social attitudes, and partly because it is so much more comprehensive. The two authors have approached Orwell's work with opposite methods. Mr. Brander says, "I propose to consider only those writings which have appeared in book form, so that the reader has some chance of checking my judgments." Mr. Atkins says, "My main aim is to collate his scattered journalism and relate it with his more easily obtainable books." He has worked his way through eighteen years of Orwell's articles in over a dozen periodicals and has linked it with the themes of his novels and his autobiographical and political writings. The work has been done very thoroughly, even lovingly, and the reader will gain from it a much truer picture of Orwell's mind and heart than from the purely literary criticism of his books or from the current publicity in connection with the television dramatisation of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and the film of *Animal Farm*.

At the same time Mr. Atkins has not altogether solved the problem of writing a book of this sort, that of extracting the essentials from a great mass of scattered material and arranging them according to their subject and chronology to give a picture of their author's thoughts and attitudes. Whether it is done by years of press-cutting or collecting of old magazines or by scribbling away in the British Museum, the difficulty is to know what can safely or reluctantly be left out. When that is resolved there remains the problem of organisation—how to make a coherent narrative of all the quotations and their interpretation, and to make the result readable. In this book it is often difficult to tell whether we are reading Orwell or Mr. Atkins, and he could have been served better by the publisher who by a different typographical arrangement could have made things easier.

### 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 . . .**  
Indian Village S. C. Dube 25/-
- Reprints . . .**  
The Third Man and the Fallen Idol Graham Green 2/-  
The Evolution of the Papacy F. A. Ridley 1/-  
The Bible Handbook G. W. Foote & W. F. Ball 4/-
- Second-Hand . . .**  
Two Silver Roubles  
Esther Salaman 2/6  
Christian Science Mark Twain 3/-  
Pillars of Society, etc. Henrik Ibsen 2/-  
Behind the Silken Curtain Bartley Crum 3/-  
Ruins of Empire C. F. Volney 3/-  
British Freewomen C. C. Stopes 2/6  
Life of Marie Stopes Aylmer Maude 2/6  
Our Day of Empire L. O. Renne 3/-  
Remembering Zion Desmond Ryan 4/-  
Everybody's Book of Politics 4/-  
Man the Unknown Alexis Carrel 4/-  
A Nest of Hereditary Legislators Ivan Turgenev 2/6
- Publications . . .**  
Individual Action, Vol. 3, No. 3 3d.  
Postage free on all items  
**Obtainable from**  
**27, RED LION STREET,**  
**LONDON, W.C.1**

The book lacks an index and it would have been interesting to have a comprehensive bibliography.

Mr. Atkins devotes chapters to Orwell's attitude to imperialism, his study of poverty, his sympathy with under-dogs and victims of various sorts, his defence of liberty, his views on the class system, his evolution as a socialist, his political commentary, his observation of 'popular culture', his literary style, his concern with the English language, his standpoint as a 'left-wing patriot'. The common element which Mr. Atkins finds in all Orwell's writing to be 'a sense of decency'—a disappearing attribute in the world of power-hunger.

"Orwell's uniqueness lay in his having the mind of an intellectual and the feelings of a common man. In the conflict between intellect and sentiment the latter usually won. This is very rare in the present era though probably more common in Great Britain than in any other advanced country. In Orwell the conflict usually took the shape of realising that our civilisation is based on intellect but perceiving that intellect unrefined by sentiment (or decency) may well destroy the culture based on it and eventually itself."

(In our next issue:  
*Orwell and Anarchism*)

## Two Collectives in Revolutionary Spain

(Continued from last week)

### 2. ELDA

SITUATED in the province of Alicante, Elda is a small city of 25,000 inhabitants. Its boat-making and paper industries are very important, and it is surrounded by a fertile agricultural belt.

Our movement, which dates back to the last century, has played a distinguished part in the syndicalist struggle, and the anarchist groups have also been active. Strikes have taken place, some of which have had deep revolutionary implications and social significance. The workers in the hosiery factories have sometimes been out for three months in order to force the reinstatement of a locked-out worker. For almost three-quarters of a century anarchist periodicals have carried out useful propaganda activities.

Naturally, in this city the revolutionary movement assumed a deep and profound character. From the very beginning the comrades realised that syndicalist activity by itself was insufficient to solve the problems of social living. Under the influence of the communalist tendencies, which have always been present among anarchist ideas, and at the same time restrained by the need for a united anti-fascist front, they immediately joined the communal council. The U.G.T. (socialist) was almost as strong as the C.N.T. (anarcho-syndicalist). There two organisations each had five representatives, the left republicans and the dissident syndicalist party two each, and the communists one. As in Granollers and Gerona, the chairman was of the C.N.T.

The commune of Elda, like others, was weighted down by bureaucratic parasites,

and first of all its structure had to be changed.

A defence section was formed, and one for public education and general culture. Others looked after labour, agriculture, health, and social services. The syndicates were active, being in agreement with the communal council.

Up till that time, public education had been completely neglected by the local authorities. Six months after July 19th, two schools had been built, one with a capacity for 400 students, and the other for 70. Others were being hurriedly got ready for children who had been evacuated from Madrid, who were lodged temporarily in the libertarian hall and in the headquarters of the local syndicates.

The municipality immediately tackled the problem of public health. The hospital was reorganised, and the services of three doctors, two assistants and two midwives were obtained. Several sanatoriums and clinics were also reorganised.

★

OF the seven thousand workers employed in the factories of Elda, four thousand five hundred belonged to the C.N.T. (five months later this figure had risen to 5,350). 2,850 workers had completely socialized the dozen most important factories. The others had been brought under control.

Each of the socialized factories was divided into six sections, five of which corresponded to the various stages of manufacture, and one to the storekeeping. Each section named a delegate, and these six formed the factory committee, which operated in co-operation with the technical council of the syndi-

cate, which had taken over the general organisation of work.

In the non-socialized factories the syndicates exercised careful control. But the failure to do away with money, was a serious obstacle to the stabilisation of the enterprises. In practice, it was the factory committees that organised the technical and financial operations. The rôle of the employers was reduced to a minimum. However, the efficiency of these controlled factories was certainly less than that of the socialized ones.

In Elda and the surrounding countryside, wages were retained. The type of economy made it necessary to carry on trade with other centres which had not all been socialized which implied finance.

There was also an agrarian community in Elda. Some of the fields belonged to smallholders.

The two agrarian syndicates of the U.G.T. and the C.N.T. were in agreement as to the requisitioning of the estates abandoned by the fascists. An administrative commission was nominated, consisting of delegates of the two organisations, each of which was about 250 strong. This met regularly. Ninety-three estates had been socialized. These were dispersed among the lands of individual peasants and smallholders, and consequently the land was divided up into thirteen zones. Each had a delegate, who kept the administrative commission informed of the data necessary for the organisation of the agriculture. The thirteen delegates met whenever necessary to make decisions, and to arrange with the committee as to the number of workers required in the various localities. The members of this collective did not work always in the same place, but moved from place to place according to the information they received as to the greater or lesser urgency of particular work.

The general line of policy was decided by the assemblies, which had the task of arranging the plan of work with the committee, and approving or disapproving of its policy. In this way, centralization and the danger of a hierarchy were avoided.

The agricultural community set up a distribution centre, in which provisions of the various types of produce were deposited, and from which all the workers could take their requirements. The collective proposed to set up others as soon as its resources permitted. There was a shortage of water. The collective had made plans for the sinking of a well in the near future. It required the outlay of 100,000 pesetas, but after that everything would have been easier.

From—"Né Franco né Stalin. Le collettività anarchiche spagnole nella lotta contra Franco e la reazione staliniana", by Gaston Leval.

(Translated by P.H.)

## Non-Violence and the Revolution

(1)

THE theories of Bart de Ligt are somewhat outside the main stream of libertarian thought, and he himself is regarded as something of a curiosity. There are in fact virtually only two books in English, with a wide circulation, which deal with the subject of non-violence in general terms, his own *The Conquest of Violence*, and Richard Gregg's *The Power of Non-Violence*. There are of course numerous writings of various sorts on, or by, Gandhi, but only these two works deal with non-violence as such\*.

In the East the peasants have often resorted to non-violent methods of resisting native despots, and foreign conquerors. Partly no doubt because of religious reasons, but partly because the longer establishment of tyranny there than in the West had taught them that it was the only effective method. In Europe, on the other hand, it is not a way of rebelling that is much favoured, probably because despotic civilisations have not existed there so long. Until the beginning of our era most of Europe was in a state of barbarism, and after the Roman Empire collapsed it speedily returned to that condition. Barbarian tribes flourished in out of the way parts of Europe, the Highlands, the Balkans, etc., until almost the present day. Generally speaking such people could defend themselves by violence, and preserve their independence that way. They were not unarmed peasants, with no chance for military experience, but every man amongst them was a trained warrior. Although non-violent methods of resistance have been used in Europe with success, the barbaric past is too close, and the tradition of violence is much stronger.

But even in those countries where non-violence was used it was not generally coupled with what might justly be called a "revolutionary" aim. It was used against specific injustices, not to alter the social system fundamentally. Gandhi and his followers had too authoritarian an attitude to be real revolutionaries, and their success in "getting the British out of India" has not been followed up in the way it should have been. Politicians such as Nehru have blithely abandoned the teachings of the

\*Unluckily for himself and his ideas Gandhi has become a second Jesus to his admirers. Moreover his philosophy is strongly anti-life, and opposed to the desires of the flesh. With him the renunciation of violence was but a part, if an important part, of his general renunciation of carnal desires. He did once say, "Non-violence is the law of our species, as violence is the law of the brute." But the general tone of his philosophy was not consistent with this statement. He seems to have regarded violence as part of human nature to be crushed by will-power and religion.

Master, some with frank joy, others with apologies, and both India and Pakistan now have navies and armies like all other countries.

The problem of the revolution lies in this. It will not spread all over the world at once. Therefore the various local risings, even if they cover a whole country, will be faced by attacks from outside, and sabotage from within.

In this country the problem is merely theoretical. The chances of a revolution here are, to put it mildly, rather slight just at present, and in point of fact, while favouring in theory violent methods, the anarchist movement does not put them into practice for lack of means. In fact it practises a sort of non-violent *fait de mieux*. In countries like Spain the problem is very practical, for there secret fighting organisations are built up, and revolution is always a possibility.

By resisting by violence the revolu-

tionary is playing the statist's game. This is never more clear than before the actual revolution breaks out. The secret society is one of the most terrible institutions devised by man, and also often one of the most inefficient. If the organisation is centralised it is only necessary for one police spy to get into an important position in it for the whole to be ruined. Unfortunately the work of secret societies and resistance movements tends to attract certain kinds of neurotic and unstable characters, who may become traitors, or give away secrets without meaning to.

Gandhi made a point of informing the British of his every move before he made it. This may have been carrying things too far. He was dealing with a (relatively, very relatively) gentlemanly opponent. But it is the right outlook to have on this question. Under the Nazi régime, though strikes and such open

Continued on p. 4

### THEATRE

## FREEDOM OF THOUGHT

MR. TED ALLAN'S "The Ghost-writers" at the Arts Theatre Club, is a play of the times. Its setting is Hollywood at the height of the witch-hunt. There is not only the usual joggling for positions, the bribery, blackmail and corruption, that we have come to associate with the film city, but hanging over it all is the much more ominous shadow of the Investigation Committee for Un-American Activities. The hysteria of the big film magnates trying to play safe with a body that considers Robin Hood to have been a dangerous communist, "because he robbed the rich to give to the poor", is shown by such means as hidden microphones, tape recorders, informers, tapped telephones and the rest. One of the characters in the play refers to this red-hot sunny spot as "a putrid orange grove!"

The central character, or I should say the one most constantly on the stage, is Paul Finch, a totally unscrupulous film producer, who in his efforts to get to the top is suddenly faced with the fact that one of his best script-writers is suspected of being a communist. He cajoles a young Canadian author, Mike Bedford, fresh from his native shores, into putting his name to the blacklisted man's scripts. For this service he is of course paid fabulous sums of money. The young Canadian, newly married and in debt is bent on making money quickly to be free of drudgery and get down to writing what he wants to say. When he begins to find his way in this newly discovered jungle he threatens, in his wife's words, to become sucked in and his marriage nearly founders.

Nick Lovell, the suspect communist who is barred from the studios though he has no communist sympathies is deter-

mined at the cost of his career, to bring his case into the open court and defend his right of free speech as an American citizen. His bosses one by one offer him large sums of money to keep the case out of court to avoid a blaze of scandal and adverse publicity, but he stands his ground in his one-man battle.

Neither of these two authors however have a chance to hold our interest for long enough, as the play is monopolized by the ruthless producer. (We have met him before, and he runs to pattern). He pops in and out of the action like a drunken Mephistophiles with an overbearing display of charms and smooth patter. Unfortunately, Mr. George Coulouris who plays him is visibly embarrassed by the mere bulk of the part and the intricacies inherent in it. His performance is jerky, a sort of delayed shock to the ear and eye, it can hardly be called stagey even in the derogatory sense. He makes us long for a scene to be played without him especially as the two young authors, Gordon Tanner, as the Communist suspect, and Jerry Stovin as the young Canadian freshman in Hollywood have an engaging ease and simplicity that immediately endears them to us. Alas, the big show-down between these two never comes, though it rears its head for a second at the end of Act 2, scene 1. And so we feel cheated for the rest of the play.

The fault is one of construction, a diffusion of interest. There are too many side-issues, the play is over involved and at times obscure. The trouble with Mr. Allan is not that he has not enough, but too much to say and tries to get it all off his chest in one play. He calls his play "a monstrous comedy", but the picture of big business threatened by the tag

of a red label, and the fight of the individual for freedom of speech and belief in his principles is a serious one, and one that calls for a more consistently serious treatment.

The two wives are most sympathetically played by Jill Melford and Andrée Melly, and the sketchy part of the informer (Lew Davidson) an unsuccessful but ambitious nonentity willing to stoop to any depth is wholly convincing. Any one of these six characters holds enough material for the basis of a play and I wish Mr. Allan had stuck by one or other of them and pruned away the irrelevant cross-talk. His dialogue is always lively and stimulating. He holds our interest up to the end, or very nearly, for in the end we are caught up in an even thicker mesh of lies and intrigue with our producer vainly trying to extricate himself from a sticky situation. But by then our two authors have gone off hand-in-hand, accompanied by their wives to fight in the cause of freedom, and we have digressed too much even to care about bringing our producer to heel. He will, we feel continue to turn, like a non-stop grinding gramophone record.

I am grateful to Mr. Allan for raising a serious issue which has been smouldering angrily for too long, and look forward to seeing more of his plays. His faults are all encouraging.

The production, by Bernard Braden is a little ragged, but the music(?) which takes the curtain up and down at the beginning and end of each act should be cut out.

It is an unmelodious jazzy crooning blared from a loudspeaker, disturbing the curtain lines, always important, and starts each act in a wrong key. D.



## HANGING RELIEVED

Continued from p. 1

appetite, the satisfactions of which must have some effect on unstable personalities . . .

This enjoyment for the literature dealing with crime . . . and a peculiar form of sex, is further reflected in the millions of copies of horror comics, paper backs and the special weekly editions of some of our dailies. If one is to judge by their huge sales one can conclude that "public opinion" favours them. Yet as a result of pressure from minority groups, such as the Church and the teaching profession, the government is now drafting new legislation whereby it will be an offence to write, publish, print and sell such publications. "Public opinion" in this instance is not taken into account. It is being saved from itself; it is being uplifted by order!

★

AT this point in the argument it might be said that the Anarchist will find himself faced with a dilemma, for we oppose all governments on the grounds that they are never the expression of the people (except incidentally and often for the wrong reasons) and yet as Mr. Chuter Ede and others have pointed out, none of the great penal reforms of the last century would have been carried on a plebiscite.

Let us in passing point out, not for the first time, that governments have never, so far as we know, initiated progressive legislation, but rather have only taken such action when outside pressure was so strong or influential that it was no longer considered politically expedient or otherwise to resist. Anarchists, whose anarchism is not simply an intellectual day-dream, but a broad concept of a way of life which will lead to more happiness and less misery, are, if anything, more interested in the present than in some distant future. For this reason we cannot ignore the fact that, even ruling-out at present the possibility of any revolutionary situation arising, certain measures of reform can be hastened by intelligent agitation. That they make the present economic and political system neither more palatable nor revolutionary goes without saying. But such reforms can mean a great deal of difference (for good) in the lives of some of our fellow beings, as well as helping to prepare the ground for new ways of thought among a much larger section of the population. Let us use the issue of Capital Punishment to illustrate the foregoing.

The *Times* (10/2/55) in an editorial notes that

Among the many people who have strong views on the subject it is probable that the opponents of the death penalty have the numerical advantage; but they have not the predominance which would overbear the passive conservatism of those who demand overwhelming proof that this immemorial deterrent, supposedly a unique protection of innocent life, has become superfluous.

The advocates of abolition should carefully note these words, for it seems to us that it is now time for them to consider whether they have not defeated their ends by obscuring the real issue—that the death penalty should be abolished because it is a barbarous practise—in concentrating their efforts on seeking to prove that it is no longer an effective deterrent and should on those grounds be abolished. For such an argument, as Sir Frank Soskice pointed out in his admirable speech, can lead to even worse horrors than hanging

I do not believe that the fact that the death penalty may be a good deterrent is, of itself, necessarily and alone suffi-

## HOW THE PRESS INTERPRETED THE MALENKOV BOMBSHELL or THE NEWSPAPER GAME

ON Tuesday, February 8, the news came through that Malenkov had resigned, and on Wednesday the newspapers indulged in an orgy of speculation. All the papers gave this news a great deal of space; the more responsible ones with texts of Malenkov's letter of resignation and Krushchev's speech, the less responsible with inspired guesswork in bold type.

Most of the papers saw the resignation as another round in the fight for absolute power (*Daily Herald*: 'Russian power struggle is titanic'), with the exception, of course, of the *Daily Worker*:

'Anyone who regards the Government changes, and particularly the calm and businesslike statement of Malenkov, as evidence of a crisis in the Soviet Union is making a tremendous mistake.'

By general agreement Krushchev was conceded to be the winner, mainly by virtue of his still holding office as first secretary of the Communist Party—so long Stalin's post of power—and of proposing Bulganin for Prime Minister. A *Times* headline said 'Mr. Krushchev now dominant' and also that he 'evidently sees himself in a powerful non-Ministerial position secure as secretary to the party, rather as Stalin was in the middle period

of his rule'; the *Sketch*—'the real boss of Russia is Krushchev; the *Herald*—'already emerging as the real leader of the Soviet Union to-night is 60-year-old Nikita Krushchev'; the *Mail*—'the appointment . . . puts supreme power squarely in the hands of Nikita Krushchev'. However not all the papers were so sure. The *Express*, for example, qualified the statement that 'the real power of life and death over Russia's 200 million people now rests in [Krushchev's] hands' with 'many observers believe'; the *Mirror* assumed that Bulganin now holds the reins of power and captioned a photograph of him with 'Marshal Bulganin . . . Russia's new boss'; the *Telegraph* rather obscurely said that Krushchev's proposal of Bulganin 'was also a demonstration that he, Mr. Krushchev, had hastened to throw in his lot with the new rules' without saying who the new rulers might be.

Some papers were not content with attributing the chief power to an individual but also wanted to find out what power was behind him (this form of speculation has endless possibilities!) the *Telegraph* and the *Herald* thought that the Army is behind Krushchev: 'It means that the Soviet Army and those, like Marshal Bulganin, who derive their power from the armed forces, have won the battle for power in the Kremlin'; and 'Up goes Marshal Bulganin. At such crises of instability the régime needs to make sure of support from the Army.'; The *Times* was cautious:

'Some may see army influence and support behind the appointment. No doubt Bulganin has the good will of many soldiers, but he is not first and foremost a soldier himself. He remains the party man and the administrator'; while the *Manchester Guardian* thought that the Army may be behind Malenkov—

'Malenkov is believed to have had the support of the Army in ousting Beria. He may still have it, and the Army may be biding its time.'

The *Mail* expressed another view—'Was Malenkov, after all, no more than Krushchev's creature? It looks like it . . .'

And it is on these grounds that the death penalty will in due course be abolished, and not as a result of water-tight arguments and statistics and cold-blooded logic, which could to advantage be applied to many other problems of the day, but hardly to the question as to whether a barbarous practice such as judicial murder should be retained or not.

★

THE abolition of the death penalty (and FREEDOM has advocated its abolition not only for murder but also for military and political "crimes"\*) will save a few murderers from the gallows each year, but it will also represent one step forward in that process of removing violence and force as the foundations on which our society is built. To-day the whole thought processes of the majority of the people are conditioned by force and violence. There is no reason to doubt that their removal from social relations will be accompanied by a revolution in our ways of thinking and of living together. It may prove the death of the *News of the World* and most of our Sunday Press, but we have no doubt that their place will be taken by more worthy exponents of what is best in journalism!

The anarchists' "dilemma" to which we referred earlier does not in fact exist. We support abolition of the death penalty for all the reasons given above and because it will mean one law less! We do not support the Bill recently introduced to ban Horror Comics, "obscene" books and the like because we are opposed to censorship and censors; because it is sheer hypocrisy to ban Horror Comics in a world of real horrors and real violence; because, just as hanging a murderer is society's easy way 'out of facing its responsibility for these products of our society, so threatening the purveyors of printed horror is society's easy way out from solving the problem of why there is such a demand for this muck; and finally, because it would be one law more!

\*See the article *Ritual Murder* in FREEDOM, Oct. 3, 1953 reprinted in *Selections from Freedom*, Vol. 3, pp. 63/4.

of his rule'; the *Sketch*—'the real boss of Russia is Krushchev; the *Herald*—'already emerging as the real leader of the Soviet Union to-night is 60-year-old Nikita Krushchev'; the *Mail*—'the appointment . . . puts supreme power squarely in the hands of Nikita Krushchev'.

However not all the papers were so sure. The *Express*, for example, qualified the statement that 'the real power of life and death over Russia's 200 million people now rests in [Krushchev's] hands' with 'many observers believe'; the *Mirror* assumed that Bulganin now holds the reins of power and captioned a photograph of him with 'Marshal Bulganin . . . Russia's new boss'; the *Telegraph* rather obscurely said that Krushchev's proposal of Bulganin 'was also a demonstration that he, Mr. Krushchev, had hastened to throw in his lot with the new rules' without saying who the new rulers might be.

Some papers were not content with attributing the chief power to an individual but also wanted to find out what power was behind him (this form of speculation has endless possibilities!) the *Telegraph* and the *Herald* thought that the Army is behind Krushchev: 'It means that the Soviet Army and those, like Marshal Bulganin, who derive their power from the armed forces, have won the battle for power in the Kremlin'; and 'Up goes Marshal Bulganin. At such crises of instability the régime needs to make sure of support from the Army.'; The *Times* was cautious:

'Some may see army influence and support behind the appointment. No doubt Bulganin has the good will of many soldiers, but he is not first and foremost a soldier himself. He remains the party man and the administrator'; while the *Manchester Guardian* thought that the Army may be behind Malenkov—

'Malenkov is believed to have had the support of the Army in ousting Beria. He may still have it, and the Army may be biding its time.'

The *Mail* expressed another view—'Was Malenkov, after all, no more than Krushchev's creature? It looks like it . . .'

## The "Screws" are Fed-up

THAT seldom thought of, but vital support of respectability, the prison officer, is not getting a square deal from his employer. It appears that the State has been economising on the Prison Service by cutting down various concessions which had been granted in earlier years to make the Service more attractive to the would-be recruit: presumably banking on the apathetic attitude of the public for the economies to be made without undue fuss. This complaint of governmental cheese-paring and a general complaint about conditions are made in an article in the current issue of the "Prison Officers' Magazine".

This article states that officers have been losing their sense of vocation (*sic*) after the Prison Commissioners 'ably abetted by the Treasury, started to trim away those little concessions formerly enjoyed by officers'.

'We saw abolished, or reduced, the privileges in respect of gas, medical attention, the purchases of articles made in prisons and Borstals and of fruit grown in open Borstals, the purchase of bread and other similar privileges. This is not a purely mercenary outlook, for apart from the small saving that an officer made by these privileges, he got a feeling that he really belonged to the Service, a feeling of comradeship. So, when the commissioners started to cut away the little ties that created this bond, they were also doing their best to kill this feeling of *esprit de corps*'.

Not only has the government attacked these 'perks', but now an officer has to give up half of his subsistence allowance if he sleeps on government property 'even for a hard bed in a prison cell'. It also seems likely that his leave rates may be reduced and that he will have to work another five years before he gets his pension.

The article claims to be an answer to the question 'What is wrong with our prisons to-day?' and the author concludes with the rather dubious statement that 'a penal system can only be as good as the morale of its staff'. To put it mildly this is rather a one-sided view of what is wrong with our prisons; whilst one may sympathise with those who are trying to better working conditions, when it is a matter of prison officers one can only wish that they were out of work. There is only one answer to the question asked and that is: 'Prisons'.

Malenkov's letter of resignation was the 'meat' of the news from Moscow and provided the basis for most of the speculation. The *Manchester Guardian* referred to the letter as 'grovelling', the *Telegraph*—'the meaningless reasons which Mr. Malenkov gave for resigning', and most of the other papers in a similar vein, but *The Times* detected

'a note of sincerity in the letter that was read on his behalf, while he sat stock still and silent, in the Supreme Soviet yesterday morning, and these professed reasons for the news that suddenly swept the world may be accepted as valid up to a point.'

Some of the differences in interpretation appear to be due to the use of different English translations. The translation used by the *Telegraph* seems to offer more scope for criticism of the kind one expects from Fleet Street than, for instance, that used by *The Times* and the *Guardian*. The *Telegraph*, anxious to prove that Malenkov's letter was not to be taken at its face value, pointed out that

'During the war he was responsible for organising supplies to the Army. After the war he headed the committee in charge of rebuilding the occupied territories. It was on the basis of his success in these fields that he became Prime Minister.'

His statement that he "did not have occasion, in a ministry of some economic body, to have direct control of particular branches of the national economy" thus makes nonsense.'

But according to the text given in *The Times* and the *Guardian*, he said

'I had had no experience of directly administering a given branch of the national economy at a level of a Ministry or a directorate.'

A much more precise statement and one which the *Telegraph's* criticisms do not refute. Similarly, the *Telegraph* quoted Malenkov as saying

'that he expected "bourgeois hysterical viragos" to produce "slandrous inventions" about his resignation. But, he said, "We Communists and Soviet people will ignore this lying and slander".'

Whereas *The Times* gave

'It can be expected that various bourgeois cliques will raise hysterical voices over my present statement . . . But we, Communists and Soviet people, will ignore this lying slander.'

—which is several degrees milder.

Several papers claimed to have foreseen Malenkov's demotion. The *Chronicle*, under a headline 'He scooped the world', said 'On January 10, in a brilliant analysis of the struggle in the Kremlin "splashed" on this page, Forrest wrote: Krushchev appears to have decided that now or never is the time for him to grasp the mantle of Stalin'; the *Mail* was a little more modest—in August 1954 the *Daily Mail* reported the collapse of the gigantic plans for cultivating Siberia, and said: "The crisis may cause a split in the Soviet hierarchy." It has come'; Candidus in the *Sketch*, rather less modestly, said "The news of Malenkov's downfall gives me the biggest horse laugh since Tito shot the coop. But it also gives me a lot of personal satisfaction, for it is just what I expected, although the news is bad. My tip has come up.'

★

The most bizarre treatment of the news was undoubtedly that of the *Sketch*, which, angled to present the "human interest" angle at all costs, devoted its front page to a story that Malenkov was only saved from the firing squad by his wife.

'Why wasn't Malenkov liquidated instead of being put up before Russia's supreme assembly to confess his sins and humbly step down as boss of the Kremlin's 250,000,000 subjects?'

A woman may hold the key to this riddle. She is Malenkov's wife Elena, a former actress—and the sister of Russia's new and tougher boss, Nikita Krushchev.

Elena, it is thought, interceded with her brother to spare her husband's life . . .

This was accompanied by a picture of Mrs. Malenkov. No evidence was produced to support the story: a note in the *Mirror*—possibly getting in a dig at a rival—said 'It has often been reported that [Krushchev's] sister is the wife of Malenkov—but this was recently denied.'

Perhaps the newspaper reaction to Malenkov's fall can best be summed up in the words of the *Daily Telegraph* leader 'Why Marshal Bulganin now sits in Stalin's chair, we can only guess.'

M.G.W.

There is a growing realisation that all is not well with the condition of our prisons in spite of the veils of secrecy with which the government surrounds the question. A correspondent writing in *The Manchester Guardian* says:

### PRISON CONDITIONS

'For eighteen hours a day we continue to keep hundreds of prisoners in solitary confinement, during which time little or no attempt is made to reclaim or reform characters who, having completed their sentences, will be released to continue their waywardness in our outer society. Perhaps the degradation of the squalor of our prisons is just one feature deliberately imposed as part of the punitive side of the prisoners' treatment, but it can have nothing but a harmful effect on its victims. Whatever the crimes of the prisoners may have been, it does not excuse our indifference to their welfare, and the ignorance of those who have never had anything to do with prisons is a sad commentary on our claim that we know something of what is done in our name.'

It is time the appalling conditions in our prisons were made public so that more and more of us can make them our concern.'

The bad conditions of our prisons are not helped by their being administered by dissatisfied prison officers. Undoubtedly there is a clear case for the reformers in both these directions: but it will require more than reform to remove 'the canker within our body politic'. Prisons will not lose their essential character by a change of form, although many of the great prison reformers have thought so. When Pentonville prison was built in the 1840's it was acclaimed as a model prison and many people imagined that it provided the final answer to the problem of deterring the criminal. But the conditions of our 'open' prisons to-day are as far removed from prison conditions in the 1840's as they are in their turn from the Newgate of the eighteenth century; and yet within the structure of a governmental society, we are still no nearer to solving the problem of crime.

This is not to say that the knowledge and technique for a positive approach are lacking: they are not. Researches and discoveries in the fields of psychology and psycho-analysis have shown where the roots of crime lie, and yet we still

cling to the barbaric idea of retribution which plays so large a part in our system of law. We cannot expect the problem to be solved by any State, because in so doing the very foundation of government would be destroyed.

### POLICE RECRUITS DON'T WANT TO STAY ON

Another vital prop of law and order, the police force, is showing signs of sagging.

There have been several campaigns in recent years to recruit policemen and though there has been quite a big response it seems that the Force is not sufficiently attractive to keep the recruits for long. In 1953, 917 men left before completing their two years' probation.

According to 'a Police Officer' writing in *The Manchester Guardian* the police are now almost 8,000 below their authorised strength. Some of the reasons he gives for this are: 'shift-working, loss of social life entailed by round-the-clock working, and the few week-ends allowed. These may seem trivial complaints, until it is remembered that shift-working in industry and in police life bear no comparison. The former means five days or nights followed by the week-end break, but in police life night duty often runs on a three or four week cycle and one weekly leave day every eighth day.'

A week-end is allowed off only every seventh week, when the Saturday is taken as the day for the first week and Sunday as that for the second week.'

Apart from these complaints he goes on to say: 'Recruiting advertisements stress that senior ranks of the police service "are open to all", but this is like Mr. Justice Mathew's famous dictum about justice being open to all—"like the Ritz Hotel".'

It is also possible that some who may have been attracted initially by the good pay leave the police because they do not relish being 'a tool of authority'.

M.G.

### NATURE HITTING BACK?

Local authorities in different parts of the country have reported that the rabbit disease (myxomatosis) may help to increase the rat population.

(*The Star*, 9/2/55).



# POLITICAL GRAFT IN FRANCE

ODIOUS politics has once more altered the course of a grand debate on the fate of the nation," said Mendes-France, the deposed French Premier, to the gathered Assembly on the eve of his defeat.

Odious politics, bound up with innumerable financial, religious and political interests, was indeed altering the fate of the French nation, if not radically, at least, more people were going to suffer in a shorter time if the opposition regressed the attempts at reform introduced by Mendes-France in his short time in office.

To anarchists, the rise and fall of political parties and politicians, generally means nothing, in the sense of altering fundamentally the basis of the normal pattern of governmental society, but, even we have to admit that the colourful reign of Mendes-France has succeeded in exposing some of the graft connected with French politics—the more sordid aspects of which Mendes-France himself, as far as we can gather, seems to have been singularly clear.

Mendes-France enjoys a great deal of support among a large section of the French people (as a pointer to this it is reported that he has so far received 10,000 letters of sympathy and regret for his defeat, and his appearance in the cinema newsreels is loudly applauded). This is particularly noticeable in France where the antics of politicians are treated with a great deal of apathy and cynicism. But, among politicians, even those in his own party, he has engendered personal hatred as well as alarm at his technique of forcing decisions on controversial issues. Reliable commentators from Paris claim that he is intellectually above most of the French politicians, and this, coupled with his personal popularity, has added to his inevitable downfall.\*

Sam White, reporting from Paris in the *Evening Standard* suggests that there has also been a whisper of anti-semitism in the campaign against him.

There is little doubt that when he was voted into office at the time of the Dien Bien Phu crisis, as a back benchner he was expected by his fellow politicians to run the usual ineffectual course, and then to quietly drop out.

## Main Issues

The other issues on which opposition to him was based are German rearmament, and colonial and home policies. The final issue on which the no

\*The peculiarity of the constitutional process, denies to a defeated President of the Council the right to appeal to the country in an election.

confidence vote was taken was North Africa. Mendes-France, who by no means had the support of all his own party, had proposed negotiations for Tunisian self-rule, and some reforms for Algeria. This is certainly not a revolutionary step but was designed to attempt a compromise with the nationalist rebels some of whom were prepared to negotiate with Mendes-France. The French colonists, alarmed at the violence, but at the same time worried about their material interests, in the first instance supported Mendes-France in his Tunisian policies, "but after immediate pressure was reduced they were alarmed by the evident spread of what they called the nationalist 'infection' across the border to Algeria, where much mightier interests are involved."—(*Observer*, 6/2/55). Ex-Premier Rene Mayer, a member of Mendes-France's own party, who voted on issues which he now rejects and whose constituency is in Algeria was obviously called upon by the French nationalists to oppose France. He is an influential industrialist who, *Time* reports, is identified with the Rothschild interests.

We hear little of French Colonial rule, being so staggered and taken up with the British Colonies, but the pattern is as bad and in many cases much worse. It appears that the Mendes-France Government "discovered" when they took over, 5,000 political prisoners in Tunisia, and in Morocco there were prisoners who had been jailed for four years without even a charge against them and among whom had been discovered an eight-year-old child. Coupled with this is the recent report in a responsible weekly newspaper, *France Observateur*, of the brutal methods of the French police in Algeria. Claude Bourdet writes:

"Torture such as by electric shock inside the nose, under the armpits, to the sexual organs and the spinal cord is preferred because it does not leave any marks.

Nevertheless, he names four cases of nationalists who bore marks of physical assault when they eventually appeared in court.

Bourdet also describes conditions in what he calls the "French concentration camps". In the prison at Tizi-Ouzou, he says, 71 prisoners are crowded into a room of 105 square metres. They may not speak, even to say their prayers.

It is difficult to believe that Mendes-France did not know of the conditions prevailing in North Africa before he took office, although he has now replaced the head of the police in Algeria with a man known for his sympathies with the Algerian Nationalists.

James Cameron, writing angrily in the *News Chronicle*, draws attention to the

interest at work among the political parties:

"The Government was flung out, in a scene of noisy and savage triumph, for reasons that mainly had nothing to do with North Africa at all, but a great deal to do with the fact that this provided a foolproof opportunity of disowning a man because he was vigorous, determined and honest.

## Political Antics

The Catholic M.R.P., for example, actually announced that it agreed with Mendes-France over Africa—but would vote against him because they disapproved of him over Germany. The Communists voted against the very reforms they helped to advocate, because M.-F. wants to unite Europe. The Right wing opposed him because he stands for colonial reform. He was rejected by many of his own Radical Party because, for this reason or that, he was personally disliked. Finally the Algerian lobby pulled the trigger for the *coup de grace*.

Further, it is reported that the Communists privately asked by the Algerian nationalists to abstain from voting on the question of North Africa, but refused to do so because their "Muscovite allegiances came first". Another aspect of the North African struggle is the fact that some Algerian Nationalists were quite relieved that Mendes-France had been defeated. His policies tended to ease the tension and thus remove their main weapon with which to incite the people to rise.

As far as the political future of Mendes-France is concerned it would seem that his spell in office has, from the point of view of electoral support, enhanced his possibilities. The French General Elections take place next year, and the Socialists and many De Gaulists lead by Mendes-France have formed a bloc with which they hope to gain a few million votes from the Communists. The fact also that Mendes-France had raised the wages of industrial workers, and issued free milk to schoolchildren will be remembered by the electorate. His acceptance of some form of German rearmament which, he argued, would have taken place without French consent anyway, was an unpopular measure, but to some extent was cancelled out by the agreement of Britain to keep several divisions permanently in Europe. For some curious reason this is expected to safeguard against a resurgence of German militarism.

It is regretful that however honest a man Mendes-France may be, whatever support he may get in Parliament and from the people, he will be limited in his pursuit of reforms by the nature of politics and financial interests M.

# The Fascist Government of S. Africa

work in Nazism, as there is, to varying degree, in all patriotic creeds.\*

## Fear

In South Africa, the pathological aspect is, we believe, more significant than the economic. The Union is in no state of depression economically, nor anything like it. It is a prosperous state, with a working class well under control. There is no revolutionary movement among the Africans—hardly even the beginnings of trade unions as we know them in Britain. They have not got to be beaten down in order for the ruling class to survive—in fact more stability would come if the State were to operate more on the good old British model, giving concessions to the workers and thereby buying their support.

This, clearly, the South African ruling class is afraid to do. They look at the gradual advance of Africans in other parts of the continent—in West Africa, for example; they see, in Northern Rhodesia, organised African miners waging a struggle with their employers not only for increased wages but also for advanced status; they see in Kenya the Mau Mau carrying on its long-drawn-out and bloody battle with authority, and they are afraid that their own African subjects might begin to tread in some or all of these paths.

But there is more than that. The Afrikaners—the Boers—were defeated by the British, who seized control of South Africa. Gradually, they have worked their way back until now they have their own elected government with the declared intention of becoming a republic, free of domination by the British Crown. But their resentment over the years has worked its poison—not so much against the nation which defeated them, but against the people over whom they have retained power—the Africans.

All the time the defeated Boers have been able to feel superior to the people they defeated, until now, no doubt, they are convinced that they are in the natural order of things superior. Ex-Premier

Daniel Malan under whose leadership the Union took such large steps in the direction of totalitarianism, was never at a loss to provide Biblical quotes ('Hewers of wood and drawers of water') to show the God-ordained nature of inequality.

## Scapegoat in Majority

Under the prevailing conditions in South Africa, the scapegoat would not appear to be as necessary, on economic grounds, as has been the case elsewhere. The Communists, however, have provided one, and the Suppression of Communism Act has provided the Government with the means of suppression in any direction—as its invocation to ban meetings during the present re-settlement activity has shown. But whereas in Germany the Jew was in the minority, in South Africa the object of hate and fear—the African—is in the vast majority. Which does, of course, increase the fear. And the fact that the whole economy of the country depends upon the continued supply of cheap black labour, on the farms and in the mines, increases the hate. For all their much vaunted superiority,

## WHAT CAN THEY DO?

THE non-Europeans in South Africa are facing a terrible situation. Not only are their homes being bulldozed out of existence, but the new government plan for education is in fact a means of conditioning for permanent slavery.

The natural culture of Africans in the Union has for long been destroyed by white 'civilization'. They are a demoralised and unorganised people.

What can they do? It is easy to say 'Revolt' but in fact any revolution that took place now would be a violent, bloody and formless affair with no direction or social consciousness short of getting rid of the present government. If it were not drowned in blood, the result would only be that a power-seeking group would get into the saddle, with little real advantage for South Africa's workers.

The task facing them (and us!) is to

the whites depend upon the blacks.

Nor can guilt be far below the consciousness of the white South African. Malan's version of Christianity has found scant support outside the Union (such Christians as might agree in principle, like General Franco, being prevented on doctrinal grounds, being a Catholic, from expressing agreement openly) and is clearly an attempt at rationalisation. But why try to rationalise if there is no feeling of guilt? Attempts to clear African locations from the proximity of European neighbourhoods is also to be interpreted as an attempt to hide the crime of African standards of living in the City of Gold. The Nazi concentration camps were kept well out of the way of the ordinary population, who could pretend they did not exist. It becomes increasingly difficult to the white inhabitants of Johannesburg to ignore or explain away the ghastly African slums right on their doorstep. So they will be shifted well out of sight.

The Africans in South Africa have for long provided the one product of fascist régimes: the displaced person. The Nationalist Party has caught up with him and now belatedly provides the typical fascist government. P.S.

build up organisations of resistance on consciously revolutionary lines, but this is a long-term policy. Their immediate need is for solidarity from all possible quarters, to make an attempt to minimise their suffering now.

There are already several committees, and their attendant funds in existence, mostly dominated by Christians. The one anarchists would probably prefer to support has as Trustees: Canon Collins, Reg Sorensen, M.P., Anthony Greenwood, M.P., and George Doughty (Sec. A.E.S.D.), the Secretary is Solly Sachs, the South African trade unionist forced to leave the country.

The fund they have launched, to assist African organisation, is:  
FUND FOR AFRICAN DEMOCRACY,  
6, Endsleigh Street, London, W.C.1.  
Further details can be obtained from this address.

# Non-Violence & the Revolution

Continued from p. 2

manifestations of resistance could succeed, underground movements were impossible in Germany. Revolutionaries, even when they resist violently, are rarely as cruel as their opponents, but by accepting some of their opponents' methods they weaken their own case. In "1984" one of the methods used by O'Brien to break down Winston Smith was to play back to him a record of all the things he had agreed to do on joining the secret revolutionary society. They included throwing acid in a baby's face. O'Brien was in the right for once, and of course he made the most of it. Such barbarities are the product of underground movements and their constant fear of betrayal and double-dealing.

Organisation prior to a non-violent revolution might have to be secret, but without the element of brutality and terror that preparation for a violent rebellion entails. However the less secrecy the better.

At this point someone usually asks about the Jews in Germany, "What would they do?" he enquires. It is difficult to see how any form of resistance, violent or otherwise, could have saved them. Had they fought they would have been killed just the same. The only thing that could have saved them was public opinion, and public action, inside Germany if possible, but certainly outside. Even the most totalitarian governments fear public opinion. But the vast mass of the people of Europe and the rest of the world were apathetic, and nothing much was done.

I am not suggesting that a non-violent struggle will be a short or easy affair. It will be as long drawn out and as hard as a violent conflict. I believe that it is more likely to be successful, but that does not mean that it will necessarily succeed always. Probably though, the amount of bloodshed will be much less, and large numbers who would have perished in a fight will survive to carry on the struggle.

The non-violent campaign, carried on in South Africa not so long ago against racial segregation, I have often heard described as a failure. If that were so then the anarchist movement itself is a failure, for after 150 years it has not yet established anarchy. The idea evidently seems to be that a method must

work perfectly the first time it is used, and that if it does not succeed at once then it is worthless, and must be rejected in favour of the violent method that has not succeeded in bringing about a revolution yet, unless it has done so by means of dictatorship and horrors worse than the ancien régime.

We are too much obsessed by the idea of "the final conflict", and the idea of a revolution that may take at most a few years. But it is likely to take much longer than that. If non-violent means of struggle take as long as violent ones to achieve success, or even longer, there would still be much to be said for choosing them. However, I believe that they will be found to be quicker and more efficient, not less.

In subsequent articles I shall discuss a few cases of the successful use of non-violence, and suggest ways in which an anarchist revolution may be carried on without resort to fighting, which would I feel involve a central command, and rigid, or fairly rigid discipline, which would poison the revolution at its source.

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)  
FEB. 20—Claudio Veliz on  
TYPES OF FASCISM TO-DAY  
FEB. 27—Emile Boin on  
TAOISM AND ANARCHISM  
MAR. 6—Tony Weaver on  
MATERNAL CARE AND MENTAL HEALTH  
MAR. 13—H. McLaughlin on  
WILL MACHINES RULE THE WORLD?  
MAR. 20—Bob Green  
(Subject to be announced).  
**INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS**  
Every Thursday at 8.15.

**OPEN AIR MEETINGS**  
Weather Permitting  
**HYDE PARK**  
Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

**N.W. LONDON HAMPSTEAD**  
at 27 Christchurch Hill,  
Hampstead, N.W.3.  
Discussions Meetings Mondays  
at 8 p.m.  
FEB. 21.—Derek Orlans on  
THE LUNATIC FRINGE.  
Correspondence to:  
Alan M. Bain, 8 Riffel Road,  
Cricklewood, N.W.2.

**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**  
Wednesday, Feb. 23, at 8.30 p.m.  
**BOOK REVIEW** by Mani Obahigbon:  
"Reflections on Violence",  
by Georges Sorel.  
Saturday, Feb. 26, at 9 p.m.:  
Anarchist Film Festival.  
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 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.  
**PHILIP SANSOM :**  
*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.  
**SELECTIONS FROM FREEDOM**  
*Vol. 1, 1951, Mankind is One* paper 7s. 6d.  
*Vol. 2, 1952, Subscriptio to Humanity* 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.

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

## PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 6

Deficit on Freedom	£90
Contributions received	£131
<b>SURPLUS</b>	<b>£41</b>
<b>February 4 to February 10</b>	
Miami: Picnic Jan. 23, per P.S. £8/15/0;	
Gt. Bookham: M.D. £1/6/0; London: D.M.*	
5/-; London: J.S.* 3/-; London: Anon. 1/9;	
London: Anon. 1/10; London: G.L.S.	
£1/10/0; Hyde Park: P.C. 2/-; San Francisco:	
Committee to aid Freedom Press, per A.G.	
£20/2/6.	
Total	32 7 1
Previously acknowledged	99 10 2
<b>1955 TOTAL TO DATE</b>	<b>£131 17 3</b>

## 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