"It is indeed a burning shame that there should be one law for men and another law for women. I think there should be no law for anybody."

impressed by the Polish slogan: 'For

friendship with Russia on the basis

The Hungarian Communist Party

Hungary must map her own road to

socialism. "The Soviet, Polish, Yugo-

slav, or Chinese roads to socialism do

not absolve us from mapping out a Hun-

garian road." To make Lenin's ideas

triumph in Hungary meant to precede

every party and Government decision by

a minute analysis of Hungarian condi-

of the Hungarian Communist Party

who returned from his talks with

Marshal Tito the day after the

student demonstrations gave a warn-

ing against all attempts "to loosen

our relations with the Soviet Union,

and declared that all attempts by

"reaction" to spoil relations between

the two countries would fail. He

also "condemned" the nationalist

propaganda which led to "the mis-

use of the country's youth for street

demonstrations". "These demon-

strations—he said—will not stop our

party and Government in pursuing

the road leading to a Socialist demo-

cracy". If one is to judge from the

reports, Mr. Nagy has thus far re-

mained silent though it would seem

clear that he as well as Mr. Gero.

as leaders of the rival groupings

within the party, must have been in

It was during the night of Oct.

23-24 that the first attacks were

launched in Budapest. The radio

reported (9 a.m., Oct. 24) that:

active contact with their followers.

Mr. Erno Gero, the first secretary

newspaper Szabad Nep declared

of equality'."

(Oct. 22) that

-OSCAR WILDE.

Vol. 17, No. 44

November 3rd, 1956.

Threepence.

HUNGARY: REVOLUTION OR-?

WHAT is happening in Europe is, as the Observer pointed out last Sunday "of the greatest interest". We confess to preferring this very English form of understatement to the banner headlines of the reactionary Press and the almost gay. abandon with which it and the politicians align themselves with the forces and the methods of Revolution! How different is the attitude when the rumblings of revolt are not in the Soviet Empire but in Singapore, British Guiana, Cyprus, Kenya, Malaya, Puerto Rico, Algeria and Indo China! The British and French governments which threatened to walk out of the United Nations Assembly if their actions in Cyprus and North Africa respectively were discussed, have called an emergency session of the Security Council to consider the "action of foreign military forces in Hungary in violently repressing the rights of the Hungarian people".

It is a matter for consolation that at this stage the self-proclaimed Revolutionaries of the West cannot do much more than send food supplies and bandages to relieve the starving and the wounded. But it will depend on the direction the struggle takes in Hungary, and the

satellite countries generally, as to whether the revolutionary upsurge will be encouraged or efforts made to isolate and starve it into submission. After all revolutionary fervour of the Press and politicians of the West manifests itself only for those clashes which they feel will result in reducing Russia's power in the overall struggle for power in the world. They seem to assume in the first place that such struggles if successful must lead to forms of government such as are common in the West, and so long as this appears to them to be the case in the satellite countries these uprisings of "the people" for their "rights" receive their blessing. It is only when the revolutionary struggle is clearly more than a coup d'etat and shows signs of developing beyond the control of the political institutions and the politicians, that the revolutionaries discover that those who appeared to be their friends are in fact false triends who have been using them, and who when they can use them no longer will become the most ruthless opponents of the revolution. One has neither to be old nor professional students of history to realise this! Contemporary history-from Spain in 1936 to the struggles of the Resistance movements in Europe during the last war -surely teaches us this basic lesson.

WE shall return to this, but for the present it may be more profitable to attempt to understand something of the nature of the violent struggle that is still raging in Hungary at the time of writing (Monday).

In a special dispatch to his paper (Oct. 22), the Budapest correspondent of the New York Times reported on an open meeting held on Györ the previous week-end, which was described by the newspaper Györ-Sopronmegyei Hirlap as the "first entirely free public and outspoken debate" since 1948. The withdrawal of Soviet troops and the release of Cardinal Mindszenty were among the demands put forward at the meeting which was presided over by Gyula Hay, a leading member of the Communist author's group (that voiced a demand a year ago for artistic freedom). Apparently this was the first occasion in which the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary had been publicly advocated. In his speech Gyula Hay expressed his approach to some of the problems in these terms:

"Yugoslavia has succeeded in protecting her complete independence and Poland and [Communist] China are on the way to develop a special way to build socialism hase on national characteristics and the past of these countries. We must strive to develop this useful practice also in our country. That depends on us."

As for the abolition of Soviet bases in Hungary, he said, this would be part of an independent domestic and foreign policy that he hoped would be developed more vigorously in the wake of the current Belgrade talks between Hungarian and Yugoslav delegations.

As for the release of Cardinal Mind-

szenty from his long imprisonment, Mr. Hay said he did not believe in religion but disapproved of administrative interference with it.

The correspondent also reported an announcement of a meeting of the central leadership of the Communist youth organisation known as DISZ to consider among other things the situation caused by the fact that university youth had begun to break away from it and form their own separate organisations.

And, of course it was on October 22 that the meeting attended by thousands of students* of the Budapest University of Economic Science took place at which, according to

the resolution that "Nagy be placed on the top of the Government and the party" was greeted by stormy applause, and the speaker who read it was wildly cheered when he said, "Poland has set an example which our country should follow. We students express our solidarity with the Polish comrades."

The same source quotes Budapest

Radio as saying that other demands raised by the students included "a complete change in the leadership of the country and full explanation why all the mistakes were made in the past and who was responsible for them." A full report of the country's economic situation must be delivered by the Government, including all details of what has happened to Hungary's uranium resources. The students were "in favour of Hungarian-Russian friendship, which, however, must be based on equality."

According to a later report the students decided at their meeting to send delegations to all factories to discuss their proposals for "liberalisation" of the Hungarian régime with "young workers".

News from Poland had been given priority in the Hungarian Press and

radio. "Both seem to have been *According to an Austrian eye-witness there were 5,000 students at the demonstrations and they were joined shortly

after dusk by thousands of workers and

"The bandits have stormed plants and public buildings, murdered civilians. soldiers and security police. "The Government was not prepared against bloody attacks from ambush.

"The Government, therefore, has called Soviet trooops stationed in Hungary under the Warsaw Pact for help. "The Soviet units responded to the

Government's request and are engaged in restoring order."

Before this announcement an-

Continued on p. 3

AMERICAN ELECTIONS Stevenson's Rocket

THE greatest difficulty which confronts a politician during an election is how to overcome the fact that the known views of his party are almost identical with those of the party against which he is fighting. This has always been so, but never more so than at the present time in America.

This state of affairs naturally leads the parties concerned into a frantic search for some "new and important issue" upon which they may build their political platform. Only too often the gullible voter has such gigantic red-herrings drawn across his path, that in the "feverish excitement" engendered by the electioneering spirit, he completely forgets that there is not the least likelihood that the great new idea will be put into practice.

In America at this moment, electioneering is working up to its usual pitch of impassioned but incomprehensible partisanship, and Adlai Stevenson has at last chanced upon his "vitally important issue" for this year's Presidential campaign—the H-bomb.

As far back as April he had said: "I believe we should give prompt and earnest consideration to stopping further tests of the hydrogen bomb". At that time not a great deal of notice was taken of the statement, and although it was repeated in subsequent speeches there was no evidence of enthusiasm from the American voter, one way or the other. (At best it was an uninspiring and negative way to put his "belief", and the reaction reflected this.)

A few days ago however, speaking in Oakland, California, the Democratic candidate for President said the same thing in slightly different words and to his surprise received a burst of applause from an audience of 5,000. An immediate decision was made by Stevenson and his top-level campaign executives to exploit this windfall for all it was worth, commencing with a national television speech this week. Here was an ideal election gimmick which might sway many men-in-the-street to the Democratic ticket. Nothing need be proved (until after the election if they win), and it all sounds very progressive and nonwar-mongering.

If, as seems unlikely, Stevenson should be faced with the prospect of actually having to put his idea into practice, he

can always say that the political situation has now changed in such a way as to make such an action ill-advised-but by this time he is in power.

Meanwhile Eisenhower continues electioneering on the basis of his "integrity and sense of high purpose", mixed with a dose of his "past record of solid achievement and elder-statesmanlike qualities." So far this has proved to be sound, reliable stuff, for as far as Americans are concerned he has about him a Churchillian kind of aura—the saviour of the side in difficult times.

Of Stevenson's H-bomb tactics, Eisenhower made his view quite clear. He has long ago decided that for America to suspend or abolish H-tests unilaterally would be a sign of weakness. This week he said in Portland, Oregon: "We reject any thought of saying 'We are going to disarm and we hope that you will do so one day.' We will do it in unision.' He then referred specifically to Stevenson's suggestion as a combination of "pie-in-the-sky promises and wishful thinking."

It is not quite clear as yet whether the Republicans deem it worthwhile creating an "issue" of their own on which to fight the election. Until now they have been so confident of victory that it has appeared to be unnecessary, but there are small signs that their confidence is weakening and something may yet

In our opinion Republican confidence is justified, and any slight H-test swingover may be discounted. As far as we are able to judge, the "American mentality" will not allow a man who apparently advocates a weakening of American military strength to come into power, whether he means it or not. Most of those who are swaved now will in due course re-appraise their view and vote against Stevenson, the "too-intellectual, over-pacifistic, not-quite-American-wayof-life-enough" contender for the Eisenhower throne.

The H-bomb test-banning strategy can only rebound upon its promoters and prove to be a string of nails in their coffin. Whether or not Stevenson really means what he says makes little difference, for the Americans are much more scared of the present "Russian menace" than they are of radio-active fall-out in H.F.W. years to come.

MORE MIDDLE EAST MADNESS Israel Takes the Plunge

others.

JUST as we go to press the headlines in our morning newspapers have taken a sudden turn. The news from Hungary which has been in all our minds has taken second place to developments in the Middle East. Israel has finally taken the plunge and marched into Egypt in considerable force. Striking across the Sinai Peninsula it is reported at this time, that Israeli tropps backed up by tanks have penetrated within eighteen miles of Suez. The strength of the attack and the way in which it has been carried out, seem to indicate that Israel is prepared for anything which the Egyptian High Com-

mand can put against her. The timing of the attack is of course of the utmost significance, and whilst it comes as something of a surprise (though FREEDOM has always regarded it as a probability at some time), this is unquestionably the logical moment from Israel's point of view. With the U.S.S.R. deeply involved in serious trouble haps more to follow, the U.S.A. on the eve of elections, with one of the main issues, the ability to maintain peace, and with Egypt apprehensive and uncertain as to her own position as a consequence of her actions in regard to the Suez Canal. On the face of it Israel could hardly have chosen a better time to attack

The attack came as a climax to a day of nervous excitement within the foreign offices of the interested

This article was written the morning of Tuesday, 30-10-56 Its speculations should be read as valid at that time.

powers. Messages had been passing between Ben-Gurion and Eisenhower; British, American and French ambassadors made frantic calls upon Mrs. Golda Meir the Foreign Minister. The British Foreign Office in London had spoken of "the possibility of a breach of peace in the area". Britons were advised to leave unless it was essential for them to remain, and the same advice was given to all Americans in the area in an ever more urgent and forthright manner.

What will happen now? No one can tell of the possibilities as between the two conflicting nations, but although the actual fighting and its results are all-important to those nations, the actions of the big Powers are the ones which may well be of real consequence. If the attack proves to be a full-scale invasion with Hungary and Poland, and per- and grows to war-like proportions then the three Western Powers are theoretically committed under the 1950 Declaration to take "immediate action both within and outside the United Nations" to prevent violation of Arab-Israel frontiers.

As usual the key to the problem of what happens next may be who is to be regarded as the aggressor. Although at the moment it is assumed that Israel is the "guilty" nation, this view need not necessarily be taken by all the big Powers if it does not suit them. However, on the assumption that the Western Powers regard Israel as the aggressor, they should in accordance with the Tripartite Pact immediately defend Egypt from the armed force of

Israel. This is a situation which if the circumstances were not so serious might be regarded as slightly amusing, for the prospect arises of Britain, France and America leaping into the Suez Canal zones in order to protect those Egyptian interests which have hitherto not been regarded as Egyptian at all. Colonel Nasser is placed in the awkward position where he may be forced to call for assistance from those powers which he has specifically informed shall have no rights on Egyptian territory, and would they kindly leave him to pursue his sovereign independent policy in all things!

Britain might reasonably regard Israel's action as a stroke of good fortune. Here is the perfect excuse for re-occupation of the Canal Zone in the guise of protector of an attacked nation. An alternative argument might be put forward that it is essential for Britain to occupy the area, not to take sides but in order to act as the strong, impartial power, present on the scene in order to stop the two little powers from hurting each other.

Continued on p.

IF ever there was a man in the British Isles for whom the title of "prince of the utopians" could be claimed, that man is Robert Owen: for his preference of the spade to the plough, for his Villages of Co-operation, for his New Harmony Colony in Posey County, Indiana, for his producers' co-operatives, and for his Grand National Moral Union of the Productive and Useful Classes. Apart from his model factory at New Lanark, and from the consumers' co-operatives which the Rochdale Pioneers took over from him, all his projects and enterprises ended in bankruptcy.

Marx, on the other hand, who was full of scorn for the utopians, presented an analysis of the capitalist system, whose inexorable logic, in spite of many inaccuracies of detail and two or three major mistakes, appeared to several generations of followers and interpreters to be borne out by facts. As he had predicted, the profit motive of capitalism, in order to prevent the fall of prices resulting from competition, forced it ceaselessly to expand and to search for new techniques; business cycles made themselves more and more alarmingly evident; small enterprise fought a losing battle against big combines, trusts and cartels; and the whole system, with the possible exception of the U.S.A., either collapsed completely or had drastically to harness and modify its operation.

Moral Decay

This admission implies no acceptance of the Marxist philosophical viewpoint. In the same year of the publication of the Communist Manifesto, J. S. Mill, freeing economic thought from the straitjacket of determinism, wrote that, be the laws of production what they may, "the distribution of wealth depends on the laws and customs of society. The rules by which it is determined are what the opinions and feelings of the ruling portion of the community make them, and are very different in different ages and countries, and might still be more different, if mankind so chose". Marx's prediction concerning capitalism were broadly realized because the ruling classes chose not to interfere with the laws of competition, and persistently, in spite of all warnings, they did everything that was in their power to prepare the rope with which to be hanged.

The Marxists will insist that they could not do otherwise. But later developments have shown that private economic power can be checked by voluntary associations, high progressive taxation, and legislation against monopo-

OPEN DAILY	
New Books	
De Valera and the March of a	
Nation M. C. Bromage	25/-
The Hand of a Stranger	
Jean Cocteau	17/6
A History of Western Literature	
(Penguin) J. M. Cohen	3/6
The Post-War Condition of	
Britain G. D. H. Cole	35/-
An International Economy	
Gunnar Myrdal	35/-
Economy and Society	
Talcott Parsons	35/-
Pamphlets	
Why I Am Not a Christian	
Bertrand Russell	1/-
Automation: the Socialist Answer	
Michael Kidron	1/-
The Secret Police and You	
Panrinte	
Reprints	-1
Gentian Violet Edward Hyams	5/-
Stories and Cream	=/
Hope of Heaven John O'Hara	
	0/0
Second-Hand and	

Stories and Cream	
Edward Hyams	5/-
Hope of Heaven John O'Hara	
Second-Hand and -	
Out of Print Thinkers	
Library	
Savage Survivals	
J. Howard Moore	2/6
Man and His Universe	
John Langdon-Davies	2/6
Religion of the Open Mind	
A. Gowans Whyte	2/6
A Short History of Christianity	2,0
J. M. Robertson	2/6
This Human Nature Charles Duff	
	2/6
Fact and Faith J. B. S. Haldane	2/6
Gibbon on Christianity	2/6
Let the People Think	
Bertrand Russell	2/6
Second-Hand	
The Dog Beneath the Skin	
W. H. Auden and	
Christopher Isherwood	5/-
The Thibaults	-/-
Roger Martin du Gard	5/4
Promise and Fulfilment	3/6
	411
Arthur Koestler	4/0
Why England Slept	100

Postage free on all items Obtainable from

H. G. Wells

John F. Kennedy 2/6

Geoffrey West 3/6

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

IS ANARCHISM UTOPIAN?

lies and for the protection of the weak. Rather than economic, the inner destructive agency of capitalism is of a moral kind, namely its exaltation of narrow economic self-interest above all values. So also, where capitalism was destroyed, not without military operations and even before it had a chance to bloom, the main agency was a set of people who were determined to be the new ruling class and to have their will enforced.

There is no fatality of process by which the proletariat becomes revolutionary and inaugurates a communist society. This was obvious even to Engels when he wrote to Marx: "The English proletariat is becoming more and more bourgeois, so that this most bourgeois of all nations is apparently aiming ultimately at the possession of a bourgeois aristocracy and a bourgeois proletariat as well as a bourgeoisie".

Now Robert Owen was a capitalist to the Marxist view of history, a product of his time. He was admittedly an exception, though by no means an isolated one; and we are still waiting for Marxists to explain the rising of exceptions, and the process by which out of many exceptions one eventually becomes the rule, in this country rather than that, in one decade rather than another. It is lack of intelligence and foresight, lack of generosity and human feelings, and not economic reasons; it is the greed, the ferocity and callousness of the capitalist class as a whole which created the misery, the injustice and the frequent upheavals of the industrialization and proletarization of the West.

These human traits are not the exclusive apanage of the capitalist class; nor need a capitalist qua capitalist exhibit them more than a member of another class, unless we deliberately refuse to recognize them when manifested in forms that are not peculiar to capitalism. Had the message of Robert Owen been heeded by the ruling classes of his time as it was by many of the workers, his world of federated agricultural and industrial communities might have become a healthy reality, and humanity would not have known those horrid agglomerations of poverty, bestiality and greed which marked the development of nineteenth century technology and trade.

A Practical Impossibility?

Robert Owen was a utopian insofar as he relied on people in the government and of his class to share the same understanding of the portentous evils which his age was breeding, and the same willingness to remedy them which was the passion of his mind. But those anarchists of to-day who, inspired by the same idealism and the same concern for mankind, vaguely envisage a type of society organized on lines similar to those which Owen suggested, are utopians in another sense. Every condition, except the paramount one of ethical disposition, were there in his time to make his plans susceptible of realization. Big industrial centres, large-scale dependence on trade, lack of open spaces and evergrowing population, the technological momentum, the importance of defence in the economic life of a country, the dynamism of autarchy and imperialism, the grip of centralized government on national income, education and information; these are all factors which make

now a full-scale application of ideas similar to Owen's a practical impossi-

Any new social organization, anarchist or otherwise, which wishes to stand a chance of wide acceptance and realization, must take the existing social and economic structure into account, for in history there is no case of sudden and wholesale replacement of one type of society by another unless wholesale destruction is envisaged and there is enough of strong and unscrupulous men to carry it out. Some of Owen's ideas are being realized to-day, as, for example, in the creation of garden-cities, even by people who are the direct descendants of those who labelled him a utopian; but they are being realized through governmental authority and compulsion. Anarchism is utopian if, aiming at influencing the course of history, it refuses to have recourse to the most (like Engels, incidentally) and, according widely available, effective and expeditious means of effecting change of a sort, viz. the use of force, the readiness of the majority to understand its language, and their eagerness in accepting any idea or ideal under cover of which they can satisfy their immediate interests, vent their rancours and hatreds, relieve themselves of their pent-up frustrations, and fulfil dreams of exaltation and power. Even more fully does anarchism defeat itself as a possible historical agency when, besides renouncing force and deceit, it also renounces the exercise of legally permitted anti-government action under the assumption that, could it be really effective, it would not be permitted.

> Of course, anarchism would not be anarchism, as it is traditionally understood, if it included participation in government; it would not be anarchism, on the other hand, as it is rationally understood in spite of pronouncements by some of its most venerable exponents, if, in order to achieve a revolution, it made use of violence, murder and coercion, the very things at the abolition of which an anarchist revolution would professedly be aimed. Thus anarchism -or, at least, one form or aspect of itdeliberately places itself on the margin of history, and is admittedly utopian or, rather, uchronian, beyond time, that is, clinging to values which it considers eternal or unaffected as values by their possibility or impossibility of realization. It refuses to avail itself of the usual means of making history, and refuses to make history, because history and the making of it are in themselves condemn-

The Dilemma of Purity

Yet, few are the anarchists who would unhesitatingly subscribe to the statement that anarchy is not of this world. Some of them may derive a faint sense of fulfilment by voicing their condemnation of history in speech and writing, by feeling and making themselves felt, not as an agency, but as a presence, and by trusting, whatever their metaphysical assumptions, that if anarchism is in them, and through them in the world, it must be there for something. But those who have direct experience of societies where anarchist ideas may not be expressed with impunity are more inclined to the conviction that to voice one's aspirations and criticisms is not enough, and that,

hold out for mankind, it can only too easily be extinguished. Finally, there is not a single anarchist, I venture to say. who has not been confronted at least once in his life with the dilemma of remaining an anarchist without doing anything positive to further the anarchist cause, or of doing something for it and ceasing thereby to be an anarchist of the purest water.

Another form or aspect of anarchism, however, often found in the same individual with the one which we have just examined, refuses to accept utopianism as its congenital weakness; but, deeming anarchy the greatest good in terms of social organization, looks for signs of its possible realization in the present structure and trends, in the weaknesses and excesses of the archist principle. This anarchism, unable to resign itself to living on tolerance on the margin of history, is ready to plunge into it, and to stances force or intelligence suggests.

Anarchism is not utopian when, striving for achievement, it does not look simply at its ideal, but also at the people through whom and among whom it is going to find a beginning of realization. This anarchism views the problems of the movement or organization, however tiny, in which it finds expression, as not less fraught with difficulties, and testing integrity and steadfastness, than the problems of the individual anarchist economically dependent on, and culturally conditioned by, a society which is far from being that of his heart's desire. The character of a person is formed chiefly by knocks and attritions with other persons, and so the character of a movement or an organization is formed by contact, attrition and conflict with other organizations and movements. It is no paradox or tautology that character is character-building. Character is influence, and to exert an influence is to make history. It is to make history in a way of which the anarchist may not always approve, but which remains none the less the only alternative to making

GIOVANNI BALDELLI.

BOOK REVIEW NEW LIGHT ON JESUS

THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS by Millar Burrows. Secker & Warburg, 30s.

WHEN in 1947 some ancient documents were discovered in a cave near the Dead Sea, their age and importance was not realised for some time. After they had passed through the hands of several dealers, scholars, and priests, it was eventually established that they formed part of the library of a Jewish religious order known as the Essene whose monastry was destroyed by the Romans in AD 70. It seems likely that the Essene had some of their library in nearby caves when they realised defeat was imminent.

The importance of the scrolls lies in the new light they throw on the origins of Christianity. The translations (which are still going on-some from very fragmentary materials) could produce some startling repercussions in the religious world; whether they will or not depends on how they are presented.

One of the main tenets of the Christian faith is the uniqueness and divinity of Jesus; the idea has received a severe jolt by the discovery in one of the scrolls of a description of a certain Teacher of Righteousness. The life of this Teacher bears many striking resemblances to that of Jesus-he preached a Kingdom of Heaven, used many of the sayings that are given in the Sermon on the Mount and elsewhere in the Gospels, was an evangelist who criticised the official custodians of the Jewish religion (the Pharisees and the Sadducees), and was crucified by the Romans. He was clearly one of the "fathers" of the Essene order and he died some thirty years B.C. This provides strong circumstantial evidence tha Jesus was an Essene*, or at the least was strongly influenced by them; there are a number of other points to support this—one of the Essene rituals involved the breaking of bread and drinking of

wine in the same manner as described at the Last Supper, John the Baptist taught in the vicinity of the monastry and had almost certainly belonged to the brotherhood, etc.

Not surprisingly most of the work on the scrolls has been carried out by Christian scholars of one denomination or another and but for the outspokenness of a Frenchman, Professor Dupont Sommer, it is unlikely that this damaging interpretation would have become known. But Dupont Sommer, to the consternation of many of his fellow scholars, put these ideas forward in a lecture and not in the decent obscurity of a learned journal, with the result that they have received a fair measure of publicity. The literary critic, Edmund Wilson, in his pleasantly agnostic book The Scrolls from the Dead Sea (W. H. Allen), puts Dupont Sommer's case well.

Professor Burrows' book provides a full and up-to-date account of the finding of the scrolls, their translation, and their importance from a Christian point of view. It is the most complete "popular" book of the many that are being published on the subject. Whilst it is too soon yet to be definite it seems that at last we have some reliable, though indirect, evidence about the particular Jewish Messiah (there were many Jews claiming to be the Messiah at that time), known as Jesus of Nazareth. It is unfortunate that most of this evidence is being presented by men whose beliefs will influence them against any anti-Christian interpretation of the scrolls.

*Nearly a hundred years ago a Professor Ginsberg suggested this in his essay The Essene (recently reprinted by Routlege). The idea was also used by George Moore in his story The Brook Kerith.

M.G.W.

whatever light and hope anarchism may

SELECTIONS FROM FREEDOM

Vol. 1, 1951, Mankind is One Vol. 2, 1952, Postscript to Posterity Vol. 3, 1953, Colonialism on Trial Vol. 4, 1954, Living on a Volcano Vol. 5, 1955, The Immoral Moralists each volume paper 7s. 6d. cloth 10s. 6d.

The paper edition of the Selections is available to readers of FREEDOM at 5/- a copy

VOLINE :

Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed cloth 12s. 6d. The Unknown Revolution (Kronstandt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21) cloth 12s. 6d.

MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI: Neither East nor West cioth 10s. 6d., paper 7s. 6d. Workers in Stalin's Russia ERRICO MALATESTA:

Anarchy Vote-What For? ALEX COMFORT: Delinquency Barbarism & Sexual Freedom

Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx

K. J. KENAFICK :

boards 3s. 6d.

paper 6s.

RUDOLF ROCKER: Nationalism and Culture cloth 21s. E. A. GUTKIND:

The Expanding Environment 8s. 6d.

F. A. RIDLEY: The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age 2d.

M. BAKUNIN: Marxism, Freedom and the State. cloth 5s.

JOHN HEWETSON: Sexual Freedom for the Young 6d. Ill-Health, Poverty and the State cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.

18.

PHILIP SANSOM: Syndicalism-The Workers' Next Step

TONY GIBSO" : Youth for Freedom paper 2s. Food Production and Population 6d. Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.

Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications : Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute cloth 5s. Journey Through Utopia

cloth 16s. (U.S.A. \$2.50)

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

LOOKING FOR A CITY

Continued from p. 3 said, "People havn't got the loose money in their pockets, it all goes on hire purchase. It's no use trying to push down their throats what they don't want to see." And one of the barkers, Mr. Arthur Sedgwick dolefully complained, "The credit squeeze has got us."

WHILE I was in Hull the University published "A Guide to Regional Studies on the East Riding of Yorkshire and the City of Hull" for the benefit of the "large and increasing group of persons" who "have frequent occasion to seek background knowledge concerning some aspect of their local community", and because "regional and local studies were never more keenly pursued in Britain than to-day". Is this a sign that thoughtful people are turning away from the cult of the metropolis, with its implications of provincial stagnation, towards that "regional renaissance" that one hears about hopefully but never meets? I would like to believe it.

"Stout walking shoes have always been among the most helpful allies", said the Guide to Regional Studies. So I walked through the rich mixed farming country of the East Riding till I came to Market Weighton where, at Dalgleish's Nursery, I met a woman planting long rows of seedlings. "Would you say this place" was a community?" I asked. "Not on your life," she replied. And I found my way to a bus stop and rode to York.

C.W. (Next week: In York and Leeds)

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP LECTURE-DISCUSSIONS

Every Sunday at 7.30 at THE MALATESTA CLUB, 32 Percy Street,

Tottenham Court Road, W.1. NOV. 4-Sidney Warr on IS A TRANSITION PERIOD NECESSARY?

NOV. 11-Tony Gibson on BASTARDS

NOV. 18-Harold Walsby on ASPECTS OF AUTOMATION

Questions, Discussion and Admission all free. OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting HYDE PARK Sundays at 3.30 p.m. MANETTE STREET (Charing X Road) Saturdays at 5.30 p.m.

MEETINGS IN SHEFFIELD Every Sunday at 8 p.m., outdoor meetings are held by the Sheffield Libertarian Forum at BARKER'S POOL

Malatesta Club

AFRICAN FORUM MEETING ISLAM & POLITICS IN AFRICA

by Prof. Thomas Hodgkin (of Oxford University) NOVEMBER 13 at 7.30 p.m.

Vol. 17, No. 44 November 3, 1956

HUNGARY: Revolution or -?

Continued from p. 1

other broadcast had given the news that an emergency meeting of the Communists' Central Committee had offered the Premiership to Mr. Nagy and he had accepted. His first act was to declare a state of emergency.

"The cabinet has established the state of emergency throughout the country against all actions aimed at overthrowing the people's republic. The following crimes must be punished by death: Uprising, instigation to uprising, conspiracy, murder, assassination, arson, use of explosives, general crimes against the public, use of force against official and private persons and the possession of arms. This decree comes into force immediately."

The "rebels" were given at first until 2 p.m. to surrender. This offer was later extended to 6 p.m. But it met with no response and there were indications that the operations were spreading beyond the capital. The following day (Oct. 25) Mr. Nagy in an attempt to break the unity of the insurgents declared that he would demand the withdrawal of Russian troops as soon as the rebels had laid down their arms, and that talks would be opened with the Russians "on a basis of national independence". These promises were treated for what they were worth by the "rebels" who were given until 10 p.m. to lay down their arms.

THE calling in of Russian troops from the first day would indicate that the government felt it could not rely on its own soldiers. And there is mounting evidence of members of the Hungarian forces joining with the insurgents. A Times report from Vienna (Oct. 27) points

That many members of the armed forces have sympathized with the insurgents, either to the extent of joining them and providing them with arms, or of deserting to avoid fighting them, seems clear from accounts given by travellers who have arrived here, and from the broadcasts of Radio Budapest calling on soldiers to return to their units.

The Observer's correspondent on the Austro-Hungarian border refers to talks he had with two members of one of the hastily formed Hungarian "workers' brigades" who have crossed the frontier to obtain medical aid from the Austrians. They reported that

the workers' brigades in alliance with improvised battalions of students are now a quarter of a million strong and have entered into negotiations with certain high commanders of the Hungarian regular army.

The outcome of these negotiations could have an important bearing on the general situation. From the beginning of the revolt some elements of the regular army threw in their lot with the insurgents; and to-day's reports say that other regular units are now actively fighting Soviet troops in various parts of the country.

But it also appears—according to the Times—that the higher command of the Army "may be taking a hand in trying to shape the political situation". A leaflet signed by "The new provisional revolutionary Hungarian government and the National Defence Committee" attacks the former Communist leaders and Government for "having been concerned only with preserving their power" and for taking "hesitant steps solely under pressure from the masses". Their five demands are for

- (1) A new provisional revolutionary Army and national Government, in which will be represented the leaders of youth in revolt;
- (2) The immediate ending of martial law;
- (3) The immediate cancellation of the Warsaw Agreement; the immediate and peaceful withdrawal of Soviet troops from the motherland;

- (4) The heads of those who are really responsible for the bloodshed; the release of the captured, and a general amnesty;
- (5) A true democratic basis for Hungarian Socialism; meanwhile the Hungarian Army to assume responsibility for order and disarm the security

"Without that, the danger of further bloodshed remains. We shall continue the demonstrations till final victory, but we must remain calm. We condemn all anarchy and destruction. Comrades, Imre Nagy and Janos Kadar are members of the new revolutionary Army Government. There has been enough bloodshed."

DURING last week-end events took an unexpected turn with the order for an immediate ceasefire by Government troops throughout Hungary and the announcement by Mr. Nagy that Red Army units fighting in Budapest had already started to withdraw after an agreement to this effect between him and the Commander-in-Chief of all the Soviet forces in Hungary. He added

"Negotiations with the Soviet Government on the withdrawal of the Russian Army from Hungary will start immediately. The Government decided to ask for the immediate withdrawal of the Russian Army and that the National Hungarian forces, consisting of the Hungarian Army and the workers' militias should take over control of the country.

"The negotiations will be conducted on the bases of equality among the two countries. The Government meanwhile announces the immediate creation of a new police force, and armed units of the youth movement and the workers."

That Nagy was prepared to negotiate the unconditional withdrawal of Russian troops immediately and place the blame for the uprising on the government and party leadership is significant.

"The faults of the past are mirrored in tragic events. The situation is made worse because the party leadership up to the last minute had not broken away from its errors. The new Government will be a true Government of the people. It will immediately begin to put into effect the repeated demands of the people.

"The Government begins under the most difficult conditions. The already difficult economic situation has been still worsened by the struggle. The Government will depend on the first place upon the working classes. It will immediately begin with the carrying out of its programme, which includes the regulation of wages, pensions, and family allowances and the production of houses."

It is surely a confession of his impotence to control the situation in face of a nation-wide movement, united in the desire to free itself from the Red Army, and, as one correspondent puts it, fighting in a mood of fanatical bravery against the heaviest metal of the Soviet troops".

But at the same time it is a clear indication that Nagy means to live to fight another day. It must be remembered that he was swept into the leadership of the country by the insurgent movement. To have pursued his policy of the mailed fist, and to have continued to use the Red Army to restore "order" might have proved successful from a military point of view but would have created a new political situation in which he would have found himself as hated as are the former leaders Gero and Rakosi. Hence the dramatic reversal of attitude and his agreement with all the workers' demands. He even "greets" the creation of workers' councils! [A Reuter dispatch from Vienna (Oct. 28) states that "Reports reaching here to-day indicated that in many areas of Hungary the Government appeared to have lost control to a disorganised popular movement which had established local councils of workers, students and soldiers to carry on the administration and to negotiate with the Government for the fulfilment of the rebels' demands].

Nagy even soundly contradicted official Russian statements by denying that what had happened was a "counter-revolution". It had beenhe said, a democratic movement which had swept "our whole nation

in order to secure our independence, which is the only basis of a socialist democracy."

THE fate of the "revolution" in Hungary will probably be decided by the time this issue of FREEDOM appears. If Nagy's concessions are accepted at their face value by the rebels then there is the likelihood of initiative passing to the Government and while politically it will not be possible to return to the situation that existed before the insurrection, the concessions will be withdrawn one by one as the government consolidates its hold on the reins of power. That there are elements among the rebels anxious to arrive at any early settlement with the Government was indicated by a Budapest radio announcement last Sunday that

negotiations were begun during the night between Government troops and rebels at the insurgents' request. Both sides were discussing the possibility of organising a joint commission to take over rebel arms, but the rebels had not yet agreed about this.

Similarly, the Györ "Freedom Radio" reported that

the "Workers' Council" there had issued a manifesto declaring that Mr. Nagy was acceptable as Prime Minister "but many of his Ministers were not." It demanded Hungary's complete independence and free elections throughout the country as soon as possible.

-and one does not know whether it is a majority or minority—of the insurrectionary movement the main objectives do not go beyond a change of Government and for "free elections".

On the other hand if in spite of Nagy's promises the insurrectionary movement stands firm, holding on to its arms and consolidating its organisation and co-ordination throughout the country then there is the hope that its original demands will appear as a stepping stone for a revolutionary movement in which initiative for the reorganisation of the economy and the social structure of the country will pass to the "local councils of workers, students and soldiers". If there is a possibility, of this happening we should expect to hear very shortly that workers' organisations are taking over the factories and the land, and that the social services are being reorganised under workers' control. So far what information has found its way out of Hungary into even the serious Press seems to deal with the struggle purely at a political level. Yet 10 million people cannot go on living on politics alone. How are they managing with food distribution (and production) and what is the position regarding the public ser-

AT the time of writing the insurrectionary movement appears Thereby indicating that for a section to be still strongly united. But if this movement has within it the seeds of a far-reaching social revolution then the time will come when

cracks will appear in that unity and new struggles and new alignments will emerge.

We do not believe that the revolutionary elements (as distinct from those who for patriotic or religious reasons have joined the struggle in its present phase) must inevitably be authoritarian and anti-libertarian as a result of more than ten years conditioning under Stalin's régime. The contrary might well be the case, though it is true that so far as the reports go it appears that in spite of their experiences they still have faith in government. But then one can never be sure of the reliability of press reports. After all, the struggle in Spain was for more than two years described by the liberal press as a struggle between democracy and fascism in spite of the fact that parallel with their armed struggle against Franco the workers of Spain were attempting to carry through one of the most daring and far-reaching social experiments of the century.

The fate of the insurrectionary movement in Hungary must not be in the hands of the rival governments of East and West. To-day the politicians of the West are the champions of Revolution. But the workers of the West must be on their guard, and refuse to be lulled into a feeling of security. The time may yet come when they will have to revive the worthy slogan of "hands off the revolution".. the Hugarian revolution!

PEOPLE AND IDEAS LOOKING FOR A CITY

"But being one day at Hull, where I went casually . . . "

-ROBINSON CRUSOE, Chapter 1.

PLATO had no doubt about it. The city, he said, arises for the sake of life, but is for the sake of the good life. And from Aristotle who declared that the city was a place where men lived a common life for a noble end, to W. R. Lethaby who in one of his valuable essays on town-planning boldly claimed that "the whole purpose of civilisation is to build beautiful cities and to live in them beautifully", philosophers have concluded that the purpose of the city is to enhance the lives of their inhabitants in common, that is to say, as a community. Seldom have dreams and realities been so divergent, and the reason of course is that our cities are too big. They have become places that we enjoy escaping from. If we get that pleasant feeling of belonging to a place, it is not a feeling of belonging to London, but to a few streets, or one of the submerged village nuclei. We are really attached to the Old Kent Road, or Notting Hill, or Parson's Green. Recognising this, intelligent town-planners, in developing or redeveloping a residential area, seek to provide the physical background (an example of this kind of planning is the Lansbury Neighbourhood at Popuar), which may make the growth of a community possible. They cannot of course plan a community, and only a few very arrogant or stupid people would

think that they could. But nobody lives in London for the sole purpose of living at Camden Town. They live in a place because that's where they have found a place to live, or because it's near their work, or because it's a good place to raise a family, but also, and this is where Plato comes in, because it makes available their idea of the good life—the facilities for the thousand and one things that people enjoy doing, which they couldn't do, or think they couldn't, if they lived in a more remote' place. Our idea of the good life might imply the Festival Hall, or the Hammersmith Palais, or the British Museum, White Hart Lane, or Petticoat Lane, or simply the company of people like ourselves. In fact, leaving aside the question of whether or not the city as a social form is in fact obsolete, the criterion by which we judge a city, is the amenities it provides for living whatever our conception may be of the good life.

With these thoughts in my mind I have been wandering around in Yorkshire, of whose four million or more people, all but about 300,000 live in large towns and cities. Yorkshire, you will remember consists of three counties, meeting at the city of York; the North Riding with its moors and dales, largely agricultural, but with the iron and steel town of Middlesbrough at the north on Teeside, the West Riding with its 3½ million

people and enormous cities, the centre of the woollen and steel industries and the provider of one-fifth of Britain's coal, and the East Riding with the fertile plain of York where the rivers of the country converge in the long estuary of the Humber with the port of Kingston-upon-Hull serving the industrial hinterland.

WENT casually to Hull from the other side of the Humber. New Holland, at the northern tip of the Lincolnshire flatlands is a pier, an empty dock, a brickfield, two decaying hulks sinking in the silt of the old boat-building yard, and one long straight street with two Methodist chapels. No-one was about except the dustmen from the Rural District Council, wheeling the bins out of the backyards on two-wheeled trolleys with long handles. I had never seen this aid to refuse collection before. "It must make your life easier," I said. "Well they have to do something to make us stay in this dump," said the dustman, "You have to go over that blooming ferry if you want a bit of life." He pointed past the level crossing where the shining new diesel railcars from Immingham Dock were going down the

So over the ferry I went. As the paddle-steamer churned up the muddy silver estuary, the long line of docks, warehouses and sidings from Hessle to Salt End, came out of the mist. Last time I was in Hull, after the bombing, little seemed to be left of the centre of the city except Queen Victoria on her pedestal among the tram-wires and the formidable City Hall. In those days everything was going to be different. Mr. Max Lock prepared the Hull Regional Survey, declaring that "The regeneration of our obsolete and blighted towns, industrially over-developed, culturally stilted, requires a penetrating diagnosis of all aspects of town life". Using the facts that the survey revealed, Sir Patrick Abercrombie produced his Plan for the City and County of Kingston-upon-Hull. To-day the civic survey is in the City Clerk's archives, and the Abercrombie Plan is buried in a handsome binding in the Reference Library, and that is all that remains of the mood of 1944. There are new housing estates on the outskirts of the city, no better and no worse, in fact, no different from those anywhere else. There are big new blocks of shops and offices in Prospect Street, and still plenty of gaps for the Architects to do their worst. There is a certain 'period charm' about the Hull Garden Village built by Reckitt's, the starch firm about fifty years ago, for their employees. (When it was opened Sir James Reckitt declared "I urge people of wealth and influence to make proper use of their property to avert possibly a disastrous uprising"). And

in the dockyard areas there is the same

mixture of squalor and vitality that you find in ports everywhere, though it is more clean and open than most.

HULL is certainly a lively city. In terms of goods handled it is the third largest port in Britain, and one of the biggest fishing ports. The trawlers were landing miles of haddock and cod, and were leaving daily for Bear Island, Iceland and the White Sea. The conservative Hull Daily Mail was thundering in its leading article about "Iceland's Nasserism" (referring to the dispute over territorial waters); the Labour Party's monthly Hull Sentinel was full of drivel about the people's democracies. (That was the October issue, I wonder what they will say in November!). The Film Society was showing Windfall in Athens, the Opera Society was presenting Verdi's Nabucco at the City Hall, Lord Harewood was talking about Mozart at the University. For Hull has the advantage of being a university city and however little that may mean to the students, it does mean that lectures and courses in most things are available to the general public, and it also means presumably, that support for the more rarified of amusements is increased by the presence of the University intelligentsia.

I stood in the market place in the old town, looking for the street with the wonderful name Land of Green Ginger, and I asked my way from a man standing under a great gilded equestrian statue of William the Third. "Our great Deliverer" it said on the plinth. "They must have thought a lot of him." I said. "Yes," he replied, "On his three hundredth anniversary all the tramcars in Hull were decorated." As it turned out he misinformed me both ways. I couldn't find the Land of Green Ginger, and the occasion when they decorated the trams was nothing to do with William the Third; but something much more remarkable. It was to celebrate the tercentenary of Andrew Marvell, the author of the greatest love song in the English language, who was a Hull man. A city which does honour to its poets is a rare city indeed. Then I recalled that there to-day, from the Marvell Press in Hull Road, Hessle, George Hartley publishes his poetry magazine Listen, and that from there came last year the best book of new verse for years, Philip Larkin's The Less Deceived.

There was also the fair. It has always been held in October in Hull since 1643 when, in the civil war, after battles outside the walls, the royalist Marquis of Newcastle had to call off his siege of the city and retreat, opening canals, destroying bridges and breaking up the roads behind him. But the fair, I was told, through the deafening strains of See You Later, Alligator, was not what it used to be. The boom was over, the showmen

Continued on p. 2

70 Years of Freedom Press: ACADEMIC NURTURING?

A NARCHISTS, in my opinion, are far too modest in their attitude towards their ideas and their movement. Too often are they prepared to admit rather sheepishly that after all these years we haven't got anywhere, because we cannot point to any corner of the world where an anarchist society has been established; because in countries where there have been sizeable and relatively influential anarchist movements they have been crushed; because in the 20th century the tide of political trends has been in the direction of statism . . . and so on.

To yield to this kind of argument is to fall into the trap into which our opponents have fallen-to accept to some extent the dangerous philosophy that if a practice has been established it must be right (50 million Frenchmen can't be wrong) and that if a body of ideas have not won the struggle for men's allegiance they must be wrong.

Now seventy years seems a long time for a tiny little enterprise like Freedom Press to have survived. And even longer for it to have existed without any noticeable effect upon world society. It might be said to have failed, because after all this time we still haven't got anarchism -or rather an anarchist society, because we have got anarchism. But in terms of social development 70 years is no time at all, and to throw up our hands in despair, to point to the mistakes made during those 70 years and to compare ideas which have barely been tested during that time with species of animals which took millions of years to evolve and die out seems to this very amateur student of history very unscientific indeed.

ISRAEL ATTACKS

Continued from p. 1

Certainly from an American point of view the latter argument would be the only feasible one. It is almost laughable to suppose that America would fight with Egypt against Israel with the elections so near. Neither the Democrats or the Republicans are likely to take such a risk of damaging their Presidential chances by advocating such action.

As for Russia, what will she do? She probably has not the time to bother over-much about the Middle East with all her present "satellite" problems, and as a consequence of this it is doubtful whether she is prepared at this time to take a really firm stand one way or the other, since one way might involve serious differences with the Western powers. No doubt there will be the usual denunciations and recriminations, but it seems unlikely that threats of force will be forthcoming unless the West sides in the last resort with Israel. One cannot help wondering whether perhaps there is some "deep-laid plot" of an "unofficial character" between Israel and Britain. If so, and events prove the possibility or not, it would be the most cunning strategy the Middle East has seen for some time. British and American public opinion has been with Israel against Egypt for a long time, and if the cards are played correctly, both the Western Powers and Israel stand to gain in terms of security at least, not to mention economically and politically speaking.

There remains one other possibility. Israel may think better of her violent action and withdraw. If she does it is unilkely that her troops will be hotly pursued by the courageous Egyptian army, unless other Arab nations are also prepared to join in. But on the whole the Arab nations prefer to talk of unity within their ranks rather than actively participate in a struggle whose outcome is completely unforseeable. Most small powers, of which Israel and Egypt are the exception, do not like to jump into perilous situations until they have discovered which of the big powers are for or against

If Israel withdraws and the only result is a lecture from General Burns the United Nations truce supervisor, it would constitute a major victory, politically as well as militarily for Israel.

H.F.W.

The main point that is overlooked by the realistic people who tell us that anarchism has failed, that it is a dead end, is that every other social ideology has also failed-and they have been tried, while anarchism hasn't. Is there anyone who will argue that any of the social or economic systems that have been established with great show of strength, purpose and permanency, have succeeded? Has capitalism? Have communism, Fascism or social democracy? They haven't succeeded even on their own terms, let alone on anarchist terms. They have all had to retreat, or go forward to destruction, or reform-as capitalism has done during this century by adopting some of the characteristics of the others.

True, capitalism has by this means survived-but Freedom Press has not had to adjust its principles in order to survive for seventy years as much as capitalism had had to do in that time. The mighty Nazi Party made rapid and obvious progress and stamped the anarchists in Germany into their graves; it built a Third Reich that was going to last for a thousand years. It went down in flames after twelve. The Communists built an empire that a year ago looked as solid as a rock. Look at it now.

THERE is one tremendous advantage which we of to-day have over our ideological ancestors of 70 years ago. Our experience. When Kropotkin launched Freedom in 1886 his theory was scientifically water-tight-but his listeners and readers had not experienced the failure of all the alternatives as we have to-day.

It is natural that people should try the easy way of doing things first. And when Labour politicians emerged promising to do things for the working class in return for no more effort than it took to walk round the corner to the polling booth, it was understandable that the majority of patient, easy-going, trusting folk should agree to let them have a go. When the terrible anger of the Russian people against the Czar simmered down it was not all that difficult for the Bolsheviks to persuade them that it was best for them to place their affairs in the capable hands of the Party-because no-one knew better from experience.

It is the easy way out to shuffle responsibility off on to someone else's shoulders. Anarchism, in demanding that the individual be responsible for his own affairs, makes the acceptance of it that much more difficult for people conditioned to irresponsibility-which is what servitude really is. But since Kropotkin's time the peoples of most countries have followed the path of irresponsibility only to suffer bitter disillusionment as a result.

Clever people look now at the workers and see apathy and lack of concern in what is going on around them and then proceed to climb upon a plinth of superiority, declaring the 'proles' to be stupid and hopeless. But what it really amounts to is that people to-day have been so deceived and let-down that they are becoming chary and cynical; they are wiser than before, but since there is not in this country nor in North America any situation which seems to demand anything more than dumb, personal resistance, there appears to be no need for social forms of struggle.

But when circumstances do arise in which such forms become necessarythen, and not until then-shall we see how much people have learned from their experiences. In one country or another we have seen the various parties of democracy, Communists and Fascists given opportunities to show what they can do. They all claim to be practical realists, looking at things as they arenot in the idealistic anarchist way of how we should like them to be-with short-term policies to solve the problems of their time. They have all failed. and in terms of human misery have been quite disastrous for the peoples of the world.

There is no longer any alternative to anarchism that has not been discredited. And it is encouraging to note that those people who have had the deepest experiences, such as the slave-labourers of Vorkuta and the populations of the East European States-when they voice their desires they make demands such as anarchists would wish.*

TOW it is very fashionable to-day to follow the 'gradualist' line such as was drawn by George Woodcock last week. It is a sort of line which fits in fairly comfortably with the Marxist

*See the Observer quote about returned prisoners from Vorkuta in last week's FREEDOM (27/10/56).

view, but it is a bit disconcerting to hear it coming from anarchists-even 'agnostice' ones. For it flirts dangerously with the concept of historical processes which in some way or another work their pattern upon human affairs without human agency.

Now putting it simply, surely the anarchist position must hold that history is made by people. If we are to nurture positive trends—trends which lead in the libertarian direction—this surely means that we should do everything to encourage people to become responsible in their work, their community and in themselves, and through that responsibility to make their own history. But making history is a tough business. Nobody can go it alone, for in spite of all the wonderful examples of outstanding individuals who have flown in the face of society to create changes, their fiercest struggles have all been to gain the support of their fellows so that their ideas may become effective. This has been the case in the world of science and of the arts. The struggle of Pasteur in science, Ibsen in the theatre, Cezanne in paint, achieved social significance only when championed and developed by others. How much more is that true of social ideologies themselves.

Indeed, after outlining tendencies which he considers worthy of support, George Woodcock says: 'Given direction and consciousness, these manifestations might well play their part in the weakening of the idea of coercive government . . . and in the overall expansion of freedom.' Given direction and consciousnss by whom? He can only mean by people who see the whole picture and who try to draw together all positive trends and aspirations into a coherent general philosophy. Which in fact is what anarchists have been doing for donkey's years.

Woodcock knows as well as anybody the encouragement that Freedom Press has given to the education work of such people as A. S. Niell; the work in psychology of the early Wilhelm Reich; in sociology and anthropology, Margaret Mead and Malinovsky; in biology, the field workers whose aim is liberation even in a limited field. What the gradualists are now doing however is to assert that this encouragement is more important than the general propaganda for the general philosophy itself-or the creation of a movement to put it into practice on as wide a scale as possible!

There is too a basic dishonesty in the gradualist case. It points to trends and ignores how those trends were initiated. It stresses improvements which have taken place without demonstrating what kind of struggles were involved by what kind of forces in order to achieve those improvements. I can imagine in ten years time some pacifist gradualist will point to the trend towards industrial democracy in Hungary and say that that is a positive tendency which we should nurture. And he may not even know that the conditions for that trend to commence had to be won by a bloody revolution complete with barricades, workers' militia, and a lot of out-of-date romantic nineteenth-century-heroic workers who woke up one morning to find their chiliastic dreams coming true.

SUPPOSE that having said that I am now to be firmly relegated to the museum alongside the dinosaur. Well,

if Bakunin and Kropotkin are already there too I shan't be in such bad company after all. Nor shall I object to being beside all those other comrades for whom anarchism is something more than an intellectual exercise—a position from which to utter moral judgments.

For far from agreeing that anarchism has been passed over by history (whatever that means) I maintain that history hasn't caught up with anarchism yet. The groups and movements which have sprung up and died down since Godwin developed anarchism as a system of thought have been in the nature of explotatory, probing experiments. Inasmuch as they have found little response in the world in general so far we can only say that we must wait until a lot more clearing away and cultivation has been done before the ground is really receptive to the application of our ideas. It doesn't mean that we have missed the boat at all, unless we take a very narrow view of the nature and function of the revolutionary movements of the past.

Nor is it helpful in my opinion to Peckham Experiment, and indeed to all make purely negative criticisms of our

movement-especially if we don't apply the same objective criticism to those 'trends' of which we think so highly. There is not a single tendency which is listed by gradualists to which anarchists could not raise pointed objections. But I always feel that such purist objections are rather sour and negative. By all means let us encourage everybody doing anything which is similar to what we should do in the circumstances-in spite of the limitations always imposed on such endeavours by the authoritarian environment and a non-anarchist approach.

But to point to the mistakes of anarchists in the past and gloss over the achievements seems to me to be unnecessarily leaning in the other direction. To cast aside all that was done by the CNT-FAI in Spain for example because of the failure of 'leaders' is to be very doubtfully objective. One begins to listen for the grinding of the axe. After all the mass-based movement in Spain did more to demonstrate a true industrial democracy in practice than all the social commentators who go to weekend conferences and pat themselves on the back for their acumen in discerning and nurturing trends will do in a hundred years. And to refer to the present movement in Spain as a 'pathetic rump' appears to me to be simply unjustifiable impudence.

IT is always amusing to notice that when someone adopts what is fundamentally a dogmatic attitude he always first accuses others of dogmatism and rigidity. In casting aside all the 'traditional' concepts of anarchism, it is as dogmatic to classify them as all wrong as for any adherent of one school of thought to maintain his as the only right one. Indeed, in taking the line he has done, George Woodcock has quite dogmatically stated that all other interpretations of anarchism are wrong save that one which would reduce it to a sort of cheer-leader for other people's activities.

Well that is certainly the safe way. You can hardly go wrong if you carefully select those adjustments of capitalism which are not in the totalitarian direction, as are most, and give a limited approval to them. It requires nothing more from you than the academic consideration of moral problems. But it bears about as much relationship to anarchism as the Marriage Guidance Council bears to love.

PHILIP SANSOM.

THE HANGING DEBATE Worthless Constitutions

W/E are generally not very impressed by constitutional arguments used by politicians because we have seen the contempt with which Governments can treat legislation enacted "by the will of the people" when they decide that the will of the people is contrary to the (often obscure) interests of the Governments. British Guiana is an important case in point. There, a Government was democratically elected but Whitehall decided that the banner under which the electorate had chosen to live was the wrong colour, so they destroyed the constitution.

We are therefore not surprised, particularly since we had a pre-view of things to come at the Tory conference, to learn that the Government intends obstructing the Death Penalty Abolition Bill, introduced by Sidney Silverman, and passed by a majority free vote in the Commons in February.

The method the Government has adopted, in rather a stupid attempt to cover up that pressure has been

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! £860 Deficit on Freedom £727 Contributions received £133 DEFICIT

October 19 to October 25 New York: S.G. £1/2/6; London: J.S.* 3/-; Ashton-under-Lyne: J.P. 1/-; Birmingham: A.R.L. 16/6; London: H.M.* 2/-; London: S.E.P. 5/-; London: P.M. 5/-; London: A.M. 10/-: London: Hyde Park Sympathisers 4/-: Cheltenham: R. & V.L. 10/-; Hitchin: L.A. 6/-: Welwyn Garden City: Mog 10/-: Belfast D.M. 1/-: London: D.M. 2/-: London: W.E.D. £1; Northwood: E.H. 17/6; San Francisco: L.Incaricato £70; San Mateo: J.O. £1/15/0: Philadelphia: Il Circolo d'Em Sociale £3/10/0.

* Total ... 82 0 6 ... 645 10 3 Previously acknowledged 1956 TOTAL TO DATE ... £727 10 9

GIFT OF BOOKS: London: C.F. *Indicates regula; contributors. brought to bear by the Lords, 'some most eminent ecclesiastical and legal authorities" (Eden-House of Commons), and by rank and file Tories, is to introduce a bill of its own which is expected to amend the law of murder. In this way the Government hopes to find a measure "which would meet the view of the nation" but which will not in any way "limit the rights of member's "private bills". (We have never noticed that the Government is anxious to meet the views of the nation-whatever they might be-on issues where they feel popular opinion will militate against them. Measures which might be unpopular but which seem necessary for Government interests are generally legislated for first and justified afterwards).

Eden has asked the House to await the terms of the Bill which the Government proposes to introduce, but it will not find time in the next parliamentary session for Mr. Silverman's bill, although in February, after the first Commons vote the Government "declined to introduce an abolitionists bill itself but promised parliamentary time and a free vote for the Silverman bill".

The ramifications of the Parliament Act, introduced to limit the power of the Lords, are such that the Government is able to claim that any undertaking given applied only to the last parliamentary session. According to this interpretation therefore, if the abolitionist bill is re-introduced it will be an ordinary private member's bill "enjoying no special facilities".

Tribune, usually so definite and loud in its condemnation of Government policy promises that the matter will be examined in its columns by legal and penological experts but offers no solution except to say that the Lords should be abolished, a sentiment with which we wholeheartedly agree. We would go further however, and suggest that the Commons should go with it and put an, end to the parliamentary farce.

It would seem that the Government, the Lords and the Bishops have 'worked a fast one'. If the Government bill is brought forward and hurried through early in the new session "it could finish its career through the Commons before Mr. Silyverman's re-introduced bill had started" (Manchester Guardian, Oct. 24).

Silverman is quoted as saying, that pressure on the Government will force them to give time for his bill in the new session under the terms of the Parliament Act, if not, they would be committing a "grave constitutional error". This obviously has not deterred the Government from following its present course, and while it will have to concede time eventually, the delay will make the abolitionists' task more difficult, if not impossible.

According to all the terms of parliamentary democracy the free vote taken in February in favour of abolition should have decided the issue once and for all. But this is only another example of the defects of written constitutions; many ways can be found to legally get round

FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly Postal Subscription Rates : 12 months 19/- (U.S.A. \$3.00) 6 months 9/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50) 3 months 5/- (U.S.A. \$0.75) Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies 12 months 29/- (U.S.A. \$4.50) 6 months 14/6 (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.I. England

Tel.: Chancery 8364