

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"Everywhere the strong have made the laws and oppressed the weak; and if they have sometimes consulted the interests of society, they have always forgotten those of humanity."
 —TURGOT.

THE BANK RATE LEAK

INSPIRATION OR INFORMATION ?

HAVE you ever lifted the telephone after working hours and put through a deal worth £200,000? Have you ever made £32,000 in a week?

Foolish questions, perhaps. If you had, you would be among the Top People, and would read *The Times*, not *FREEDOM*. For most people, figures like these are so astronomical as to be almost unbelievable—yet the disclosures at the Bank Rate 'Leak' Tribunal show quite clearly that such transactions are not all that unusual within the golden square mile of the City of London.

Indeed, the main difficulty facing the Tribunal is to decide whether the vast amount of selling of Government stock which took place on the part of a few City firms just before the increase in Bank Rate was announced, was due to special knowledge, and improper use of it, instead of to normal business procedure.

Shares Fall

The inquiry has been instigated as a result of allegations by the Opposition in Parliament that a 'leak' occurred last September of the Government's intention to increase the Bank Rate. An increase such as was introduced (from 5 to 7 per cent.) has an adverse effect upon the Stock Market. Shares immediately fall in value—this is in itself an anti-inflationary move, which is what the increase is expected to do—and clearly anyone in possession of the knowledge that this is bound to happen can clean up handsomely if they can make use of it.

Well, somebody appeared to make use of it. A few City firms made suspiciously large sales of Gilt-Edged stock, and the Labour Party in Parliament began to allege a leak of information, finally naming Mr. Oliver Poole, deputy Chairman of the Conservative Party, as one of the City gents involved. In order to clear his name, Mr. Poole persuaded the Government to yield to the Opposition's pressure for an inquiry.

So far—we write on the 6th day of the inquiry—it looks as though Mr. Poole's name may remain unsullied, although much more may yet be disclosed, and he is (or was on Sept. 18, the day before the Bank Rate went up), a director of, among others, the City firm of Lazards, who did pretty well out of buying and selling before and after the change.

Liquidity

Lazards is one of a group of companies which began heavy selling of Gilt-edged securities (the stock most likely to be affected by Bank rate changes) three days before the rate went up. Two others are The Royal Exchange Assurance Company and the British Match Corporation. Lazards sold about £1,500,000 worth of Gilt-edged, Royal Exchange nearly £1,500,000 and British Match £300,000.

Lazards are merchant bankers and they have to keep "liquidity" at a fairly high level, they say. This means that they have to keep a large proportion of their assets (£11,320,000 last July) 'liquid', i.e. in cash or readily realisable form, in order to meet demands from their depositors, many of whom are foreign concerns who, were getting

worried last summer about the possibility of devaluation of the Pound, and were liable to call for their money at any time. Oh my, the worries these people have!

In order to maintain their "liquidity" Lazards had been calling in loans from local authorities (is it widely known how much local authorities, even 'Socialist' ones, borrow money from banking and finance corporations?*) and small sales of Gilt-edged during August. But on September 17, Lazards attempted to unload £2,000,000 in Gilt-edged! They sold about three-quarters of them. Two days later the Bank rate went up; four days after that Lazards bought back over £500,000 of Government stock, at a reduced price, showing a profit for the week of £32,000. Nice work if you can get it.

Buy Cheap: Sell Dear

These financial wizards operate on the simple formula which is the basis of all trade: buy cheap, sell dear. It's even better when you do it in reverse order. If you buy a bicycle for £5 and sell it for £6, you've made £1.

*We know of at least one Borough in East London which would be bankrupt to-morrow if the financiers called in their loans to it. This could mean all the houses and flats built on the borrowed money could be taken over by the finance corporations—with somewhat disastrous results on the rents. However, we are assured by someone who should know that it would also mean the barricades on the streets!

But if you then buy it back for £5, you have the £1 and the bicycle, to sell again for £6 if you can. One way of making money with shares is to buy cheap, hold them till the price goes up and then sell. But if you happen to know that something is going to happen which will drive their value down—why then you sell right away and buy them back when they hit bottom. That way you've still got the shares and you've made the difference in the two prices. And if you can do this on a big enough scale, your very operations can affect the movement of prices in your favour.

A Connecting Link

However, in the cases of the three companies we have mentioned, there was one connecting link. An important City gentleman named Lord Kindersley, who is chairman and managing director of Lazard Bros., chairman of the British Match Corporation (and of Rolls Royce) and a Governor of the Royal Exchange Assurance Company. He is also a director of the Bank of England (which fixes such things as the Bank Rate with the Treasury), and as such knew that the Bank rate was going up three days before it was announced in the House of Commons. The next day after he gathered his knowledge the three companies mentioned began their heavy unloading of Gilt-edged.

Now, this could of course be pure coincidence. One must hesitate to

Continued on p. 4

Wolfenden Report on Homosexuality Government Refuses Action

'It's the Will of the People'

WHEN politicians are explaining away unpopular government measures they usually claim that such actions are taken for the general good or in the national interest. But when they are considering legislation on matters which involve private morals and they feel that general approval will acclaim their decision it is always put forward as being what the community wants. Thus last Wednesday's decision by the Government to reject the recommendations put forward by the Wolfenden Committee on homosexuality was expressed as follows by Lord Kilmuir in the Lords:

"The Government does not think that the general sense of the community is with the committee in this recommendation. It thinks the problem requires further study and consideration. Certainly there can be no prospect of early legislation on this subject."

We are not impressed by this consideration for the wishes of the people as we remember so many other decisions taken against their wishes, but we are alarmed at the lamentable fact that so many people approve the Government's conclusions on homosexuality on grounds that are far from rational.

In spite of the evidence that consenting adult males cannot harm anyone if they carry on their sexual lives in private, indeed the present laws are more likely to cause harm, people regard homosexual practices as "abnormal" and in some curious way dangerous.

It is evident from the various observations on prostitution that, although it was condemned, it does not excite so much indignation as homosexuality. Yet prostitution far more than homosexuality is an economic relationship which at best can only provide a temporary sexual release. As we understand it many males satisfy their need for love in other men and form lasting relationships based on mutual agreement. While admitting that male prostitution exists it is not as prevalent or obvious as female prostitution. If then the arguments against homosexuality are to be taken seriously, namely that it is a dangerous and corruptive force, the case against female prostitution should be much stronger. The attitude, while disapproving, has generally been that no amount of legislation will prevent prostitution and yet it is argued that homosexuals will be prevented from practising their "perversion" by making it a criminal offence.

Evidence from homosexuals and other impartial sources indicate that prison sentences rather than diminishing the desire increase it.

Another manifestation of the illegality of homosexual practices is the lucrative trade in blackmail (perhaps overstated) which is even acknowledged by the Archbishop of Canterbury who is in favour of the Wolfenden recommendation and who cannot by any stretch of the imagination be described as 'progressive'.

It is obvious that the Government's decision is not based on an honest desire to deal with the problem for the good of society, but that it is submitting to the irrational impulses of the majority of people which echo the feelings of many of its members.

★

The Bishop of Rochester when disposing of the Wolfenden recommendation in the House of Lords last Wednesday said that "homosexual behaviour is a leprosy" therefore the law should not be altered. We thought that Christ, of whom the Bishop is an earthly representative, had a different way of treating lepers!

17 Days to Go and £362 To Find!

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!

WEEK 49	
Deficit on Freedom	£980
Contributions received	£678
DEFICIT	£302

November 29 to December 5	
London: Anon.* 1/10; London: S.B.* 2/3;	
London: P.F.* 1/1; Preston: R.S.M. 6/3;	
London: J.S.* 3/4; Sheffield: P.L. 4/1; Shef-	
field: H.W. 2/-; London: F.L. 1/3; Surbiton:	
F.N.F. 3/6; St. Paul: C.C. 12/-; Earmley:	
G.B.A. 6/-; Oxford: M.T. 5/6.	
Total	3 7 8
Previously acknowledged	*674 19 8
1957 TOTAL TO DATE	£678 7 4

*Indicates regular contributor.

Fire Fund

TOTAL TO DATE £390 10 0

GIFTS OF BOOKS: London: Anon: Glasgow: L.B.

Continued on p. 3

There is a Growing Impatience with Politics and Governments Declare War on Politics!

IN spite of all kinds of material inducements the police force in this country is permanently under strength, and the regular army is unable to attract more than a fraction of the recruits it needs to take over from the existing army of unwilling conscripts. In the public mind the job of being a policeman or a soldier is unpleasant as well as being socially degrading. Yet that same public which does not like being a policeman or related to a policeman will, if questioned on the subject of abolishing the police and the armed forces, hasten to point out that without the police there would be no law and order, and that disarmed we should certainly be subjected to some alien dictatorship!

Similarly the public has the utmost contempt for politicians and governments. Yet talk to them about abolishing governments and dispensing with the services of politicians and we shall discover that they could not conceive of a society without government, or without political leaders.

What do the public want? At a conscious level we doubt whether they have given this question much thought, but unconsciously and through conditioning it seems clear that their lack of faith in, and even hatred of, themselves and their fellow men lead them to want authoritarian institutions on the one hand, but, for the same reasons, resent the individuals who wield power, on the other. The popular press feeds this schizophrenia, by first building up personalities larger than life and

then, when the opportunity presents itself, destroying them, only to build up new ones to take their place. Personalities are built up through mass communications, and are allowed certain eccentricities (indeed if they are really quite ordinary people then it may be necessary to invent a few to make the "personalities" stand out from their lesser fellows!) and are even allowed to utter certain heresies, especially if they are neutralised or swamped on the spot by the spokesmen of respectability and the *status quo*. (This, after all, is the pattern of TV, and sound broadcasts in which controversial subjects are dealt with).

But let the "personality" subject the Establishment to criticism even of the mildest nature and the machine that raised him to such exalted heights will topple him overnight. An example that comes to mind is that of Mr. Malcolm Muggeridge whose mild criticisms, in an article for the American press, of the Royal *entourage* (not even of the monarchy) was enough to destroy him as one of the leading TV personalities in this country and to close most doors which until then were opened wide to welcome anything he wished to say or write. Conversely that political pariah Aneurin Bevan, denounced or ostracized by the Press, emerges from the Labour Party's Brighton Conference an International Personality, a responsible Statesman, only because he had made it clear in his speech that he would not dream of conducting foreign policy without an H-bomb

tucked under his arm. In other words, in the event of a Labour government coming to power, it was being made quite clear that there would be no dramatic changes in policy and that negotiations would be conducted according to the established rules of the game.

Apart from these two glaring examples of the operation of the Cult of the Personality machine, one has only to analyse the contents of the press (including the "serious" newspapers and reviews) to be made aware of the fact that the objective, dispassionate discussion of ideas, of existing values and the presentation of "new" approaches (which are "new" only because they are systematically suppressed by the purveyors of the printed word) are taboo.

★

IT may be objected that we are too sweeping in our condemnation of the Press, and as examples to disprove our contention we may be referred to the current discussions in the *New Statesman* started by J. B. Priestley's penetrating and powerful article on "Britain and the Nuclear Bombs" (No. 2), or the forceful series of "Arguments" in the *News Chronicle*, or even such editorials as "A time for Political Stocktaking" which appeared in *Peace News* a couple of months ago (Oct. 18). For us, who deplore the barrenness of the Press, these isolated examples of unorthodox thinking, are tasty morsels which, however, confirm the monotony of the daily diet. But it

Continued on p. 3

ANYTHING TO DECLARE?

DECLARATION, ed. by Tom Maschler, (MacGibbon & Kee, 18s.).

IN *Declaration*, eight young writers are given an opportunity to make personal statements about their view of life. Doris Lessing, the oldest of them, is a much-admired novelist and an ex-Communist of recent vintage. Colin Wilson is the author of *The Outsider*. John Osborne is an actor and playwright. At the moment you can see his *Look Back in Anger* in New York and *The Entertainer* in London. John Wain is a novelist, poet, critic and former university lecturer. Kenneth Tynan is dramatic critic of *The Observer*. Bill Hopkins, former press officer of the Crusade for World Government. Lindsay Anderson is a film director, involved in the "Free Cinema" movement.—Stuart Holroyd is the author of a book called *Emergence from Chaos*.

(Kingsley Amis, university lecturer, poet and novelist, author of *Lucky Jim*, declined to contribute to the volume, saying "I hate all this pharisaical twittering about the 'state of our civilisation' and I suspect anyone who wants to buttonhole me about my 'role in society'." He has, however, written on just this theme, in his Fabian pamphlet *Socialism and the Intellectuals*).

These writers fall roughly into two categories, which you might call 'believers' and 'humanists'. The believers, Messrs. Wilson, Hopkins and Holroyd, sound a familiar note, the revolt against reason. Mr. Wilson detests Bertrand Russell and A. J. Ayer, because "without mystical premises, philosophy becomes mere logic". Mr. Holroyd views them with a milder distaste. Obviously, when you think of all the people who are far more conspicuously hate-worthy than Russell and Ayer, they are singled out not for what they are, but for what they symbolise—the spirit of sceptical enquiry. To Mr. Wilson "a sceptical civilisation is a half-dead civilisation". Our age, he says, "has become rotten with scientific materialism". There is some hope, however, because "our way of

thinking is swinging back to religion":

"What are the conditions that produce new religions? And are they available in our civilisation to-day? The first and most obvious can be stated immediately. All the great religions were founded by one man, a law-giver: Mahomet, Moses, Zoroaster, Christ, Gautama. That is most important".

"Provided you feel an acute need for some solid belief, and are prepared to look far enough, you can arrive at a religious position in which there are no elements of superstition... The Outsider has retraced the road from philosophy—from total scepticism—to religion. Can the civilisation do it too?"

"The obvious answer—obvious, yet not necessarily true—is No. In which case we must smash".

Smash is one of his favourite words. We must "produce a higher type of man, or *smash*", the Outsider shut up in his personality must *smash* the windows, two centuries of free-thinking have *smashed* Christianity, while man himself, "is born bent and twisted, is a *smashed* radio set".

From Smasher Wilson we go to Crusader Bill Hopkins who tells us that "The times we are entering require a far more flexible and powerful way of thinking than rationalising ever provided" and goes on in the same paragraph to demand "solutions on a new level. A level of universal planning that can only be encompassed by a supranational body like world government". A man who can believe in world government can believe in anything. And indeed he does.

"... a new leadership must also be evolved with the aim of combating this exhaustion by the restoration of belief. When I speak of belief in the present

context, I do not mean any belief in particular, of course, but rather belief divorced from all form whatsoever.

The third member of the trio, Mr. Holroyd, holds that "a properly directed will to Freedom is the only thing that will save our civilisation in its present hour of crisis". The main root of the degeneration of the age "is the humanistic-scientific culture which has dominated the European scene for the last hundred years, and infected all branches of thought, political, philosophical and aesthetic, with its poison." The myths of democracy and representative government, he says, "have placed the controls in the hands of arbitrarily chosen individuals who, more often than not, have no ideas about the very delicate art of governing". Representative government he tells us, is a myth because "no man can represent another". Agreed, but then, instead of hearing more about that will to Freedom, we learn that "government is an art which should be in the hands of an expert minority" since all the greatest civilisations of the past were hierarchical.



AFTER the Superman it is a relief to turn to the "small personal voice" of Miss Lessing, who, demanding in literature, the "warmth, the compassion, the humanity, the love of people which illuminates the literature of the nineteenth century", reminds us that

"the great men of the nineteenth century had neither religion nor politics nor aesthetic principles in common. But what they did have in common was a

climate of ethical judgment; they shared certain values; they were humanists".

Our new writers are sunk in parochialism she declares, and she thinks that when Colin Wilson says "Like all my generation I am anti-humanist and anti-materialist", it is a sign of his "invincible British provincialism" that he should claim to speak for his generation. For

"outside the very small sub-class of humanity Mr. Wilson belongs to, vast numbers of young people are both humanist and materialist. Millions of young people in China, the Soviet Union, and India for instance. And the passions that excite the young African nationalist, five years literate, watching the progress of dams building in India and China, because he knows that what goes on in other countries intimately affects himself, have little in common with the passions of Mr. Wilson. Mr. Wilson may find the desire of backward people not to starve, not to remain illiterate, rather uninteresting but he and people like him should at least try and understand it exists, and what a great and creative force it is, one which will affect us all."

For Miss Lessing, "there are only two choices: that we force ourselves into the effort of imagination necessary to become what we are capable of being; or that we submit to being ruled by the officeboys of big business, or the socialist bureaucrats who have forgotten that socialism means a desire for goodness and compassion—and the end of submission is that we shall blow ourselves up". What however makes us tend to lose patience with her is that throughout her essay she seems to assume that there is some special virtue in being an ex-Communist—that it bestows a certain wisdom that the others haven't got. As Mr. Osborne says in his essay, "Old Lucky Jim may be a simple romantic old snorter, but it didn't take him until last October to smell that one out".

BOOK REVIEW

THE NAGY 'LINE'

IMRE NAGY ON COMMUNISM. Thames and Hudson, 30s.

IMRE NAGY is to-day a prisoner somewhere behind the Iron Curtain, having been abducted, despite guarantees of safety, by Soviet Security Police after leaving the protection of the Yugoslav Embassy in Budapest where he had taken refuge when the Russian army scotched the Hungarian Revolution of October, 1956. There are grounds for believing that a political trial is now being prepared in which he will figure as 'the Imperialist agent who led the forces of Fascist counter-revolution'. If he is ever brought to trial, this book will no doubt be used as part of the documentary evidence to condemn him. It consists of a 'dissertation' written shortly after he had been ousted from the position of premier which he had occupied from July 1953 to April 1955. During that period of 'de-Stalinization' he was largely responsible for initiating 'the New Course' designed to 'liberalize' the Communist régime in Hungary, the chief features of which were a slowing down of the tempo of industrialization, halting forced collectivisation in agriculture, and attempts to restore some measure of national independence from the Soviet bloc. The book is a defence of his policies and is addressed to his former colleagues on the Central Committee of the Hungarian Communist Party and indirectly to the Soviet leaders. It has been circulating clandestinely in Hungary since July of this year and the present edition is based on a copy of the original which was smuggled out of the country last spring.

Of its authenticity there can be little serious doubt. It bears all the marks of its origin. It is a turgid, rambling work, couched in the language of the faithful and liberally laced with quotations from the Marxist scriptures, all designed to prove that Nagy's line was the really 'correct' one and that he was not, therefore, guilty, as alleged, of 'right-wing deviationism'. At first glance, nothing could be duller. Who, except the faithful, cares whether he was or was not an 'objective counter-revolutionary'? And yet, for all its jargon and theologizing, it is one of the great historical documents of our time. Indictments of communist régimes have been pouring from the presses for the last forty years and there are many of greater general interest than this one. But there are few which can escape the charge of being partisan propaganda. For the really self-authenticating indictments one needs to go to the Communists themselves. Condemnation from such sources inevitably carries more weight. Nagy when he wrote this was a Communist writing to Communists: his views may be heretical but they are advanced with patent sincerity.

In Hungary, as elsewhere, the Communists seized power in the name of the proletariat. Their ostensible objective was to end the capitalist exploitation of the working class. This they achieved—but only to replace it by a new form of exploitation. The Rakosi régime, pursuing a policy of industrialization which out-Stalinized Stalin, promised during the Five Year Plan, 1949-1953, to raise living standards by 50%. Industrial output did in fact double during this period and the productivity of labour increased. But the working class did not benefit from these increases. On the contrary, as Nagy points out, living standards were steadily reduced. At the same time, the economy was weakened by the over-emphasis on heavy industry—so much so that, after Stalin's death, even the Soviet leaders were forced to express their dismay at Rakosi's industrial policies.

But more serious than economic exploitation is the political exploitation which Nagy reveals. Long ago Bakunin predicted that the Marxian dictatorship of the proletariat would result in a dictatorship over the proletariat. Later writers have spoken of it as the dictatorship of the Communist Party. But in Hungary, as in Russia, the degeneration of power did not stop merely at the point of party dictatorship. Nagy points out how the dictatorship of the proletariat "is obviously being replaced by a Party dictatorship which does not rely on Party membership, but relies on a personal dictatorship and attempts to make the Party apparatus, and through it the Party membership, a mere tool of this dictatorship". In this dictatorship, the chief weapon is the Secret Police and the principal victims are the very workers in whose name power is exercised. "The majority of those convicted," sates Nagy, "have come from the ranks of the working class, the industrial workers. This, more than anything else, is evidence of the degeneration of power and economic and social conditions under which the working class is carrying out its task of socialist construction." The apparatus of 'the worker's state' was used to pass mass judgments, without any legal foundations, on thousands and tens of thousands who resisted the policies of the ruling clique. Having concentrated supreme power in their own hands, the party leaders came to regard themselves as infallible. "They generally considered criticism from below as the voice of the enemy and acted accordingly... They took even the mildest form of criticism as a personal insult. According to them, mistakes could only be made by the lower echelons."

In its original form Marxism was a profoundly humanistic creed, a product of the great 18th century enlightenment, and inspired by the hope of ending the alienation of the masses of men in modern society. The contemporary prac-

tioners of Marxism, however, have emptied it of all its vital content. Nagy's comments on the Rakosi régime have a general applicability to Communist governments everywhere. "Under their leadership the building of socialism was reduced to the socialization of the instruments of production, the establishment of the economic basis of socialism, the transformation of the economy and the class relations depending thereon, and the acquisition and consolidation of political power. They completely forgot about living society, about man with his manifold, complicated, individual and social relations, at the crux of which are ethical and moral problems."

Nagy cannot be absolved from his share of the responsibility for the crimes committed in the name of the proletariat in Hungary since the war. But, as these quotations and his actions show, he retained something of his native honesty and integrity in the face of the new barbarism. Within his circumscribed limits, he attempted to do something to alleviate the conditions of the Hungarian people and this explains why he became for a brief moment during the October Revolution a symbol of their demand for freedom. In this book there are several passages in which he warns of the impending disaster that will follow the abandonment of his programme of 'liberalization'. In this point, subsequent events have proved him right. But these same events serve also to underline the dilemma facing all those who seek to liberalize Communism from within. Once one begins to set one's course towards freedom there is no knowing where one will end. The Communists have acquired and maintained their power by means of political terrorism. Once that is relaxed the whole system of Communist Party rule collapses. There is nothing in this book to suggest that Nagy himself had any answer to this problem or that, had his views prevailed, he would have been any more successful than Tito or Gomulka in reconciling Communist rule with the workers' demand for freedom.

G.O.

Are you ordering your Gift Books from FREEDOM Bookshop?



It helps to pay the overheads and the deficit

As might be expected from his plays, Mr. Osborne has a splendid line in vituperative language. And he hits plenty of targets. The Royalty religion, the Suez affair, the British H-bomb tests, the Church, and the people who are angry with the 'angry young men' because they don't rally behind the Labour Party's clever young men. His own attitude is expressed in these words:

"Nobody can be very interested in my contribution to a problem like the kind of houses people should have built for them, the kind of school they should send their children to, or the pensions they should be able to look forward to. But there are other questions to be asked—how do people live inside those houses? what is their relationship with one another, and with their children, with their neighbours and the people across the street, or on the floor above? What are the things that are important to them, that make them care, give them hope and anxiety? What kind of language do they use to one another? What is the meaning of the work they do? Where does the pain lie? What are their expectations? What moves them, brings them together, makes them speak out? Where is the weakness, the loneliness? Where are the things that are unrealised? Where is the strength? Experiment means asking questions, and these are all questions of socialism."

Mr. Tynan too, writes very well about what is wrong with the British theatre and with the social assumptions that lie behind its mediocrity and vapidty. He sees as a symbol of renaissance the work of the English Stage Company, from which "intelligent drama is seeping into the West End", slowly and lethargically, "like ink across blotting-paper that has spent a generation in thick and petrified aridity". But,

"we are still deficient in plays that are socially critical at the same time as they are uproariously funny. We miss the sound of *responsible* gaiety. And we could do with more of those detonating farces that are written by anarchists, who are usually Socialists driven to drink by the anti-fun bias of English Socialism".



IF you want to see what the youngest generation is like, he says, go to the jazz clubs, where you will find

"an instinctive Leftism, an undemonstrative sympathy with anarchy, a dislike of class politicians, a vivid vernacular made up of Hollywood, space fiction and local dialect, a polite interest in drugs, a good deal of shared promiscuous pleasure, and almost no drunkenness. These young people cannot look at Macmillan's face without laughing, and they cannot work up much interest in our inalienable right to flog Cypriot schoolboys... They are bright, unaggressive and authentically tolerant. Few of them would be capable of doing anything with a razor except shaving with it. You could never make a lynch-mob out of them, because the art they live for was invented by Negroes. What they (and you, and I) lack is a rallying-point, social and political..."

John Wain sees the writer's job as that of humanising our environment. "The artist's function is always to *humanise* the society he is living in, to assert the importance of humanity in the teeth of whatever is currently trying to annihilate that importance". We are walking on a tightrope, he says, and the important thing to do is to keep our heads, which implies

"a rejection of wholesale thinking and block attitudes. If a mechanical rebelliousness is futile, it is also true that an uncritical 'acceptance' of the age one lives in is not so much culpable as impossible. How can anyone say that he accepts, or rejects, the twentieth century *en bloc*? It is too full of unresolved muddles for that. Not only have the forces of change acted patchily, leaving inert areas (e.g. the physical sciences have changed out

Continued on p. 4

Freud without the Complexes

GLORY REFLECTED by Martin Freud. Angus & Robertson, 21s.

THIS is a cosy and modest book and one at least of the motives for writing it—in addition that is to those of filial pride and piety—would seem to be to redress the atmosphere of gloom and heaviness which may have been built up around the name of Freud. This aim is successful and one gets the impression of a Freud who was a powerful but benign *pater familias*.

Mr. Martin Freud would also seem to be straining a little to produce an atmosphere of 'normality'—which here means a refutation of any 'Freudian' motivation to the family behaviour. It is as though he must emphasise that nothing of the analytical theory or practice applied to them. Apart from this over-compensation, and a hint of excessive nostalgia (understandable in the light of the subsequent tragic events in Austria) the book makes pleasant reading and certainly emphasises the 'human-ness' of Freud.

M.N.W.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

(Open 10 a.m.—6.30 p.m., 5 p.m. Sats.)

- Second-Hand . . .**
- Prosperity Decade George Soule 6/-
 - A Village by the Jordan Joseph Baratz 5/6
 - An Essay on Population T. R. Malthus (2 vols.) set 7/6
 - Art and Regeneration Maria Petrie 2/6
 - Wealth Against Commonwealth Henry D. Lloyd 6/6
 - The Labour Movement L. T. Hobhouse 4/-
 - Garden Cities Ebenezer Howard 3/6
 - The Wonder World A. G. Whyte 2/6
 - Comrade, O Comrade Ethel Mannin 4/-
 - Men, Machines and History S. Lilley 3/6
 - Valley of the Moon Jack London 5/-
 - Disobedience Alberto Moravia 3/6
 - What is Mutualism? C. L. Schwartz 2/6
 - The Dreamer Julian Green 3/6
 - Strait is the Gate André Gide 5/-
 - Russia Louis Segal 3/-
 - If I Were Dictator James Maxton 2/6
 - Between Two Worlds Upton Sinclair 3/6
 - The Doomington Wanderer Louis Golding 3/-
 - Commonsense and the Adolescent Ethel Mannin 4/6
 - The Black Monk Anton Tchekhoff 3/-
 - John Barleycorn Jack London 3/-
 - The Cruise of the Snark Jack London 3/-
 - Crime and Punishment Fyodor Dostoevsky 3/6
 - The White Peacock D. H. Lawrence 5/-
 - The New Spirit Havelock Ellis 3/-
- Periodicals . . .**
- Libertarian (Australia) No. 1, September 1957 1/-
 - University Libertarian No. 4, Autumn 1957 1/-
 - Views and Comments October 1957 3d.

WE DISTRIBUTE:

Socialist Leader, Peace News, Free-thinker, Industrial Worker, L'Adunata, Solidaridad Obrero, Umanita Nova, etc., etc.

We can supply ANY book required, including text-books. Please supply publisher's name if possible, but if not, we can find it. Scarce and out-of-print books searched for—and frequently found!

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

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

Declare War on Politics!

Continued from p. 1

is expecting too much of those whose tastes have been conditioned by the cooks of mass-communications to assume that they will appreciate titbits of ideas drowned in a gravy of conformism and orthodoxy!

We put forward this view seriously and in the hope that it will be given more than a little thought, particularly by those of our readers who have a social conscience as well as being writers in the public eye. Perhaps we should first state our opinion that ideas, values and systems cannot be changed suddenly. Nevertheless we believe that no headway of any consequence will be made in a hundred years if one's propaganda lacks the courage—or the conviction—to strike at the root of the social problem as the first step.

If we were to be asked whether there is agreement among progressive people as to what is "the root of the social problem", we should have to reply that we don't know for the simple reason that no one outside the small anarchist and some socialist circles ever raises this question in print. And it is not altogether due to an oversight on their parts. It is sad but true that those whose mental gifts and intellectual preparation fit them to lead a revolution in thinking, have themselves been absorbed by the system and "converted" to a tacit acceptance of the social and economic premises from which stem their own positions of privilege in society. That they have all got hot and bothered over the H-bomb and the missiles is understandable; in such a war there will be no more funk holes at a safe distance from the receiving end of the explosions and the fall-out, except perhaps for the few deep shelters reserved for the politicians and their chosen people.

The apathy of the man-in-the-street against which they are now so vocal, is after all understandable. He is accustomed to be at the receiving end of flame-throwing tanks and those old fashioned High Explosive bombs; he hasn't many privileges to lose, and not much of a life to defend in spite of the undoubted glamour (provided by TV) of having the cream of our intellectuals in his front room any evening of the week.

It is sad but true that our best brains are ignored, ostracised and even imprisoned when they say what they believe, but given world wide publicity the moment they become realists, and write and talk in the political jargon of the "statesman"! Not only do they do an injustice to themselves and to those of us who appreciated their real worth as thinking men, but they reveal that they are so carried away by this new sense of their importance as public figures, that they believe that what they say may influence the trend of events. It is true that a Bertrand Russell, an Oppenheimer, a Picasso, or a Schweitzer could influence governments in the best interests of mankind, we would even be prepared to withdraw our criticism of their actions. But the fact is that no government is influenced by moral argument or even considerations of the public good.

The only argument to which governments lend an ear is power: a people in arms, passive resistance, mass disobedience, a self-reliant people who create their own organisations for self-help, who by-pass the centralised machinery of production and distribution—these are the arguments which make governments sit up and think not the appeals by learned professors and eminent Television stars!

We have digressed only because we believe that these same voices, in "the wilderness", away from the brain-addling glare of the Press spotlight, have so much to contribute to the mental transformation of society if only they direct their intelligence and their gift of language to the people themselves, to the potential victims, to the army of industrial slaves, who at this very moment are forging the weapons for their own destruction.

THE need to understand "the root of the social problem" can best be illustrated by reference to some of the articles by our grey eminences to which we made mention earlier. Alan Taylor in his contribution to the *News Chronicle's* series of "arguments" suggests that public apathy in politics is largely the fault of our leaders. "How can we follow?"—he asks—"when they are not going anywhere—except to destruction?" And he goes on:

"Our present political leaders of all parties don't believe in anything, don't believe passionately and with all their souls. They want office. And they administer conscientiously when they get it. But they don't want to do anything. They just wait for the next crisis, and hope it will not be too tough."

Apart from the contradiction when he says that our political leaders "don't believe in anything" and then goes on to say "they want office" (which means Power), it will be noticed that Mr. Taylor is indignant because the leaders are not worth following, and not because the people are stupid enough to follow! The whole theme of his article is that we should be provided with leaders with black and white policies to choose from, that is "more social equality, or less social equality. I mean: more hydrogen bombs or no hydrogen bombs. I mean: holding the colonies down or setting them free".*

J. B. Priestley in his "Britain and the Nuclear Bombs" debunks the antics of the politicians and statesmen with devastating skill, and at one point argues that if it is true that our civilisation is bent on self-destruction it is nevertheless possible "that the spell can be broken".

If it can, then it will only be by an immensely decisive gesture, a clear act of will. Instead of endless bargaining for a little of this in exchange for a little of that, while all the time the bargainers are being hurried down a road that gets steeper and narrower, somebody will have to say "I'm through with all this".

But in spite of that he cannot resist arguing in political terms, and at one point even confuses the people with political power when he writes:

Alone, we defied Hitler; and alone we can defy this nuclear madness into which the spirit of Hitler seems to have passed, to poison the world.

This is *factually* pure nonsense; as a peroration it's no better than second-rate Churchillise.

However he inspired Edward Hyams to join the fray, and welcome, we regret to say, "Mr. Priestley's magnificent return from the wilderness" (our italics). Mr. Hyams when he talks of freedom has, as usual, pertinent things to say. But his conclusions are depressing. He thinks that "there is nothing we can do because we are, *de facto*, disenfranchised", and that, because

the instrument which we have for long thought of as the means whereby we make the government do what we, the people, want it to do [the House of Commons] has ceased to be responsive, if it ever was, to its constituents, and its members simply march in and out of the voting lobbies according to the decisions made by parties. . . . Decisions made by parties are, to a large extent, made by the leaders who will form cabinets. Politicians certainly don't want to go to the lifetime of trouble required to get office,

*Whilst Mr. Taylor—"I'm a rank-and-file member of the Labour Party and have been for 30 years"—offers as policies no hydrogen bombs or more hydrogen bombs, on social equality it's not quite so black and white: it's "more" or "less" not social equality or no social equality! "more social equality" in any case is the language of "some are more equal than others"!

and then find themselves no more important in the world than the cabinet ministers of Switzerland or Norway. We have recently seen this horrid prospect corrupt even Mr. Bevan, a politician whom we thought better than most, but of whom we can now say no more than that he is no worse. In short, it seems to me that the interests of the people of Britain, and that of any conceivable government of Britain are now as opposed, though not so obviously opposed, as those of the people of Hungary, the USSR or Spain, and their respective governments.

It could not have been better expressed by an anarchist, except that we never imagined that governments could, by their constitution ever represent the people. But Mr. Hyams should not feel despondent at his discovery—he might well have spent the rest of his days flogging the Labour horse without results—and should now use his great gifts as a publicist to tell the rank and file of the Labour Party, and the workers in general of his discovery, which, shared by millions, will convert his "shoulder-shrugging mood" into one of enthusiasm and optimism!

We pass over Bertrand Russell's "Open Letter to Eisenhower and Krushchev" (*N.S.*, Nov. 23) which is a pathetic attempt to appeal to their better instincts, to the two most powerful men in the world who at the same time are warm, human beings with the good of mankind at heart. It was perhaps tactless of Kingsley Martin to follow this appeal a fortnight later with a long article on Eisenhower by an American woman professor entitled "The Cipher in

the White House"! As the title indicates the criticism of Eisenhower is that he is not only a sick man but a political stooge of the public relations men and "the palace guard". Indignantly the *New Statesman* points to the fact that "the President is becoming the Chief Co-ordinator instead of the Chief Executive". When will they exorcise Stalin's ghost from Gt. Turnstile?

MEANWHILE in Blackstock Rd. our pacifist friends have been busy clearing out skeletons from their political cupboard, and in *Peace News* for October 18, they announce editorially that the end of Bevanism ought to be "A time for Political Stocktaking". They oppose the two political parties for

both accept that there shall be increasing concentration of power in large corporations in one form or another—the framework of the "managerial society"—and both accept that, except for his power to give an increasingly meaningless vote once every five years, which must represent his wishes over the whole vast complexity of issues that govern his conditions, the average man—outside the inner two thousand or so—shall have less and less opportunity of making any impact on the way his life is ordered.

In their place, *Peace News* declares:

There is need for a new and distinctive school of political thought, and we believe that the many pacifists who have always been apprehensive of the increasing power of the existing social order to destroy the individual and prohibit real community can play a key part in the development of such a school.

Such criticisms and such objections surely lead one to the acceptance of the anarchist position. Will our pacifist friends take the plunge and recognise that war is a symptom of a diseased society, or will they continue to treat it as a boil which may perhaps respond to "understanding between nations" and the application of political poultices?

WE will conclude with a quotation and a simple question. The quotation is from a letter published in the *New Statesman*:

... Mr. Hyams, I am sure, has hit the nail on the head when he speaks of our feelings of inadequacy against the men we have set up to represent us. That, surely, is a primary reason for young people's inertia to-day. (I speak from first-hand experience, as I am 22). We feel outclassed, that we don't count, that politicians and business men have the whole world taped and will carry on regardless of our feelings and wishes, creating tensions, and testing bigger and better nuclear bombs. But please, Mr. Hyams, don't shrug your shoulders. What hope there is for my generation may depend on the lead of such distinguished individuals as yourself. Given that lead many of my age would respond, in Mr. Priestley's words, to "something great and noble in its intention".

JENIFER JACKSON.

The question is addressed not only to Mr. Priestley and Mr. Hyams but to all men and women of goodwill: Has the time not come to declare war on politics and to encourage Youth to take the hard, materially unrewarding road of personal integrity, responsibility and resistance?

Bourgeois Proletarian Intellectuals—2

THE HEART AND THE HEAD

THE anarchist's task in present day society is colossal, yet the fields of activity open to him are very limited. He can make propaganda by writing or speaking, he can take part in the less publicised but equally necessary work of administration of various functional enterprises (in the case of the London anarchist, the bookshop, the club, etc.) or he can seek to live his anarchism as truly as possible by joining a community where all wealth is shared in common, a free environment is provided for the children, and so on.

With the size of the movement and the state of the working class being what they are, any mass revolutionary action in Britain is out. Such activity as is possible is so within small groups or perhaps even only on the individual level. Nevertheless within those limits there is plenty of scope, possibility and need for enthusiasts to do positive work for the movement in the general sense.

Not Interested in Freedom

When therefore, we find people less interested in carrying out any positive work than in denouncing others for deviationism and dilettantism we may be excused if we assume that they are not truly interested in the work of the movement—and, thus, the *ideas* of the movement—and, fundamentally, are not interested in achieving freedom for others, and perhaps not even for themselves.

Now fortunately we are not plagued with many such in our movement, which is in itself a good sign in view of the many directions from which we are approached, for few people come towards the anarchist movement having held no previous social ideas whatsoever.

I came into contact with anarchism and joined the movement without having been in any party or organisation at all. Before embracing the ideas of anarchism I was a vague sort of humanitarian pacifist, but socially and politically I was a virgin. This, perhaps, carries the same sort of disadvantage as a virgin bride may suffer on entering holy matrimony. A lack of previous experience, and therefore no means of comparison. On the other hand, I had no misconceptions of which I had to be aborted, nor did I bring with me any nostalgia or hangover from any previous liaison.

The Last Resort

Probably the majority of those who embrace the anarchist philosophy have had experience in political, religious or industrial organisations. There are undoubtedly some for whom the anarchist movement represents the last resort in their slide down the slope of disillusionment, a haven of cynical rejection of activity, a nihilism, almost, but of course without the desperate urge to protest of the 19th century Russian nihilists.

With the latter we need not concern ourselves overmuch. They do represent some slight disadvantage in that such influence as they do have is for apathy and negation and if they are taken as in any way representative of anarchism they create an impression of ineffectuality which, in such generally apathetic times as these, can be contagious. But my subject in this present dissertation (in case any of you are wondering), is the category of converts from authoritarian organisations who become holier than thou on entering the movement and appear to be burning with enthusiasm for activity without stopping to understand what it's all about first.

Phoney Science & the Irrational

The trouble is that, as Max Stirner put it, or might have put it, "The heart still beats for that which the head has rejected". Stirner, in his analysis of the Ego, recognised himself as a whole being—heart, head, guts and all. Our intellectual beliefs do have a connection with our emotional character—a connection which is played upon in mass movements where a phoney ideology is built upon emotional instability.

The highest example of this, so far, was the Nazi movement. True the Communists run them close with a pretended scientific theory which can yet only justify its applications by the most unscientific apologies by people who are emotionally identified. But still I think the Nazis took the biscuit with their use of the appeal of the irrational, the hysterical, on a bewildered, unsure people suffering from grievances and a sense of unfulfilled potentialities.

The welding of emotional and intellectual factors applies, by and large, to all ideologies. The Nazis and the Communists are the outstanding examples because they have appeared to apply consciously the hypnotic techniques of mass psychology. But it applies also to all patriotism and all identification with authority. It applies also to anarchism, as I have already indicated: "Anarchism is not a theory which can be embraced intellectually without involving the emotions, the character, the behaviour of the professed anarchist".

Disillusionment

Trouble comes to an individual when he splits himself in two and embraces intellectually a body of ideas which do not coincide with his emotional character. Many an authoritarian has demonstrated the ease with which he can slip from one dogma to another. The game of Catholics and Communists is our favourite example. And within the political and religious world, one could wander happily from one party to another, one church to another, with no more inconvenience than changing the badge in one's lapel, if once one accepts the basic self-abnegation which an authority demands,

When however a person with an authoritarian personality wanders out of the warmth and comfort of leadership and organisation from above into a sphere where there is nothing to lean on—in *this way*—he may find it possible, through disillusionment with leaders, to accept the theory with his head, but the implications for his heart will fill him with torment.

Disillusionment with a body of ideas usually begins through one becoming disillusioned with the people holding them. How many Marxists have gone right through the whole gamut of Marxist parties, even sometimes ending up by parties (even sometimes ending up by starting their own group, which, they are convinced, will one day be the new revolutionary party in which the masses are waiting), being, at every stage, disillusioned not with the ideas but with the people interpreting them? How many have stamped out of the Anarchist movement snarling that "They're not real anarchists"?

If you can't work with people although professing similar ideas it is usually because their interpretation of those ideas is different from yours, and if you become disillusioned with the people, it is then possible to pass on to the thought that you now no longer agree with the ideas. There may be a variety of reasons as to why you cannot work with particular people, and most probably none of them have any ideological basis, but breaking with the people gives the physical appearance of a change of idea, and you look around for another group with a different idea which coincides with your present position.

The Intellectual Embrace

For the Socialist the change from one party to another presents no problem—once the initial suspicion that you are planted to bore from within has been dispersed. But for the socialist who has become disillusioned with socialists—because of the behaviour of the Labour Party in office, the excesses of the Stalinists, Hungary, because a comrade ran off with his wife, or what have you—and thereby fools himself that he has finished with socialism, and embraces intellectually the revolutionary ideas of anarchism—this character is building up a sad experience for himself.

Basically, his heart will continue to beat for the tenets of socialism. The historic mission of the working class, the dialectic and the class struggle, the necessity to provide a leadership for the masses in action, and a lot more of the jargon will colour his interpretation of anarchism, which he will embrace intellectually as an "advanced form of socialism". In fact he will probably argue that we should call it Libertarian Socialism instead of Anarchism so as not to put people off.

P.S.

(To be continued)

The Aftermath of War

WHEN the 'gradualists' propose social reforms as being the only realistic approach to the free society we agree with them to the extent that it is better to have some form of social service, however inadequate, than none at all.

When however, they compare improved social conditions of to-day with earlier periods, enthusiastic gradualists are apt to ignore the fact that large areas of the world are still full of hungry people without homes or hope.

Gradually, we are told, this condition will be eliminated. But in some parts of the world the terrible conditions which exist are the result of recent war. Capitalism and technological progress have meant for thousands of people napalm bombs and for those who have survived burned out houses. It is therefore the anarchist belief that as long as people are prepared to put up with some reforms instead of aiming to remove the basic causes by a radical change in social conditions and relationships, the wars and the ensuing misery are likely to continue. Thus some sections of the world population may benefit from reforms while others continue to suffer.

If there was any evidence that each new reform widened its scope and remained a fixed part of social conditions it could be argued that gradually capitalism would be reformed out of existence. It is our conviction that the economic system supported by a political power principle can only concede reforms which will not interfere with its need to expand. In times of economic crisis social services are deprived of money and labour to meet commitments which are generally described as being in the national interest, which means the State and those who control the wealth in any country.

We also maintain that war cannot be reformed in the interests of humanity; it can only be abolished. The threat of war on a small or large scale is the companion of capitalism, in the interests of which people and principles are constantly threatened.

It is often so much easier for people to believe that 'things' are always improving. This conviction springs partly from a desire not to have an uncomfortable conscience. But ignoring the truth for the sake of an easy conscience will not alter any situation.

The Anarchists are no more "feeling" than most other people, but their sympathies may extend further. Unlike the majority we do not try to forget or make no attempts to learn about the misery of people in remote parts of the world who may even be the victims of policies of 'our Government'. Nor do we try to suppress the natural 'good' impulses which exist in everyone but which are often restrained because of fear as much as for indifference.

As we see it our interests are bound up with ordinary people all over the world and our sympathies with those who suffer as a result of war. At the risk of always appearing to only emphasise the defects in society we think it is part of our job to draw attention constantly to the existence of so many underprivileged people in forgotten parts of the world, and to try and do something to help.

We recognise there are many ways by which people can suffer; lack of freedom may be a greater deprivation to some than lack of food; inability to lead a fairly satisfactory life can give rise to a great deal of unhappiness. Barbara Hutton, the Woolworth heiress, is quoted as having said that she had nothing to live for. An example of a lady with too much money and a lot of time to spare unable to find a satisfactory solution to her personal problems.

Rational adults however, are usually capable of coping with problems which arise from day to day in the course of their lives. For children this is not so easy. They have neither the physical or mental requirements to cope unaided with some of the problems which our society creates. When children have been deprived of parents, home and basic food requirements their situation is particularly tragic.

Writing in the *Manchester Guardian* (Dec. 9th), John B. Taylor describes the lives of some of these children, and of the stock reaction to a recent appeal for money for famine relief: "Are there still refugees?" "I thought they'd got rid of famine by now", are the observations of people who do not really want to know. Some people may be genuine enough in their ignorance, being unaware of conditions existing outside their own narrow world, and certainly very little publicity is given to the underprivileged in Asia, Africa and the victims of the last war still rotting in settlements in some parts of Europe.

The few tragic stories which reach us through newspaper articles tell a pitiful tale. Korea was the last country to be completely devastated by war conducted by two powerful forces whose last consideration was for the people of that country crushed by contending armies. A Korean estimate put the death of civilians during the war at 2,000,000, out of

a population of 28,000,000. We quoted in an issue of *FREEDOM* (reprints 1951) from a *New York Herald Tribune* editorial. Estimating the dead, as well as the countless others who had been uprooted from the rubble of what was once their homes, it stated that this made the civilian disaster one of the worst, relatively, in history. But, words had been singularly unsuccessful in conveying the extent of the tragedy to the American people.

How much more difficult seven years after the event to awake the conscience of America and the rest of the world to the plight of the war victims?

John Taylor tries to convey the conditions under which the orphaned children in Korea live. He gives one example from a group of "better off" children. An old Christian pastor and his wife had collected over 50 children between the ages of 4 and 10, and were caring for them as best they could in a dark and dilapidated house. They had no toys or books, and even in summer clothes were short. Of others he writes:

Here, and elsewhere, there were far more who had none of the security of a home. The Western visitor is liable to regard the street urchin as a thorough nuisance and to forget the reason why he is not in a school or with his family. His deformities, his blindness, his crippled limbs may well be the result of deliberate maiming by his parents, who thus make their child a more lucrative source of income. His stealing and begging will often be because he is desperately hungry and certainly because he has acquired no moral standards. He carries disgusting sores and ragged clothes because no one cares for him. From the sprawling baby to the wizened old beggar, in the heat of summer and the cold of winter, in the Arab village or in the cosmopolitan city, one sees lives spent entirely in the gutter.

In Korea, much of the work "must be tackled by voluntary organisations"—the victims of war left to the pity of people who have not forgotten how to be kind.

We began by discussing the usefulness of reforms. We still feel that sometimes these have helped to make life easier for some people. But only if we recognise how limited these are can the greater human tragedies be avoided.

The United Nations Children's Fund, 14-15, Stratford Place, London, W.1., is appealing for money to allow children everywhere "to eat well, to be saved from disease, to live in a clean and healthy environment". Would it not be in the interests of mankind if war, which makes such organisations necessary, was for ever abolished? Is there any hope in pleading for the emergence of sane and humane principles by which we can live and encourage "our drives towards co-operation" so that we can at least try to create a harmonious society?

M.

The 'Leak'

Continued from p. 1

think other than well of Lord Kindersley, who is, besides being so important in the City, an Officer and a Gentleman. He is an Old Etonian, and he won the Military Cross in the Scots Guards in World War I. Such men do not betray their Country's secrets, and we would be willing to bet our own Old Etonian tie to a mug of Borstal cocoa that milord Kindersley didn't tell a soul that the Bank rate was going up.

Embarrassing Knowledge

What he may have done is simply, in his terse, clipped, stiff-upper-lip, brusque Scots Guards manner, have given instructions for his companions to sell their Gilt-edged while the going was good. And since he was the gaffer (and in a position to know a thing or two, what's more) why should anyone demand his reasons in writing, or in the minutes?

There is another financial wizard, a Mr. William Johnston Keswick,

who is also chairman of a City company and a director of the Bank of England, whose company made some inspired selling of Gilt-edged just before September 19. In his case there is a story of cables to and from Hong Kong, and a letter sent to him while he was shootin' in Scotland from a deputy governor of the Bank of England—a letter he was careful to destroy. Mr. Keswick—and others—have admitted how embarrassing it is to be sitting on both sides of the financial fence—to have the left hand doing something of which the right is itching to take advantage, but of course mustn't for ethical reasons.

A very difficult situation, and if, occasionally, the fingers touch, and the quickness of the hand deceives the eye... well, these chappies are only human, and so, fallible, after all.

The thing is, fallibility can be so jolly profitable, can't it?

Anything to Declare

Continued from p. 2

Continued from p. 2

of recognition, while the civil law has remained in the nineteenth century; we cannot get rid of the death penalty or revolutionise the prison system; not only that, but the various eddies of modern thought have lost touch with one another".

We must, he concludes "have the nerve to go step by step; and that means having the courage to say No to our fools, however influential and important they may be".

Lindsay Anderson's advice on the other hand is to "get out and push". He castigates the British film industry for the same tepid triviality that Mr. Tynan finds on the stage. He attacks both the "Establishment" and the Labour movement. "The old moral inspiration of radicalism has dribbled away, and its loss has certainly not been made good by Fabian intellectualism. The Trade Unions are as capable of philistine, narrowly sectional actions as the Tories—perhaps even more so." He also goes for John Wain and Kingsley Amis, "both of them anti-idealist, anti-emotional, and tepid or evasive about their social commitments". Commenting on Mr. Amis's *Socialism and the Intellectuals*, he says:

"Socialism as a positive ideal, involving definable human values, apparently means nothing to him: his only real concern is not to be caught out, not to expose himself through naïf enthusiasm to the ridicule of the sophisticated, not to commit himself. One can only wonder why he continues to vote Left: through a lingering, irrational, shame-faced humanism, I suppose".

The kind of 'liberal' that they typify, says Anderson,

"will commit himself to nothing more specific, or more dynamic, than a vague

notion of 'decency'. He is on the humane side. He opposes the death penalty; he disapproves of our action in Suez. But his reactions are all *against*; his faiths are all negative. Tolerance is the most positive virtue he can accept, and for a political ideal he can find nothing more inspiring than the ambition 'not to find himself bossed around by a totalitarian government'—though this can hardly be more than a pious hope on his part, since he is mistrustful of political programmes, and does not really believe in the efficacy of political action. Politically, in fact, he exists in a vacuum . . ."

★

BUT isn't this mistrust of political programmes and disbelief in the efficacy of political action, a sign not merely of liberal opportunism, but also of the greater maturity of this varied assortment of 'humanists' (we needn't take the other three seriously), when compared with the political illusions once cherished by the young writers of the thirties, with whom they are often compared? Isn't the 'commitment' of Doris Lessing and Lindsay Anderson going to be betrayed if they tie it on to a political party? The kind of socialism that John Osborne is asking for has nothing in common with the various political rackets which go by that name. Kenneth Tynan regards anarchists as socialists who have been driven to drink, but might they not be socialists who have taken his notion of socialism to its logical conclusion, from rejection of politics to rejection of the state and of the idea of authority, and are consciously seeking, where these writers are groping, for new social forms which reflect the 'liberating experience' of which he writes? C.W.

The Malatesta Club invites you . . .

IN order to celebrate Christmas in the Christian Spirit the Malatesta Club invites you to a

XMAS PARTY

at 32 Percy Street, London, W.1.
on Saturday, December 21
from 7.30—11.30 p.m.

- ★ SKIFFLE GROUP!
(THE SCORPIONS)
- ★ ANARCHIST FLOOR SHOW!
- ★ ADMISSION 2/6!
(Including Coffee)

E. London Debating Contest

IN the East London Debating Contest, the Malatesta Club Debating Society has defeated a team from the Proportional Representation League on the motion 'That this House prefers no representation to proportional representation'.

The debate was held at the Malatesta Club, but with neutral judges and chairman. One of the judges was a barrister and the chairman (whose casting vote gave victory to the Malatesta team) is not only a solicitor but a J.P. as well! It says plenty therefore, for the skill of the home team that they were able to convince the officers on a straight anarchist argument against the legalistic parliamentary case of the P.R. speakers.

In the next round—the semi-final—the Malatesta Club has been drawn against a team entered by the Hackney branch of the Socialist Party of Great Britain.

Details are as follows:

DEBATE

Semi-Final of the East London Debating Contest

Motion:

THAT THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN BEST REPRESENTS THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING CLASS

Proposers: S.P.G.B.

Opposers: The Malatesta Club.

to be held at

Upper Hall, Bethnal Green Town Hall,
Cambridge Heath Rd., London, E.2.
(nr Bethnal Gn. Stn.)
on Friday, 20th December, 1957
at 7.45 p.m.
(Open to the Public.)

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

Every Sunday at 7.30 at
THE MALATESTA CLUB,
32 Percy Street,
Tottenham Court Road, W.1.

LECTURE - DISCUSSIONS

DEC. 15—Donovan Pedely on
FREEDOM & ORGANISATION
DEC. 22—Harry McLoughlin on
LOVE AND ANARCHISM

Questions, Discussion and Admission
all free.

HAMPSTEAD LIBERTARIAN GROUP

Fortnightly public discussions are held on alternate Mondays at 7.45 p.m. in the basement of 12, Oak Hill Park (off Fropnal) N.W.3. Nearest tube station: Hampstead (Northern Line).

"Right Livelihood and the Responsible Life"

December 16, 1957
Introduced by
S. E. PARKER.

★ Malatesta Club ★

SWARAJ HOUSE,
32 PERCY STREET,
TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD, LONDON, W.1.

ACTIVITIES

Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.
London Anarchist Group Meetings
(see Announcements Column)

Every Wednesday at 8 p.m.
BONAR THOMPSON speaks

INTERNATIONAL ANARCHIST CENTRE MEETINGS

Discussion Meetings
every Thursday at 8 p.m.

DEC. 19—Alan Albon on
IS MUTUAL AID A PRACTICAL POLICY?

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.1. England
Tel.: Chancery 8364

FREEDOM PRESS

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*
Volume 6, 1956, *Oil and Troubled Waters*

each volume paper 7s. 6d.
cloth 10s. 6d.

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

VOLINE:

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

E. A. GUTKIND:

The Expanding Environment 8s. 6d.

V. RICHARDS:

Lessons of the Spanish Revolution 6s.

TONY GIBSON:

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 18s. (U.S.A. \$3)

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