

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Reflections on Bertrand Russell's Proposed "Slogan"—

"Nuclear War Means Universal Death"

ALONE, as far as we can ascertain, among last Sunday's newspapers, *Reynold's News* gives a front page splash to the announcement that "all-out efforts [were] to be launched by M.P.s, writers and scientists to rally public opinion against nuclear war preparations."

Bertrand Russell is reported as saying that he wants to see Britain adopt the slogan "Nuclear war means universal death", and that if international agreement on atom war cannot be achieved, "then Britain should renounce it unilaterally". J. B. Priestley who, the report continues, "has spent the last few weeks in talks with scientists who will play an active part in this attack on the use of nuclear arms" declared:

Nuclear war is war against the human race. It is not war as it used to be. It is suicide. In no circumstance should this country use any nuclear weapon, even for defence.

Besides the writers, there is a group of some 20 Labour M.P.s calling themselves the Labour Party's Hydrogen Bomb Campaign Committee who are "determined to outlaw nuclear war". And there are two groups of scientists in this country "who have set themselves up as watchdogs against possible nuclear dangers. One group, at London University, will keep check on radia-

tion effects on rainwater and food-stuffs, the other is "making available to trade unionists and politicians information on nuclear developments".

Finally, it was announced last week "that a conference of top scientists from both sides of the Iron Curtain will meet early in the New Year to discuss ways to ban nuclear war".

A meeting "to decide the best way to organise action" will be held some time this month—according to *Reynold's News*—between the already existing National Council for the Abolition of Nuclear Weapon Tests and the "famous writers and scientists". As vitally interested members of the human race we offer our uninvited views to the meeting.

BEFORE discussing the "best way to organise action" the meeting will, presumably, have to agree among themselves about what they wish to organise action. And this, to our minds will prove the thorniest problem as well as being fundamental to the success or failure of whatever action they may eventually take. The existing National Council opposes Nuclear Weapon Tests. Bertrand Russell and J. B. Priestley go further and call for the abolition of nuclear weapons by Britain, uni-

laterally if other countries refuse to do likewise. Other participants at the meeting may object, and we hope they do, to the emphasis which both Russell and Priestley seem to place on nuclear war rather than on war itself. Nuclear war "means universal death" (Russell), "is suicide" (Priestley). Indeed Priestley actually says that "it is not war as it used to be". Whilst many of the writers might be prepared to direct their attack on war, the politicians at the meeting may object that total unilateral disarmament would force our Foreign Minister to go naked to future international conferences.

Perhaps the first step should be to discuss the scientific accuracy of Bertrand Russell's proposed slogan "Nuclear war means universal death". If all the scientists are agreed and we have no reason for suspecting their facts and conclusions, then all those gathered at the meeting who cannot accept this should be asked to withdraw. The logical next step for those left is to ascertain if everybody agrees with the Priestley-Russell determination that this country shall abolish its nuclear armament, unilaterally, if international agreement cannot be reached. Those who cannot agree, yet have previously agreed that nuclear war means universal death,

either have the twisted minds of politicians such as Bevan (who one suspects does not imagine that the H-bomb will ever be used but who, at the same time, thinks that you cannot participate in the international political game unless you possess it) or believe that if Russia is bent on destroying mankind that we should get in first, a reaction as suicidal and neurotic as the third, which does not bear discussion, that Russia is prevented from launching an H-bomb war by the existence of similar weapons in America and Britain, is unrealistic. The very existence of the H-bomb is a threat to

"So far as a man thinks, he is free. Nothing is more disgusting than the crowing about liberty by slaves, as most men are, and the flippant mistaking for freedom of some paper preamble like a 'Declaration of Independence', or the statute right of vote, by those who have never dared think or act."
—R. W. EMERSON.

mankind; its use, collectively or unilaterally, by America, Russia or Britain, means universal death; that is, for those at the launching end just as much as for those at whom they have been directed. Thus if any one of the countries possessing H-bombs were determined to drop them, the possession of even more potent H-bombs by the others would neither stop them nor could save mankind from being annihilated. To drop more bombs in retaliation would only hasten the process of annihilation.

OUR Committee at this stage will divide into two factions. One faction which thinks in political, the other in human, terms. Both will be agreed that "nuclear war means universal death" as well as that the

Continued on p. 3

Censorship Coming in S. Africa

VERY little has been heard in this country of a recent draft Bill on censorship of the Press in South Africa, drawn up by the Cronje Commission, and designed (successfully if it becomes law) to muzzle completely the free Press.

South African newspapers may be divided into two categories, those in the English language with a combined circulation of nearly 1½ million—against the Nationalist Government, and those in Afrikaans with a combined circulation of about

350,000—for the Government. The English newspapers deal principally in news and secondarily in politics, whereas the Afrikaans Press confines itself to a solid output of politics; this helps to explain the popularity, and therefore the influence of the former, and is the strongest reason for the Press Commission's report.

The South African Prime Minister, Mr. Strydom, has often stressed the importance of censoring the English Press for a number of reasons. The most important of these being: it represents an anglicizing influence which is opposed to Nationalist ideology; it incites non-whites against white rule; it is responsible for the critical opinion of South Africa held almost everywhere abroad.

The Government has hesitated in the past to "deal" with the English Press because it has been concerned to maintain some continuing semblance of democracy, but statements are often made by leading Nationalist politicians which indicate quite clearly what is bound to happen soon. The Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, Mr. Erasmus, said a month ago: "... I want to say to those people who send reports overseas slandering South Africa that they must not expect of me that all their reports will reach their destination. It is time the Government put its foot down, and it is doing so."

The Press Commission sat for seven years before producing its report, and by its existence alone has inhibited the Press. It has compiled dossiers on every journalist working in South Africa, local or foreign, and has issued long questionnaires. It has interrogated editors, reporters and foreign correspondents behind closed doors. We print below a summary of a report from the *Cape Times* on the Commission's draft Bill—it is a Bill for suppression and control of the Press of South Africa.

Newspapers, "jobbing" publications "and other objects" will fall under the exclusive jurisdiction of the courts—but the publications Board will advise the courts on what should be regarded as "undesirable". All newspapers and magazines will have to register with the Board. All South African magazines, unless specifically exempted by the Board, will be obliged to submit a copy of each edition to the Board for inspection. If the Board finds any edition of a magazine "undesirable" it will have the power to prohibit the distribution of that edition.

If the Board has found one or more editions of a magazine to be undesirable, it may declare that magazine to be a "controlled publication". The magazine will then have to await the approval of the Board before publishing each edition.

Continued on p. 4

PASSPORTS

Arab With No Passport

E. N. KOUSSA of Israel is a native Arab who is a Catholic convert. He is also a lawyer and a pacifist, a member of the Israeli section of the War Resisters' League. Because he has been a critic of the policy of the Israeli against the Arabs he has been denied a passport to see his only son in Canada. He writes: "Because of my consistent criticism of the xenophobic policy of the Government, of my relentless denunciation of the iniquities which the Arabs of Israel suffer ... my freedom of movement has been seriously curtailed. I have been prevented from attending a Catholic Mass and baptism in an Arab village in the military area, from taking part in the funeral of the mother of the Mayor of Nazareth ... denied a passport to travel to Canada to see my son and relatives ... and to go to some Arab countries to see my brothers, sisters and relatives."

—AMMON HENNYAC in *Catholic Worker (U.S.A.)*

Americans With No Passport

THE United States to-day cancelled the passports of 24 Americans who visited Communist China in defiance of a State Department ban. The 24 men, who are still in Western Europe and India, were part of a group who went to Peking after attending the Moscow Youth Festival this year.

The State Department said the passports would be restricted to direct and immediate travel to the United States.

—*Manchester Guardian*, 19/12/57.

Pole With No Passport

MR. JOHN LESLIE, aged 46, a Glasgow electrical engineer, left Poland to-night by train for England, leaving behind the Polish woman he married on Christmas Day. The couple, who had waited 16 years to marry, failed to obtain a passport for the wife, Mrs. Wanda Leslie.

—*Manchester Guardian*, 28/12/57.

Nigerian With No Passport

MRS. RANSOME-KUTI, President-General of the Nigerian Women's Union, recently applied for the renewal of her passport, stating that she wished to travel abroad for health reasons. The passport was refused on the ground that the Government suspected that she was intending to visit East Berlin.

—*Manchester Guardian*, 28/12/57.

Bevan's 'Opposition'

THE Labour Party pundits did their best to make political capital out of the futile NATO conference held in Paris. Before Parliament adjourned for the Christmas holidays a debate on Foreign Affairs, which gave Bevan a chance to condemn the H-bomb (after making sure at Brighton that the future Foreign Secretary would have it to 'negotiate' with), ended with a majority vote for the Government of only 38. The Liberals voted with Labour. And six of the seven Tory Independents abstained.

Riding the wave of public fear the Labour and Liberal M.P.s demanded and end to American air patrols over Britain with nuclear bombs on board, and British control of rocket bases in this country. The punch was taken out of the protest by the reminder that it was the Labour Party when in office which was responsible for the making of American bases in Britain, a point which was conceded by Bevan who claimed that the situation had now changed.

The Prime Minister stated that not only were bombs flown in by American aircraft before 1951, but they were also flown in exercises in machines based in this country. Further disclosures seemed to indicate that the Government was not entirely informed about what the American Air Force was actually doing.

Many people who are afraid of the consequences of Britain being made a nuclear base under the control of America, will unfortunately read into the Labour Party protest a hopeful message of peace thus concluding that Labour is unlikely (or less likely) to engage in military adventures. Nothing could be more foolish. Neither parties are anxious to go to war while the threat of superior retaliation is held by the Soviet Union. But apart from this the history of the Labour Party is not one of militant pacifism. Their

object is to get into power and they will exploit any popular feeling which at the moment happens to be fear of nuclear war, in an attempt to achieve support. When they formed a coalition under Churchill in 1940 they were not concerned with the international socialists who had been educated in the principle that all wars between competing states are fought for economic reasons.

When Bevan claims that the situation has now changed from the time when Labour was in power and allowed American bases to be set up in this country, his meaning is clear enough to us. The change is that Labour is no longer in power! Intelligent political students know that before any political party puts on "the mantle of responsibility" it is at its most militant.

In addition to his duties to the party Bevan has another reason for his present opposition to the Government's specific defence policy. Many sad Bevan supporters deplored his reversal of policy at the Labour Party Annual Conference; what better method than of winning back their allegiance and affection is there than by exploiting the stupid blunderings of the Tories? But if we really examine the statements made in Parliament in his opposition speech they don't amount to very much. What super-patriot would disagree with the sentiment that 'we' should have sovereign claim over nuclear bases? And any good Tories will agree when he says:

"We are prepared to abrogate British sovereignty for an overriding international purpose, but not merely to add to the sovereign power of another nation."

The 'international purpose' can be interpreted in many ways.

We take no especial pride in seeing through the carefully selected words of politicians' speeches, because we have experienced the difficulties of persuading people (even those who see the contradictions)

that awareness is not enough.

There is general acceptance for the theory that an orderly society must be organised through a privileged power group backed up by force. The faults in our society are sometimes as much the responsibility of the majority of ordinary people as those who are in power over them.

As long as the myth continues that there are special kinds of men who, if given power, will dispense justice, peace and equality then we must continue on our crazy course.

We see signs that more and more people are developing cynical attitudes to Government, but we do not see much evidence that logical conclusions are being drawn from the behaviour of Governments.

If the Labour Party is returned to office in the next general election it will not mean that we are embarking on a new era of enlightenment; in our view it will merely indicate that some people think a change of government may bring them nearer to what they want. Their wants may range from cheaper food to the abolition of prison sentences for homosexuals, and while we think that these are reasonable desires we also know that their attainment will be subject to economic and political conditions.

What is lacking most of all however, behind the decisions taken on which way to vote, is vision; the inability to see society as a whole, to think only in terms of narrow interest which rarely extend beyond the house we live in or 'our' country.

This is why political systems and national states will continue to flourish in the interests of which no political party will ever encourage too much freedom of thought or action.

We can only hope that our voice may become louder during the coming year—with the help of our readers.

PEOPLE AND IDEAS

DECLARATION AND SHIBBOLETHS

IN the same sense as that of the famous remark (made over sixty years ago by Edward VII), "We are all socialists nowadays", one might say to-day "We are all anarchists nowadays". Slowly the public image of anarchism is changing; it is no longer necessary to introduce the subject with whimsical remarks about bomb-throwers. From J. B. Priestley in his radio talks on *The Gentle Anarchists* to the Mayor of Fulham declaring himself to be a "believer in anarchy", hardly a week goes by without some figure in the public eye describing himself or being described as an anarchist. Apart from old stagers like Augustus John and Charlie Chaplin, there are those publicists like Mr. Priestley and Mr. Muggeridge to whom the press gives the label 'angry old men', and people like Clare Sheridan, who avowed herself an anarchist in a radio interview a few weeks ago, and Compton Mackenzie, who described himself similarly on television during the same week.

It is valuable of course, that such iconoclastic public personalities should be known as anarchists, even though their anarchism may not be what we should accept as such. But anarchism is not the same thing as iconoclasm, individualism, non-conformity, disillusionment with politics, or mistrust of the state, and few people are going to be weaned from their tacit support for political and governmental institutions without being given some kind of answer to the question "What can be put in their place?" or "What alternative means of social organisation do you support?" When, for instance, Malcolm Muggeridge says, "it seems to me evident that there is no such thing as progress, whether automatic or contrived, in human affairs, and that Man's present condition is, essentially, as it ever has been and ever will be", (apart from believing the assumptions behind many other utterances of his), he is, by appearing to deny that any social action can be of any importance, refusing to answer these questions. J. B. Priestley on the other hand (see his "Rough Sketch for a Lifeboat" in his collection of essays *Thoughts in the Wilderness*) is at least groping beyond both negative criticism and political panaceas towards anarchist solutions.

★

BUT these dissenting voices are almost all among the old. Where are the younger writers declaring for anarchism? The contributors to the recent book *Declaration* (ignoring of course those who

sought a return to religion), while just as iconoclastic, and while expressing views with which we have the greatest sympathy, displaying ideas and attitudes which could be described as anarchistic, regard themselves as socialists, and are—like Kingley Amis and many of their contemporaries—reluctant or *faute de mieux* supporters of the Labour Party. The same goes for their colleagues in other branches of the intelligentsia—those whom Mr. Amis calls the 'sociologicals'—economists, social scientists, statisticians, teachers, psychologists, medical and social workers, the sort of people whose work provides a great deal of evidence for our point of view, but whom themselves are likely to be merely *New Statesmanites* or *Bevanites*.

This is a loss both for them and for anarchism. It is a loss for them because their political attitudes are so palpably below the level of their intelligence. (Such a mountain of intellect, such a political mouse!) And it is a loss for anarchism because it means that the best brains are not in fact hammering out anarchist attitudes which fit our present conditions. They may be full of sympathy with anarchism's destructive criticism, but will consider its positive aspects messianic, idealistic or nineteenth-century and unrelated to the scale and complexity of modern life and technology. And instead of working out an anarchistic approach which does relate, they will swallow whole the Fabian and managerial view of social organisation which is all that socialism has dwindled to.

We need these superior and specialist brains in the task of relating anarchist principles to the problem of the world around us. As it is, we grab here and there a snippet from the sociologists, from the students of industrial relations, a little bit of Bronowski, of Brock Chisholm and the anthropologists, a dash of Julian Huxley and Ashley Montagu, a UNESCO cocktail of anarchistic utterances which do not, however add up to anarchism.

This lack of adherents among the shapers of opinion and the framers of social action may not worry the anarchists, for as Max Nettlau said, "Anarchism is equally dear to me whether held by five thousand people or by five hundred millions, or by a few individuals", but it does, to say the least, lessen the

opportunity of pushing the world in the direction of the kind of society we think desirable. What are the obsolete dogmas, which stand between anarchist ideas and their acceptance as a basis for action? A recent lecture at the Malatesta Club on "Some Shibboleths of Anarchism", given by Bob Green, raised this question, but his shibboleths, for the most part, turned out to be Aunt Sallies, rather than any essential doctrine definable as anarchism.

★

HOW is anarchism to be defined? We may as well take as a definition the opening paragraphs of the article on the subject which Kropotkin wrote for the *Encyclopædia Britannica*:

ARTURO BAREA

THE Spanish writer Arturo Barea died at his home in Berkshire on December 24th, at the age of sixty. He came to this country at the end of the Spanish Civil War in 1939, "a refugee as much from the Communists as from Franco". A great writer, scarcely known in Spain itself, his literary reputation rests on his three autobiographical works, *The Forge*, *The Track*, and *The Clash*, first published in a translation by his wife Ilse Pollak, in this country in the nineteen-forties. These books, collected together under the title *The Forging of a Rebel* have been published in ten languages, but did not appear in Spanish until their appearance in Buenos Aires in 1951. Barea was also the author of a novel *The Broken Root*, and of studies of Miquel de Unamuno and Federico Garcia Lorca.

Barea's poverty-stricken childhood in Madrid was followed by an adventurous life. He was one of the founders of the Clerical Workers' Union, and participated as a socialist in the Civil War. But, he wrote, "My own convictions forced me to forgo the membership card of the party to which I at that time belonged. But I consider myself a socialist, and I think that I belong to the movement of the workers, precisely because my socialism demands a fight for a free humanity, without the destruction of the individual or of his human qualities, without turning the individual into one of a herd, subjected to a dictatorship".

BOOK REVIEW

LAND THROUGH LOVE

THE FIVE GIFTS by R. P. Masani. Collins, 15s.

INDIA is a country of many poor and most of these poor are the landless of the rural areas. In 1951 Vinoba Bhave, a close disciple of Gandhi, set out on his mission of Bhoodan Yagna (Land-Gift). He began walking from village to village asking landowners to donate a portion of their land (usually one-sixth) to the landless. By May 31, 1956, over 4,000,000 acres had been given to him and almost 500,000 acres of this land had been distributed freely to 149,043 families. Not only this, but by the end of April, 1957, over 2,500 villages had pooled their land and were beginning to farm it on a co-operative basis. Without the force of law or the violence of terrorism one man and a few followers inaugurated a campaign for a potentially far-reaching land reform. And Vinoba Bhave is still walking from village to village. . . .

The Five Gifts is the latest account of this new and, in some ways, unique development of Gandhi's technique. It is marred by an irritatingly eulogistic tone, but is nonetheless a quite valuable description of the origin and development of the Bhoodan movement and of its aim of a society of Sarvodaya (Welfare for All).

To those who can only conceive of social changes being effected by legislation or by other means of coercion, the idea that landowners could be persuaded to part with large sections of their land on the strength of a moral appeal must seem the dreaming of a utopian. Yet this is what, under the impact of Bhoodan, many landowners have been, and are, doing in India. One example, quoted by Masani, is that of the Rajah of Ramgarh and his family who gave Bhave 200,000 acres of their land "keeping for themselves only 300".

It is true that this movement must be seen in the light of the milieu in which it takes place. India is a country in which religion is a powerful force and Bhave couches his appeals in terms of the religious beliefs of the landowners. Again, the Communists have been terrorising landowners in some of the areas

in which Bhave has been and it is possible that these particular landowners saw Bhoodan as the 'lesser evil'. These factors could be the reason for the amazing success that Bhave has had. Nevertheless, it must be recognised that in one country at least a moral appeal has proved an effective way of securing a considerable mitigation of poverty.

A feature of the Bhoodan movement which is of particular interest to anarchists is the proclamation by both Bhave and his 'second-in-command', Jayaprakash Narayan, that their ideal is a stateless society. As late as September, 1957, Bhave is reported as saying: "They must know that we are out to create a society of the free and equal in which the institution called government has come to an end". This anarchical sentiment finds expression also in the means of non-violence which Bhave advocates and in his concept of direct action, which Masani describes in the following words:

"A democratic government may use its police force, but that could not create nor be as effective as the united strength of the people. Nor would it help people to be free from dependence on the State. Coercion by the sword, by legislation or by a police force may bring about the desired redistribution of property and reduce gross inequalities. But can it transform individuals and society, as envisaged in the philosophy of life underlying the Bhoodan mission? Could it succeed in transforming unjust systems? Revolution brought about by force may abolish vested interests and change the outward form of the social structure, but it cannot change men inwardly. It would leave the heart untouched and the mental outlook unaltered. Without the conversion of man and, through him, of society, the dream of inaugurating the kingdom of love on earth would remain a dream."

An anarchist, however, would not be justified in giving the Bhoodan movement an unqualified welcome. There are certain other features of Bhoodan (mostly in the thinking of its leaders) which do not correspond with anarchist attitudes and which would, in fact, seem to be inconsistent with the basic postulates of "the philosophy of life underlying the Bhoodan mission".

ANARCHISM (from the Greek *an-*, and *archia*, contrary to authority), is the name given to a principle or theory of life and conduct under which society is conceived without government—harmony in such a society being obtained, not by submission to law, or by obedience to any authority, but by free agreements concluded between the various groups, territorial and professional, freely constituted for the sake of production and consumption, as also for the satisfaction of the infinite variety of needs and aspirations of a civilised being.

In a society developed on these lines, the voluntary associations which already now begin to cover all the fields of human activity would take a still greater extension so as to substitute themselves for the State in all its functions. They would represent an interwoven network, composed of an infinite variety of groups and federations of all sizes and degrees, local, regional, national and international—temporary or more or less permanent—for all possible purposes: production, consumption or exchange, communications, sanitary arrangements, education, mutual protection, defence of the territory, and so on; and, on the other side, for the satisfaction of an ever-increasing number of scientific, artistic, literary and social needs.

Moreover, such a society would represent nothing immutable. On the contrary—as is seen in organic life at large—harmony would (it is contended) result from an ever-changing adjustment and re-adjustment of equilibrium between the multitudes of forces and influences, and this adjustment would be the easier to obtain as none of the forces would enjoy a special protection from the State."

Not a perfect definition perhaps, but it does postulate an anarchism, which is neither static, nor Messianic, nor 'contrary to human nature' since it bases itself on tendencies which exist and have always existed in human society. What irreversible trends are there in the world that prevent it from moving in this direction? Yet among the bold spirits of *Declaration*, there is none who declares for it, none it seems, who grasps the distinction between the social principle, the principle of action upon which anarchism is based, and the political principle, the underlying assumption of the idea of authority. Kenneth Tynan, in his contribution, noted among his contemporaries "an undemonstrative sympathy with anarchy", and it is on this sympathy which we will have to build,

clothing it with knowledge and conviction.

"We are all anarchists nowadays", in the sense that we are all growing out of our faith in politicians and governments, losing our belief in the political principle; and all these dissenting public voices are welcome in giving expression and currency to this anarchism of despair. But unless we are to leave the field open to those who believe only too fervently in the political principle, we have to find ways of changing it to a constructive anarchism which, building not on shibboleths but on social realities, seeks to "replace the government of men by the administration of things". C.W.

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 is available to readers of *FREEDOM* at 5/- a copy

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.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

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

Second-Hand . . .

Jack O' Peterloo	
Theodore Wilson	3/6
Three Guineas	6/-
Virginia Woolf	6/-
Social Theory	3/-
G. D. H. Cole	3/-
Transformation	2/6
Two	2/6
Mumford, Read, etc. (imperfect)	2/6
The Magicians	3/6
J. B. Priestley	3/6
Production for the People	2/6
Frank Verulam	2/6
A Modern Symposium	3/-
G. Lowes Dickinson	3/-
The Great Illusion	2/6
Norman Angell	2/6
Selected Poems	5/-
Horace Gregory	5/-
Hunger	4/-
Knut Hamsun	4/-
The Soviet Impact on the Western World	2/6
E. H. Carr	2/6
Candid Reminiscences: My First Thirty Years	4/-
Upton Sinclair	4/-
They Found Refuge	7/6
Norman Bentwich	7/6
About Levy	3/-
Arthur Calder-Marshall	3/-
All Manner of Folk	3/-
Holbrook Jackson	3/-
Walls Have Mouths	4/-
W. F. R. Macartney	4/-
Work While Ye Have the Light	3/-
Leo Tolstoy	3/-
Teach Them to Live	3/-
James Hemming	3/-
The Free Child	5/6
A. S. Neill	5/6
A Dominion in Doubt	3/-
A. S. Neill	3/-
A Dominion Abroad	4/-
A. S. Neill	4/-
That Dreadful School	4/-
A. S. Neill	4/-
Reminders . . .	
Notes on Democracy	4/6
H. L. Mencken	4/6
Chaos and Order in Industry	4/-
G. D. H. Cole	4/-
The Common People	3/6
G. D. H. Cole & Raymond Postgate	3/6

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

On the question of the ownership of wealth there is considerable vagueness in the Bhoodan attitude. The concept of trusteeship, whereby the rich treat their wealth as not being their own property, but as being held in trust for the welfare of all, could be used as an excuse for maintaining a privileged position and as a cloak for the process of exploitation by which they have acquired their wealth. This danger is made manifest in the first point of Bhave's reported formula regarding "the divisions of the fruits of industry" which reads: "A fair return to be ensured to the worker, the manager and the investor." No indication is given as to what criterion should be used to determine the precise character of a "fair return", nor is it explained by what right the investor can sit back and draw an income from the labour of others. There is also no explanation of the difference in status between the manager and the worker. (The suggestion of point four of the "formula" that directors and managers "undertake some token manual work" would not "revolutionise the human relations between the boss and the man at the bench". The boss would still be the boss, and the man at the bench would still be at the bench).

These are but a few of the contradictions and ambiguities of Bhoodan thinking which struck at least one reader of this book. They must be laid in the balance against the libertarian aspects mentioned above. The future of Bhoodan, as a clearly libertarian movement, depends upon the ability of its adherents to free themselves of the elements of power thinking which still afflict them, to clarify their analysis of property relations and the nature of exploitation, and to develop the capacity for autonomous action. Perhaps one of the greatest obstacles to this would be the very prevalent belief in providential saviours which, in their case, takes the form of the cult of "Saint Bhave". Bhave himself seems to be aware of the danger of the dependence upon his leadership shown by so many of his admirers, but the traditional Indian religious reverence for the 'holy man' and the lack of a consistent libertarian attitude may prove too much.

Is there a way in which anarchists can make a contribution?

S. E. PARKER.

Reflections on a Slogan

Continued from p. 1

threat of universal death can be ended by the abolition of the H-bomb here and in America and Russia. Those who think in political terms however cannot agree to their country making the first move by removing the H-bomb from their armoury and their political vocabulary. For them it's either all or nothing, and therefore whatever hopes they have depend on agreement at Top-Level, between politicians, or propaganda directed at the potential enemy countries (surely a proved hopeless task among the unholy trinity!)

Those who think in human terms, who have overcome the obstacles which prevent straight-thinking in politicians, will accept the idea of unilateral abolition of the H-bomb, and they can now proceed to graft an ethical, a personal meaning onto this slogan—"nuclear war means universal death"—which relies for its strength on Man's fear of death or extinction. To our minds Man spends more hours of his life arguing with his conscience than in thinking of his death* or of the possibilities of his planet going up in smoke (of course it may well be different a hundred years hence when his power of self-destruction is no longer the novelty that it is for us to-day). And if our Committee, that is, what is left of it at this stage, is intent on achieving its ends (and not simply of salving the consciences of its individual members!) it must direct its appeal to our "better self"; to something nobler than our narrow self-interest; to something more dignified than our petty (nationalistic) pride; to something more intelligent in us that the standards of our yellow press would lead one to believe. Immediate results might not be spectacular, but at least, so we believe, a minority, a conscious nucleus of determined people would respond, whereas so far, the approach based on fear (after all, we have known of the potentialities of the H-bomb for years), has not prevented governments from carrying on their lunatic machinations, of digging into the public pocket with impunity, of directing human energy with the self-assurance of slave-drivers, or of uttering the most unutterable bilge which has been lapped up by the philosophers and the intellectuals no less than by the so-called uneducated masses.

For all these reasons we would, as self-appointed chairmen of this gathering of eminent men of letters and science, propose that, whilst in accord with Bertrand Russell's declaration that "Nuclear war means universal death" and with J. B. Priestley's that it is "war against the human race", we should nevertheless not lull ourselves into believing that the removal of the threat of war can be achieved either through sweet reasonableness at top-level or by selling peace with a slogan of fear.

Let us accept, and face up to the fact, that we are at present at the mercy of the psychopaths who can press the button which will spell universal destruction. We can do nothing to humour or stop them going their own (from our point of view, suicidal) way until (a) we

know what we want (b) have crossed the Rubicon, that is, have translated an idea into a desired way of life (c) pursue our objective to the bitter end.

We agree with J. B. Priestley when he writes, in his excellent contribution to last week's *New Statesman* (*Utopian Night*) that what is wrong with politicians "and all those closely associated with them" is

their staggering, almost frightening conceit. I remember an editor once telling me that in his view authors and actors, prima-donnas and film stars, and all the other familiar archetypes of human vanity, could not compare in their greed for notice, favour and applause, with most political leaders, whose unwavering rapacity for publicity and praise was almost maniacal. And everything that has happened in our time has tended to increase and strengthen this conceit.

But this is as it should be. The politician wants power just as Imperial Tobacco wants markets. He must convince the public that he knows the answer to every question just as Imperial Tobacco spend millions to convince the public that "Players Please" more than any other brand. What Mr. Priestley should investigate more closely is why it is that our writers, our philosophers, our scientists and our "intellectuals" with few exceptions make no impact on the public mind when they lend their names to issues affecting the public conscience and the future of mankind?

AN idea is good or bad irrespective of the moral or spiritual qualities of the man who has propounded it. The capacity to translate abstract thought into meaningful words is a great gift but the ideas may be beyond the ability of the writer to live up to as a person. This does not affect us if we are influenced by the ideas and not by the personality behind them. But in this age of mass communications, where the writer is (and he has only his own vanity to blame), if anything, more important than the ideas he expresses, then how he behaves, the relation between what he says and how he acts, between what he said yesterday and what he says to-day suddenly loom important. He has, in fact, become a propagandist. Unfortunately our intellectual wants the best of both worlds; he wants both to entertain and be taken seriously; to accept honours and attack class distinctions; to enjoy the advantages of material privilege yet preach material and social equality. Little wonder that their eleventh hour appeals to humanity are received with a shrug and a helpless sigh!

IF mankind is not to be stampeded into mass suicide, we need the modesty and the *sang froid* of starting from the beginning. We must, on the one hand, recognise that the political road only leads to more politics, more conflict and war; on the other that no individual or individuals have the prestige to influence the power struggle between governments, or to halt the development and use of nuclear weapons. We must reach the people step by step, not by slogans but by awakening understanding in them of themselves and their political and economic surroundings. We must reach them not through fear but through their imagination and aspirations.

Yes, we know that in the meantime we may be annihilated by an H-bomb war. But we should be, in any case, if we go on relying on words without deeds at Top-level. In any case we are not discouraging the intellectuals from doing what they can; all we are doing is to advise you not to expect more than fine words. Action must, as always, come from below, from you, from us, from the anonymous but real victims who share with the intellectuals the fear of nuclear war but few of their social and economic privileges.

WHAT KIND OF PEOPLE?

THE concept of the proletariat waging a revolutionary struggle has been dogmatised by the Marxists into an alleged science of historical process. Certainly one can look back through history and see the continual struggle of the oppressed against their masters, and as society has developed technically and commercially, new classes have arisen.

There were obviously no money-lenders before money came into use, therefore we can admit that the development of the use of money led to the emergence of a class of usurers, which developed into the bankers of to-day. Just as industrialisation created the need for a proletariat, and therefore measures were taken to depress the peasantry so as to drive them into the factories to become wage-earners.

One set of circumstances created a bourgeoisie, the other a proletariat. This development was beautifully analysed by Marx who then proceeded to devise a formula for it according to which the process would inevitably lead towards a classless society. In this process the workers had an historic mission to fulfil; being the last class to emancipate themselves, their emancipation would mean the end of classes—i.e. the classless society.

In accepting this kind of generalisation one has to overlook a lot of things, and one of them is that if the proletariat were to emancipate itself, it would not be the last class, it would be the first class to do it. No one can describe the old aristocracy or the bourgeoisie as being emancipated unless one equates emancipation with the holding of power over others. There is no other criterion by which they could be judged emancipated, for both classes are narrow-minded, hide-bound, superstitious, sectarian and fearful of change.

What is Emancipation?

If one therefore interprets emancipation in terms of holding power, the logical next step is the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat—with the disastrous results which we have seen in the Soviet Union. If one rejects this, then the alternative is a concept of emancipation in terms of free-thinking libertarianism which is incompatible with the organisation for political power which characterises all socialist parties.

It is this incompatibility which divides socialist parties into two camps: those who have sacrificed principles in order to gain power and those who have sacrificed all chances of power by sticking to principles. No party has yet been able to demonstrate (in any country) its ability to

have both at the same time, for the true aims of socialism simply cannot be achieved by the means they have chosen—the means of political power. This is a fallacy of Marxism which has led to the corruption of socialism, but which the socialists so frantically deny—because it is the very foundation of their justification for authoritarianism.

Now it is clear that the emancipation of the workers from wage slavery will certainly be a feature of the social revolution we wish to see. However, if it comes about and by whatever processes, we could not call workers emancipated who allowed themselves to be organised by the wage system, to be bought and sold like any other commodity.

Change from Above

But the mistake, in my opinion, comes in thinking that the abolition of capitalism is to precede the emancipation of the workers. This concept is part of an ideology which thinks in terms of revolution from above. We know socialists who declare that as soon as their party is elected to power they will pass a law abolishing capitalism and introducing socialism! If I may be permitted a cliché (just for once!) I can only say that my imagination boggles at this conception of the social revolution—yet it is akin to the attitude of all authoritarians, who think men can be made good by laws and edicts from above.

No, surely the abolition of the wages system can be achieved only by workers who have already achieved a tremendous degree of emancipation in their thought and in their relationships with their fellow-workers and their families. For the abolition of the money and wages systems will not only affect the relationships between worker and employer, and worker and worker, but between the worker and his wife and children as well.

With the abolition of money there will be no bread-winner in a family, since the community as a whole would be the provider for all. Hence neither wives nor children would be economically dependent upon father any longer and he will be able to retain their affection or even their company only on his merits as husband and father.

How Many Can Face It?

This is one tiny aspect of the social revolution, but a vitally important one to the individual. One does not need to ask how many workers are prepared to face this result of the abolition of the wages system—just ask yourself how many socialists, or proletarian intellectuals of the type we are discussing, could accept it? The shadow of emotional

insecurity for people never properly weaned from authority clouds their thinking on these subjects. Which is exactly why they are so scornful (because fearful) of time 'wasted' discussing problems other than the class struggle pure and simple.

Most of the consistent readers of this journal will know that for many years I have expounded the ideas of anarcho-syndicalism, which I have roughly described as the application of the ideas of anarchism to the problems of workers' organisation in industry. In anarcho-syndicalism, the concept of a class struggle plays a part, and possibly some readers are now wondering if I have shifted my ground in this matter, in view of what has gone before in this current series.

What Kind of People?

Well, I have not changed my views with regard to anarcho-syndicalism, which still appears to me to provide the best means for a revolutionary struggle in industry. What rather pre-occupies me now, however, in view of the complete lack of revolutionary feeling among the British workers, is: what kind of people are going to make a revolutionary, anarcho-syndicalist, struggle in the field of industry?

I hope that I have never failed to put the horse before the cart, i.e.: the revolutionary individual as the pre-requisite for the revolutionary movement. Perhaps I have now adjusted my sights somewhat, however, in that I now feel that it is pointless to call for revolutionary action when there aren't any revolutionaries to take it.

The emancipation of the workers from wage slavery will certainly be a feature of the anarchist revolution—but to imagine that it is possible to create a libertarian society without a most widespread understanding of the consequences of freedom in every aspect of human life is so pathetically naive that I don't know how it can exist in one who calls himself an anarchist.

The only activities which make sense for anarchists in the circumstances in Britain to-day are those which help to liberate individuals from the mental and moral chains that bind them. If these individuals are workers, their awakening will express itself in their attitude and activity at work. It is from them that any industrial struggle will come—and propaganda groups outside industry will have played their part in that way.

(To be continued) P.S.

Another Depressing Year

Continued from p. 4

this is always the case. If it is not controls or hire purchase or new trade agreements then it is the Bank Rate. A leak of some kind is always requiring to be plugged in the British economy, and so it will be for the next twelve months, or for that matter the next twelve years.

Indicative of the government's position was its attitude and actions with regard to the proposed legislation on prostitution and homosexuality. In spite of recommendations for considerable reforms, with some of which even the Anglican church agreed, the government decided that reforms were not desired by the people in general, and nothing will now be done. So much for the recommendations of committees which are in advance of government thinking. As for what the people think on the subject, it is probable that most do not take the trouble, and the views of those who do are generally disregarded.

Emancipation and the Law

The Americans have had a domestic problem of a more serious nature; it is a problem which has been with them for over three centuries. White supremacy has been the greatest concern of the American South since the Civil War, and it received its severest blow when the Supreme Court ruled that integration should take place in American public schools. The South ignored the ruling to a great extent and finally in Little Rock, Arkansas, the Governor forbade integration and used

troops to back up his order. His pretext—to avoid riots of which there were no signs.

Here was a conflict of law, and Federal Law found itself on the right side (largely for the wrong reasons) over State Law. Government troops were sent to enforce integration at the Central High School of Little Rock and the emancipation of the American Negro moved another step forward on its very long road.

Greater Destruction Further

Perhaps the most spectacular event of 1957 was the launching of Russian satellites. The Sputniks brought into focus the fact that technology in the East is quite as far advanced in some spheres as in the West. For the Americans the two little moons were (and are) a terrible blow to their pride.

After the initial shock had worn off all the implications of Russian missile superiority came home to roost. What follows is the frantic rivalry, intermingled with a lunatic fear, for superiority in the next most-deadly weapon. 1958 will be for the USA a year in which all possible labour and expenditure will be put to manufacturing a weapon which will fly higher and faster and further, and cause more destruction on arrival than anything which the USSR can make. A similar effort will be made behind the iron curtain to maintain the lead.

The politicians and militarists,

and possibly the scientists too, will have no time for rational thought, and therefore there is little hope that they will realise how futile a contest for superior missiles really is. Any one of a dozen can no doubt destroy mankind any day this year.

The Nightmare of Mr. Muggerridge

THERE is a nightmare which often assails me. I imagine myself waking up one morning and finding that England has become overnight a monolithic, totalitarian state, without anyone noticing; without any revolution of the left or of the right, or any large constitutional controversy or last stand by defenders of individual liberty. The two party machines, without abating Lord Hailsham's bell or Mr. Bevan's furious eloquence, have coalesced: in all key positions—the Bank of England, Printing House Square, Broadcasting House, etc.—a complacent managerial figure has been posted: all radio and TV channels are turned over to a royal broadcast, in which the Queen, seated with her family, appeals to the people to work together for the common good: the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Moderator of the Church of Scotland and other like dignitaries, announce a day of prayer and thanksgiving, and even King Street hangs out flags because Harry Pollitt has been made Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Education and Mr. Palme Dutt a governor of the BBC. As for the press—like Old Man River, it just has to go rolling, or rather lying, along.

—MALCOLM MUGGERIDGE in *New Statesman*, 2/11/57.

*One has only to observe the gay abandoned with which he crosses a busy road to save perhaps half a minute, or his growing addiction to flying machines and tobacco, to be aware of his contempt for life! And is there no significance in the fact that most young men accept conscription and risk life and limb in war rather than face the hostility, ostracism and imprisonment which are the price they pay for refusal?

Censorship Coming in S. Africa Continued from p. 1

The Board will have similar power to prohibit the distribution of "undesirable" editions of imported magazines and books. If the Board finds several editions of an imported publication "undesirable" it may declare that publication permanently "excluded". It will not, however, have the power to prohibit permanently the publication of any South African magazine—this power is left to the courts.

Penalties

The courts, advised by the Publications Board, will be able to close down a South African magazine or newspaper by suspending or withdrawing its registration as punishment for the publication of "undesirable" material.

In addition, the courts will be empowered to impose fines of up to £500, imprisonment for up to 2½ years, or both fine and imprisonment, on anyone found guilty of publishing "undesirable" material.

A similar penalty is prescribed for anyone who distributes a "controlled publication" without the prior approval of the Board.

Anyone who "orders, buys, sells, lends, borrows, imports, exports, conveys, consigns, stocks or advertises a prohibited or excluded publication" is liable to a fine of up to £1,000 and five years imprisonment. For other infringements of the proposed Act the maximum prescribed penalty is a £200 fine and one year's imprisonment. An additional punishment is automatically imposed on the editor of any publication found to be undesirable.

He is prohibited from taking any other appointment as editor, or in any other capacity, on any periodical publication during the period of his journal's suspension or withdrawal of registration.

Re-registration can be sought only after two years, if the withdrawal was the result of the publication being found to be morally "undesirable", and after five years if it has been found "undesirable" because of its "communist" content. Further control will be exercised by the registration of all publishers, distributors, booksellers and importers.

No unregistered person will be allowed to carry out these functions, and they may be punished by the suspension or withdrawal of their registration—in addition to any other penalties that may be

imposed. Provision is made for appeals against decisions of the Publications Board to a special Board of Appeal.

Undesirable

The Commission considers that, in particular, printed matter and other objects or any part thereof, are undesirable if they depict, represent, describe or portray miscegenation, sexual relations, intermarriage or other intimate social intercourse between Europeans and non-Europeans in a eulogistic manner.

Under the Riotous Assemblies and Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1914 (Act No. 27 of 1914), the Governor-General may prohibit the publication or distribution of printed matter if, in his opinion, such printed matter is calculated to engender feelings of hostility between the European inhabitants of the Union on the one hand and another section of the community on the other (Section 1 (7)–(11)).

Communism

In the Suppression of Communism Act, 1950 (Act No. 44 of 1950), it is enacted that the Governor-General may prohibit certain periodicals or other publications if he is satisfied that they propagate communistic principles or promote the spread of communism or further the achievement of any of its aims (Section 6).

During the process of infiltration in the pre-revolutionary stage it is not so much the overt communistic agitation which manifests itself most strongly, but—and this is much more dangerous—the gradual and generally covert and subtle infiltration of the communistic ideology which is furthered in every possible way.

In this connection publications which are openly communistic or which have a disguised and subtle communistic trend, naturally play a great part.

The "class struggle" is already being fomented by the communists and their (sometimes unwitting) confederates through the dissemination of misrepresentations, distortions and half-truths in connection with race relations in the Union.

Evidence was submitted to the Commission to the effect that the control of communistic publications is at present not as effective as it should be.

It was pointed out that, if communis-

tic publications—or, to put the matter more broadly, communistic printed matter and other objects—were not brought under the Commission's envisaged system of control, a more or less parallel system of control of communistic printed matter and other objects would have to be established.

"Undesirable" Definition

The Commission's detailed definition of "undesirable" matter is as follows:

(a) Printed matter and other objects, or any part thereof, which are blasphemous or represent religion in a derisive or derogatory manner; or

(b) Are subversive of or endanger, or tend to be subversive of or to endanger, the morals or moral conceptions cherished and respected by the ordinary, civilized, decent, reasonable and responsible inhabitants of the Union; or harm or tend to harm their moral values; or are offensive to or tend to be offensive to their sense of chastity, purity, modesty and propriety; or

(c) Contain any illustration which portrays or depicts a person in attire or a pose which is deemed impermissible, improper or indecent by the ordinary, civilized, decent, reasonable and responsible inhabitants of the Union; or

(d) Describe, depict, represent or portray one or more of the following in an indecent, offensive, or harmful manner: Murder, suicide, death, horror, cruelty, fighting, brawling, ill-treatment, lawlessness, gangsterism, robbery, crime, the technique of crime and of criminals, tipping, drunkenness, trafficking in or addiction to drugs, smuggling, sexual intercourse, prostitution, promiscuity, white-slavery, licentiousness, lust, passionate love scenes, homosexuality, sexual assault, rape, sodomy, masochism, sexual bestiality, abortion, change of sex, night life, physical poses, nudity, scantily or inadequately-dressed persons, divorce, marital infidelity, adultery, illegitimacy, human or social deviation or degeneracy, or any other similar related phenomenon; or

(e) Depict, represent, describe or portray miscegenation, sexual relations, intermarriage or other intimate social intercourse between Europeans and non-Europeans in a eulogistic manner; or

(f) Tend to engender or have the effect

of engendering friction or feelings of hostility between the European and non-European population groups of the Union or between the various non-European or racial groups; or

(g) Propagate or tend to propagate communistic principles, or promote or tend to promote the spread of communism, or further or tend to further the achievement of any of the aims of communism.

The Commission says that if the question arises whether anything is "undesirable", consideration shall be given to the "Christian outlook on life; the religious character or tenor of the matter; the scientific or professional manner of representation, exposition and explanation; the artistic merit of the matter; the special circumstances prevailing in and the racial composition of the Union"; the possibility of the manner of its presentation being morally harmful to the class of persons for whom it is intended.

Censorship

Complete secrecy of the proceedings before the board of censors and the total exclusion of the Conje censorship proposals. The Commission's draft bill is full of references to the jurisdiction of the courts, to magistrates and to judges, but elementary analysis reveals that the only meaning of these references is that the function of the courts will be to impose penalties and nothing else. In any given instance of a book or magazine the Censor Board, deliberating in secret, decides that the publication is "undesirable". It then becomes a crime to publish, buy, sell, lend, borrow, advertise, import or export the publication. Anyone doing so is arrested and brought before the court. The crime is of dealing in a publication declared to be undesirable; the court has nothing in the world to do with whether it is in fact undesirable. All the accused can do in court is to plead in mitigation. His guilt on the facts is established when the censors in secret have found the undesirability; and the talent of the defence lawyers is limited to trying to influence the court in choosing a penalty—a £1,000 fine, five years in gaol, suspension of the magazine and/or the suspension of the editor from any journalistic activity for five years. On the facts of undesirability there is an appeal of sorts only to another secret committee made up of a judge picked by the Minister and another set of ministerial nominees.

Essentially the same procedure applies to newspapers although the Commission, for the sake presumably of window-dressing, tries to give a contrary impression. "Newspapers", it declares in the draft bill, "shall fall under the exclusive jurisdiction of the courts". The courts however do not go behind the Minister's opinion and try whether it is in fact objectionable. An accused can only succeed if he performs the impossible task of demonstrating that the Minister had not applied his mind to the matter, that his opinion was grossly unreasonable or that it was formed in *mala fide*. Quite clearly an accused newspaper under the proposed legislation will appear before the court only for sentence, with the facts of undesirability being decreed by the Board and with no recourse except to try to show that the Board was acting in bad faith.

Some examples might illustrate these abstractions. The Nationalists dislike and would dearly like to put out of existence *Africa South*, a lively, intelligent and liberal political journal. Nothing could be easier. The journal must apply for a licence and it is refused. There is no hearing, everything is done in secret, no reasons need be given, there is no appeal to the courts. Newspapers which do not enjoy the protection of high Nationalist dignitaries could have their lives made impossible by prosecutions which, based on an unchallengeable finding of undesirability, could not be defended.

We are convinced that even the Commission's favourite character, the ordinary, civilised, decent, reasonable and responsible inhabitant, will not stomach these excesses and that even a Nationalist Government will feel its hair standing on end. But many leading Nationalists have talked wistfully of the joys of a full internal censorship of South African reading matter. The next step and the next danger to be looked for is a soothing Nationalist statement which will disown most of the absurdities of the Cronje extravaganza and, profiting by the general feeling of relief, will insinuate another scheme which, less blatantly perhaps but

nevertheless effectively, establishes an internal censorship.

★

It will be appreciated that the *Cape Times*, since it is published in South Africa, has taken quite a courageous stand in its straightforward reporting of the Commission's recommendations. We do not agree with all that it says in the last paragraph, but feel convinced that Press censorship, along the lines of the Cronje draft will certainly be instituted in South Africa within the next few months. It is the logical next step for a Government devoted to the Fascist creed—and no other description fits the Nationalist ideology.

A Government back-bencher (J. C. Greyling) stated the case quite clearly: "Supposing we could get the English Press to keep silent for four months in South Africa, we would have a different South Africa". A Government front-bencher suggested a year instead of four months. A Government Senator (P. E. Roussow) urged the Minister of Justice not to delay the necessary legislation to prevent the English language Press from "abusing its freedom . . . we know what is best for them," he said.

That is precisely what all dictators in all Fascist countries have always said, and have promptly censored the Press.

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

JAN. 5.—G. Ostergaard on
LABOUR AND PUBLIC
OWNERSHIP

JAN. 12.—Rita Milton
Subject to be announced

JAN. 19.—Tony Gibson on
THE PSYCHOLOGY OF
POLITICAL BELIEF

JAN. 26.—Arthur Uloth on
THE YEAR 2084.

FEB. 2.—S. E. Parker on
WHY I AM AN ANARCHIST

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 Froggnal) N.W.3. Nearest tube station: Hampstead (Northern Line).

January 13th, 1958

"WAR RESISTANCE TO-DAY"
introduced by
ARLO TATUM
(Secretary—The War Resisters'
International)

★ 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.

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

SCRAPBOOK

Another Depressing Year

READERS are no doubt familiar with a programme the BBC has been putting out over the years called *Scrapbook for 1917* (the year of course varies), in which a series of nostalgic memories are "vividly" called to mind of the "good old days" of that particular year. The programme is subject to a number of faults, it is over-sentimental and conservative in outlook, inaccurate by omission, jingoistic and absurdly patriotic, and gives as great an importance to the particular year's hit ballad as for example to the Russian revolution.

In the same way it is customary at this time of year for newspapers to look back over the preceding twelve months and review the more salient features of the year in the form of a scrapbook. Needless to say the importance with which certain events are treated, and their manner of presentation varies as to the political colouring and allegiance of the newspaper concerned.

The reason for mentioning these things is two-fold: firstly, because what follows will be our own abbreviated scrapbook of certain significant political events which took place in 1957; secondly to state what very few, if any, other papers may, that FREEDOM, though slight in circulation and influence, and having its share of faults, does not owe allegiance to any political or national interest, but is on the side of mankind everywhere regardless of any applied status or grouping, and that this paper is written by individuals who state their own views as directly as possible—sometimes wrongly but always so far as they are aware, honestly.

Middle East Doctrine

The year 1957 started bleakly with the aftermath of Hungary and Suez giving small hope of any improvement in the struggle between

the big powers; indeed prospects were much worse than had seemed possible before Eden's idiotic display of "armed conflict" and Moscow's nauseating treatment of the Hungarians. The atmosphere of cold war was, as it still is, oppressive.

After Suez came the Eisenhower "doctrine" for the Middle East, one of those American masterpieces of diplomacy which achieves almost the precise opposite of its supposed intention. This particular undertaking, designed to "fill the vacuum", and modelled on the methods employed by bulls in china shops, only succeeded in making the doubtful situation of the Middle East nations almost impossible. Apart from the fact that it was only too obvious that the USA wanted to cash in on British stupidity, the Arab nations were forced to state a preference for East or West on a principle laid down by America that, those who are not for us are against us.

The consequences of this and the fact that America in effect joined the absurd Bagdad Pact were that the neutral Arab nations came out *against*, and therefore nominally open to Russian blandishments; in April came the Jordan crisis, by no means resolved as yet, and August brought Syria's new coalition government which is pro-Soviet. Thereafter Moscow stirred up a non-existent crisis in order to unsettle Turkey in her relations with the West. The Middle East therefore promises plenty of trouble for 1958.

Aspects of Leadership

Leadership has been a dismal study for the past twelve months. Khrushchev has emerged as undisputed Czar of Russia. Using methods which are by now, classic, though there have been signs that his emergence was not without its hazards. Malenkov and Molotov have

been demoted and placed out of sight, Zhukov's ambitions for power and prestige are now mere dreams, and Bulganin has faded into comparative obscurity. All are alive—for the present. Concurrently with his increasing power, Khrushchev has applied the brake to the Russian "liberal" trend which commenced at the 20th Party Congress. Conscious of having "gone too far" for his own liking, Khrushchev is now trying to regain lost ground—he may not succeed entirely, but 1958 may well become increasingly tougher for the Russian people.

Eisenhower's leadership since his last election has become noticeably more discordant, but despite a wain in popularity his illnesses still produce ridiculous economic results, not only on Wall Street but on the Stock Exchanges of the western world as well!

The leaders of France still come and go with monotonous promptitude, but it is always possible to discern a continuing policy in matters colonial. The Algerian struggle will no doubt be maintained throughout 1958; the massacre of Algerians by the French, interspersed with their torture and ill-treatment puts a very different complexion upon "the most civilized people in the world". The fact that Frenchmen are also being killed simply makes matters worse. It is hard to tell at what point the French authorities will bow to economic pressure (no other pressure will prove sufficient), and make peace so that the Algerians may reap some of the benefits of their own country. Or perhaps the French army will prove as successful in Algeria as the British army in Kenya or Cyprus.

Always Economy—No Reform

In Britain the economy has been the focal point of attention, but then

Continued on p. 4

EAST LONDON DEBATING COMPETITION

FINAL MALATESTA CLUB

versus

UNIVERSITY HOUSE DEBATING SOCIETY

Friday, January 10th 1958

at BETHNAL GREEN TOWN HALL