

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"Authority and no truth seem to go together; as also truth and no authority."

—BERTOLT BRECHT
("Galileo").

Vol. 17, No. 34

August 25th, 1956

Threepence

THE EOKA TRUCE STATEMENT

New Development in Cyprus?

WITHIN the last few weeks Egypt has stolen the headlines from the struggle which is being waged in Cyprus against British occupation. As crisis replaces crisis that which has gone before is pushed into the background and attention is focussed on the immediate issue.

The EOKA movement in Cyprus has realised the importance of world opinion towards their aspirations, especially in those countries where there is a strong nationalism, and by use of militant methods have kept attention until recently on their struggle. They have therefore lost an important weapon in the eyes of the world in having a vital issue like Suez take the place of their own crisis.

It would seem likely that this is one of the reasons why the swashbuckling leader of EOKA, Digenis, has issued a statement ordering suspension of activities to give both sides a chance to discuss a solution without further bloodshed. But just as important is the reaction of the population against violence directed by EOKA against numbers of Greek Cypriots suspected of giving information to the British authorities.

The recent killing of a young man on the eve of his wedding to a Greek girl was exploited to the full by the British. The case was given wide publicity, and in a broadcast by Cyprus radio the young woman, Drosoulla Demetriades, from a carefully prepared script said: "Terrorists get out. I am not afraid of you any more." The emotional appeal of this on a population whose sympathies are with the nationalists' struggle but whose lives are restricted by military occupation with its accompanying fears should not be underestimated.

Doubts as to the wisdom of violent opposition to the British which will have been in the minds of the population and the romantic appeal of a shot lover adds to the loss of support for violence.

On the other hand many innocent and "guilty" Cypriots have been held by the British in prison under deplorable conditions, and to tip the balance of the emotional scale in favour of EOKA, three young Greek Cypriots were hanged last week (by a hangman specially flown from England), condemned for ambushing a British army jeep and killing its driver. A gesture on the part of the three, while still in prison, will appeal to the imagination of many, even if it was

made with a view to being released.

A 78-year-old retired British civil servant who now teaches English to Cypriot children was picked up on a street in Nicosia and held by EOKA on threat of death pending the release of the three youths. An appeal from the prisoners asked for his release whatever the decision taken on their lives by the British authorities, and as a result the Englishman was allowed to go free. But the young men were still hanged, to the accompaniment of the words of a British Official: "EOKA terrorists are not entitled to think themselves humane or magnanimous." (Incidentally this report came from an American paper, not British).

We suggested some time ago in FREEDOM that the British Government was considering the possibility of bringing Makarios to London to negotiate over Cyprus, but having made the blunder of exiling him it would mean considerable loss of face to be forced by 'terrorists' into such a move. The speed at which the British Government has taken up the proposal of the EOKA cease fire which included the condition of discussion with Makarios, indicate that the martyred priest may be triumphantly reinstated sooner than he thought.

Meantime the drafting of a new "liberal constitution" for Cyprus is to be speeded up by Lord Radcliffe, who recently paid an abortive visit to Cyprus, and who said on his return that it would take him three months to complete the job of drafting a constitution.

Until recently EOKA appeared to be intransigent, and apart from the considerations which we have mentioned as possible factors in the suspension of the armed struggle, it is obvious that no movement whose main weapon is a guerilla type violence can be sustained indefinitely.

What must be considered is what has

been gained as a result of the methods adopted by EOKA.

It seems obvious that little will be wrung from an Imperialist power without a fight, except where it is in the interests of the power to concede a degree of self-government voluntarily, as for example in Nigeria.

The Greek Cypriots have forced the British Government into accepting some of their claims, but, will Cyprus from now on cease to be a military base? The need for it has not lessened but increased since Nasser's move over Suez. Can it be that the Cypriots have decided to risk their island being turned into an atom bomb target, or do they hope to negotiate first on the immediate issue of a constitution which would include the British, and then at a later date press for complete self-determination?

Britain cannot give up its claim to Cyprus, so, short of another armed struggle where there must be a vanquished and a conqueror, the Cyprus people must face the consequences of a peaceful settlement. The alternative is for the people to carry on the struggle, but for this they must be united and the process of disunity is already taking place.

We do not advocate the use of violence as a method, but very often the only answer to a military force, equipped and trained, is the guerilla and terrorist method used by the Cypriots.

The soldier runs an occupation risk, and if he does not like being shot at the answer is to contract out; we have therefore very little sympathy for 'our boys' who face death in the various corners of the world into which Britain has forced herself.

We do not suppose that the Cypriots will be much better off under Makarios and his supporters than under the British, but if this is what the people want, then according to all the rules of democracy this is what they are entitled to have.

LONDON ANARCHISTS ON T.V.

ON the whole, anarchists and like-minded people tend to be somewhat snooty about TV—especially commercial TV. We deplore the downgrading of programmes in order to attract the widest possible audience (although there must come a time when programmes get so low that they drive people away rather than keep them watching!), and point to the dire consequences of bringing up generations of children who find their pleasures second-hand and instead of making their play themselves, sit glued to TV sets, thereby emulating their elders for whom conversation is becoming a dying art and independent thought a heresy.

From now on, however, self-interest and the ego being what they are, we shall probably look a little more kindly on this dread means of mass-hypnotism. For anarchists have appeared on TV!

A month or so ago the charming young ladies and gentlemen of Associated-Rediffusion came swooping into Hyde Park with their cameras at the ready. They were running a series, we gathered, called 'Look in on London' and they wanted to do a feature on Speakers' Corner.

Last Monday evening the films they took were telecast, and members of the London Anarchist Group were frantically checking up on all likely and unlikely acquaintances to find which of them were so philistine as to look in on Channel 9. All reputations remained unscathed, however, and finally we had to end up in various pubs.

How strange it was to see on that unfamiliar screen the familiar faces one sees each week at the Park. There was Solly of the London Forum, old 'Churchill', a cracked old heckler who wanders from platform to platform with a tittering crowd at his heels, Matthews holding forth from the Coloured Workers' platform, an Irish speaker, a brief moment with the S.P.G.B., and an interview with the Prime Minister of Hyde Park, Bonar Thompson, who gave an insight into the

life of one who lives by public speaking and of his own philosophy.

And then—the anarchists. First we saw comrade John Bishop, caught in full flight, expounding the case with the words 'London Anarchist Group' boldly standing out for all the viewing thousands to see. John was asked a question on the anarchist attitude to law and ably answered it by showing that there is no necessary connection between law and order, anarchists maintaining that people can live in an orderly way without laws to hold them down. Comrade Bishop's confident voice and manner were most convincing.

The second anarchist speaker was Rita Milton, who presumably had the added interest for viewers in that she was the only woman speaker shown in the Park. First from the platform, expressing the anarchist opposition to domination of people by any ruling groups, and then we saw comrade Milton being interviewed after the meeting by the producer Michael Ingrams, who asked her why she had become an anarchist.

Rita replied that although she had resisted the anarchist case when she first heard it in Glasgow, she soon became disillusioned with all the political parties and realised that only anarchism provided the answers to the problems of the world. She told the interviewer how she earned her living—earning enough to live on and still leave her time to work for the movement, for which all activity is voluntary and unpaid.

Asked about the strength of the movement, she had to admit that Britain had one of the smallest movements in the world, and managed to work in that joke about the anarchists holding their last conference in a telephone booth. But the producer agreed with her that it was quality that mattered, not quantity.

On the original film, Rita had worked in a small boost for FREEDOM, but, presumably because unpaid advertising is frowned upon on ITV, that was cut out of the eventual telecast.

What do the Politicians Mean by International Confidence?

IN his opening speech at the London Conference on Suez, Mr. Dulles declared that Colonel Nasser had struck a blow at "international confidence". Commenting on this the *Observer* writes:

Everywhere, the old methods of "imperialism"—of development by colonial Powers or foreign private companies—are becoming unacceptable to the peoples. Everywhere, the new nationalisms risk destroying confidence, and, by deterring both private and public foreign investment, retarding the development they are intended to foster. The only solution within sight lies in devising new organs of international action to guarantee the interests of all concerned.

It seems a pity that the *Observer*, which is one of the few national Sunday papers in which one can hope to find some common sense, does not extend its critical faculties to fundamentals, and bases its arguments on certain assumptions which, we submit, are false. The growth of nationalism in Africa and Asia is itself in part a consequence of the lack of confidence in the Great Powers whose interest in the underdeveloped countries of the world is motivated by economics and/or politics. We thought that, apart from the public utterances of politicians which no one takes at their face value, it was generally recognised that philanthropy was no part of the capitalist system. That one gets nothing for nothing is surely shown by the fact that the increased productivity in the world during the past ten years has very largely gone to raise the standard of living of the have-countries, whilst the other half of the world, which comprises the 1,000 million people of the have-not-countries, continue to live on the verge of starvation.

The poverty-stricken countries carry on scratching half a living from the soil by exhausting, primitive methods, just as they did a hundred or five hundred years ago. Such conditions and methods do not of course prevent the growth of a parasitic class.

It is in countries such as India, China and Egypt that some of the richest families in the world are to be found (and in the West it is significant that the greatest parade of wealth exists in such countries as Spain, Portugal, Italy and Greece where the poor are really poor by any standards. It is undoubtedly true that the standards of living in these "underdeveloped" countries of Africa and the Middle-East and Asia can be improved within the existing economic system by the elimination of the parasitic class. But it is only by using modern techniques—or at least by adapting them to local conditions—that real progress can be made. And to achieve this to-day in a world linked by lines of communication but divided by an economic nationalism is a matter of chance, for it depends on buried sources of raw materials and on the way the political wind is blowing. But since these countries have not the means to exploit the former or the power to determine the direction of the latter they can only hope to benefit from both by indirect pressures, which in some cases could be called blackmail. And though power politics and capitalist economics are just that, it is amusing to see that when these "colonial" nations seize their chance to give the Big Boys a dose of their own medicine they, who should be the last to protest,

Continued on p. 3

AMERICAN ELECTIONS

The Greatest Show on Earth

IT is difficult, even at the best of times, to generate any great respect for those American customs and institutions which are connected with the State; but at this particular time, as the elections approach, the American scene resembles nothing so much as a circus.

An enormous circus, with a cast of thousands, many millions of supporting players, a gigantic ring spread over three thousand miles of spectacular terrain, and sideshows at every conceivable vantage point—surely "the greatest show on earth".

The star of this particular show has not yet made an appearance. His name is Eisenhower, but he is not scheduled to appear until nearly the end. Meanwhile his would-be emulators busily jostle for position amidst uproarious throngs of the populace, surrounded by swirling eddies of limelight and the beating of big drums, for the chance to take his place.

All available tactics are permissible. No promise is left unpromised, no platitude remains unsaid. Any device for gaining popularity may be used with gay abandon, from the wearing of hilarious headgear to the indignant condemnation of policies previously supported. That

The anarchists, however, came out well in the feature. In the two shots of the platform the speakers could not fail to impress viewers with their reasoned and rational points. In the interview, Rita Milton (who is convinced she 'looked awful') must have persuaded the audience of the sincerity and integrity with which anarchists hold their views.

We apologise for not being able to advise readers beforehand when this film was to be shown. We did not know ourselves until two days before, after last week's FREEDOM was circulating.

which may be shouted defiantly in New York State, cannot be said above a whisper in Colorado, and its meaning must be completely altered in Georgia.

Last week the Democrats held their convention; they chanted "the hymn of inevitable victory":

Precious Lord—
Take our hand—
Lead us on!

The keynote speech was delivered by a rising young demagogue from Tennessee, Governor Frank Clement, 36-year-old master of rhetoric. Sample:

"How long, O how long, shall these Republican outrages endure? How long, O how long will Americans permit the national welfare to be pounced upon at home and gambled abroad? How long, O how long, will Republican roustabouts engage in a sideshow scramble for power and privilege?"

We ourselves remain unmoved, as will, in all probability, the Republicans.

Any time now will come the Republican convention; there will not be much difference, even by way of dialogue, excepting one or two changes of name and sense. Eisenhower's co-star (tricky Dick Nixon), will either be in or out. The policy remains the same for it is, after all, conducted by the same agency, situated in the environs of Wall Street, with sub-agencies in Texas (care of the oil-fields), the Pentagon building, and a handful of similar places.

As for the Democrats; Stevenson is elected as "man most likely to succeed". He has a touch of polish which the others have not got, he even appears to be a man with some principles. If he has, he will have to forget them, if not—so much the better. Democratic policy will remain the same. The same as it has always been, the same as the Republicans. Who will be President? Do you care?

A Ban on Colour

A colour bar resulted in the expulsion of 1,000 flowers from Parliament Square, Westminster, to-day.

Occupying four flowerbeds facing the Houses of Parliament were pink and mauve stocks and antirrhinums and standard fuchsias.

Their only offence, it seems, was that they were too colourful.

Four gardeners, working under the supervision of a Royal Parks' foreman, spent all morning uprooting them and replacing them with 500 bronze chrysanthemums from the Works Ministry nurseries at Richmond.

Said the foreman: "I was told to have the beds changed as M.P.s had objected that there was too much colour in them."

The Evening News.

HAVING read the above paragraph in the *Evening News*, one wonders how soon it will be before M.P.s legislate against the barbaric custom of enjoying colour. Even now it is about the only sensuous pleasure left to us to enjoy without State sanction.

Will the day dawn (grey dawns only), when gardeners can no longer grow *Pretiflora Gaypinkia*; when girls are arrested in the streets for emerging like butterflies every summer in gay cotton dresses, and Mr. Jones furtively draws his curtains before painting his walls a cheerful colour.

It seems M.P.s are so blind to the realities and beauties of life that they can't bear anyone else enjoying them, while they look forward to the time when light is abolished and we are all in mourning.

PEOPLE AND IDEAS

BERTOLT BRECHT

Galilei: (sleepily). Only by crawling on his stomach can an unpopular and troublesome man obtain a post where he will have sufficient time.

Brecht remained utterly loyal to the régime in power. His former friends could never believe that he did so from conviction.

UNHAPPILY Brecht has said his last word. If he was, like Galileo, playing for time, time has overtaken him and we shall never know what he had up his sleeve.

the Weimar Republic. "One might think", said an article in The Times which appeared on the very morning of the day he died, "there was a sort of conspiracy to boost this German playwright at any price".

Nothing is more dreary than listening to impressive phrases like 'Epic theatre', and 'Verfremdungseffekt' without having an authoritative demonstration of what they mean, and we shan't get that until next week.

BRECHT'S first works were the plays Baal (1920), Drums in the Night, In the City Jungle (1924), Man is Man (1927), and a collection of poems, taken largely from the plays, Die Hauspostille (1927).

stagnant pools, carrion, rotting wrecks—and the whole flora and fauna of decay: seaweed, moss and swamp vegetation, worms, maggots, rats, hyenas, vultures and sharks.

This kind of fascination of disgust is not rare in the experimental poets of that period, the aftermath of the First World War. What makes Brecht exceptional is in M. Lüthy's claim that

"all this is not morbid at all. Under a thin protective layer of wild posturing, it is really careless, joyous, and with genuine spiritual depth. What is presented here in the language of decomposition is the life-process itself, the great orgiastic metamorphosis of nature. It is a wholly vegetative sense of life, passive and thankful and full of a sense of brotherhood with plants and animals and everything transitory, a bitter and contented, a despairing and sensual drifting on the stream of being".

The effect of these poems, to judge from the French translations of the Ballad of the Friendliness of the World, the Chorale of the Man Baal and the Great Thanksgiving Chorale, is a large and receptive Whitmanesque acceptance of life. Let oneself drift, says Brecht, not swim. Of social criticism there is none, except in a negative sense in Drums in the Night where the 'dead soldier', back from the war, answers those who want to enlist him in some revolutionary cause, "My flesh is to rot in the gutter so that your ideas can triumph? are you drunk? . . ."

In 1927 Brecht discovered Marxism. In 1928 he became famous overnight with the Dreigroschenoper, his adaptation of Gay's Beggar's Opera.

"It was produced as a period piece, a kind of Gilbertian fantasy with naively charming music, traditional airs, and mockingly sentimental lyrics. Although at the time it was produced there were nearly two million unemployed, nobody thought of drawing any analogy between the beggars of the opera and the recipients of the dole".

When Brecht rewrote it, setting it in Victorian Soho, sharpening the satire, introducing magnificent ballads borrowed intact from François Villon, and an anti-military anthem lifted, with a twist from Kipling's Barrack-Room Ballads, the whole set to Kurt Weill's jangling and erotic blues music, the work became 'instantly recognisable as an unmistakable picture of the vicious cesspool of contemporary Berlin.'

How Normal Can You Get? OR There are Only 29 Years to Go

PSYCHOLOGICAL testing is nothing new. It had its origins in the study of abnormal persons and this naturally involved the study of normal persons in order to achieve a standard of measurement.

Educators, and others, became interested in the idea.

In the last war the armed services started to use psychological tests, not only to find out whether the testee would be best employed firing a rifle or an anti-aircraft gun but whether he was likely to have second thoughts about pulling the trigger.

The idea that reliability and loyalty could be predicted began to be noticed by American employers. Here was a "scientific" method of screening applicants for jobs and also for checking up on those already employed by the company.

This latter aspect has become increasingly important in the executive stratum: should Smith or Jones be promoted? A personality test will provide the answer.

Mr. William H. Whyte, an assistant editor of the U.S. business magazine Fortune, writing in this month's Encounter* has given an incisive account of this phoney application of the scientific method. The moral aspect of using them apart, he shows conclusively how inefficient these tests are (testing has now become a regular business itself with many firms competing to show that their particular test is superior).

The subject of a test writes down the following facts about himself: his name is John Jasper Jones, age 26, that he has only one dependent—his wife, that her name is Bernadine Butterfield, and that she is aged 28.

From this information the analyst concludes that "Jones may not take his general obligations very seriously, may have a tendency to self-importance and wishful thinking, may be inclined to be passive-dependent, i.e. reliant on others for direction and guidance in his general

work relationships, may be inclined to take pleasure in unearned status or reflected glory."

Amazing. And how did he arrive at this assessment? The analyst worked along these lines:

1. Whenever a man writes his name out in full he is narcissistic.

2. Jones gave his age as 26 and his wife's age as 28.

Fact: Married a girl two years, older than himself.

Empirical Observation: The majority of men marry women younger than themselves.

Primary deduction: May have been influenced in marrying her by unconsciously considering her as a mother-surrogate.

Tentative inference: May like to have an older woman, or people, take care of him.

Provisional extension: May be inclined to be passive-dependent, i.e. reliant on others for . . .

And so on. This is claimed as an example of scientific method.

Mr. Whyte's investigations have led him to the conclusion that the people who score highest in these tests are those who are extroverted, disinterested in the arts, and accept the status quo. So he advises the testee "when in doubt about the most beneficial answer to any question", to repeat to himself:

"I loved my father and my mother, but my father a little bit more. I like things pretty well the way they are. I never worry much about anything. I don't care for books and music much. I love my wife and children. I don't let them get in the way of company work."

Footnote: in case readers should think that psychological testing is not very widespread in business, Mr. Whyte says that over 60% of the big U.S. corporations now use it. One wonders how the idea is catching on in this country?

The Deficit is Still Over £100. HELP TO REDUCE IT. HELP TO FIND NEW READERS FOR FREEDOM.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

OPEN 10 a.m. to 6.30: 5.0 SATURDAYS All books sent post free, so please get your books from us.

Reprints . . . Man Makes Himself V. Gordon Childs 5/-

Woman Nigger of the Narcissus, etc. August Bebel 5/6

Peer Gynt Joseph Conrad 7/-

Remainders . . . 100 Years of Revolution Woodcock, Beloff, Postgate, etc. 3/6

Second-Hand . . . Nudism in Modern Life George Woodcock 5/-

J. Keir Hardie Maurice Parmelee 7/6

War and Peace William Stewart 6/6

Leo Tolstoy (Pocket) 7/-

Smoke Bellew Jack London 3/-

The Iron Heel Jack London 3/-

Esseys, Political and Social Annie Besant 3/6

Progress and Poverty Henry George 2/-

The Wages of Fear G. Arnaud 3/6

The Government of Man G. S. Brett 3/-

Manon Lescaut Abbé Prévost 3/-

The Pastures of Heaven John Steinbeck 3/-

The Fall of Valour Charles Jackson 3/6

A Handbook on Hanging Charles Duff 6/-

THE WELFARE STATE AND I (3)

3. Military development. It is interesting to study how far the Welfare State is a reflection of the needs of the Welfare State. A recent government publication defines the first two duties of government in this order:

"The first duty of Government is to protect the country from external aggression. The next aim of national policy must be to secure the general prosperity and happiness of the citizens."

It became obvious at the beginning of this century that Britain could no longer depend on recruiting an army from the social derelicts who did not like the idea of rotting away in the workhouse. Recruitment for the Boer War showed that a high percentage of the young men who presented themselves for enlistment were medically unfit for the army.

Now the prosperous classes in Victorian Britain were accustomed to living in a country inhabited by "two nations", the rich and the poor, but in the face of the military threat from the German Empire the time had come to see that the Great Unwashed was not too feeble to defend their masters. Germany was certainly ahead of Britain in matters of social welfare.

"He introduced this announcement by enthusiastic reference to what he had seen in Germany. 'A superb scheme it is'. He spoke of putting ourselves in this field on a level with Germany; we should not emulate them only in armaments."

It is perhaps significant that Health Insurance is associated with the name of the war leader of the First World War, Lloyd George, and Unemployment Insurance is associated with the war leader of the Second World War, Winston Churchill. The Great Unwashed earned their right to be considered as worthy of being kept in health, a right normally accorded to cattle, because their masters needed them, all of them, as cannon fodder.

Our present Health Service has the stamp of Mars upon it. In preparation for the 1939 war it was necessary to devise a scheme by which casualties could be coped with all over the country without the threat of the central administrative body being knocked out by bombing.

There was another and quite different consideration . . . The nation could not be caught a second time in the position of having to create an Emergency Medical Service as in 1939-40.

The emergency, in fact, has come to stay. And so whenever we hear people criticising some of the curious ways in which the social services are

organised, let us remember that they serve the purposes of warfare as well as of welfare.

4. Political Expediency.

Laski, that walking compendium of conflicting ideas, characterised social security measures as "buying off the social revolution". To some extent this is true. In Russia it took a social revolution to produce a Welfare State, and in Britain it has taken a Welfare State to forestall a social revolution.

The working class history of this period has recently been outlined by Geoffrey Ostergaard in the columns of FREEDOM. What needs emphasising, however, is that the principle of workers' control was not simply sold by the working class politicians; the concrete reality of welfare socialism was more powerful than ideological socialism.

1. Social Insurance, H.M.S.O. Cmd. 6550, p.5. 2. Lord Beveridge Power and Influence, p.80. 3. J. R. Ross The National Health Service of Gt. Britain, p.130.

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

