

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"The wise man can suffice for himself . . . civil society is only an external association for the purpose of protection."
—EPICURUS.

Mock-Indignation and the

HUNGARIAN EXECUTIONS

WITH the honourable exception of individuals whose spirit has not been blunted by the violence, the brutality, the callousness and the widespread misery in the midst of potential plenty which characterise our age, the "wave of horror" provoked by the announcement of the execution of Imre Nagy and his friends has a false ring about it. Indeed, those who are most genuinely shocked are, we would say, simple, politically "uneducated" people who are horrified by violence in all its manifestations, irrespective of whether it is carried out with the due sanction of law or in some dark dungeon operated by the secret police; people whose feelings cannot be regulated to "hot or cold" by considerations of political expediency, nationalism or even self-interest.

But these are the inarticulate reactions so far as mass communications are concerned. "Public indignation" to-day is expressed by Press and the political parties which, even before they have had time to wipe away their crocodile tears of sympathy for the victims, were busily exploiting the murders to their political advantage as well as cold-bloodedly speculating on the political motives behind the executions. And even the speculations are not objective but coloured by the political interests of those concerned.

To say that Khrushchev has blundered politically is to assume that in the game of politics the leaders either rarely make mistakes or that a particular action has misfired when the political results are not all to their advantage. The political interests of the different powers not

only do not fit into a neat pattern, with the "West" on one side of the line and the "East" on the other, but are continuously being modified. Politics is a hand-to-mouth business; propaganda, unlike advertising which aims at conditioning the mind, is directed to giving it the kind of flexibility which will make it possible for the public to accept white one day and black, with equal facility, the next. The public, as we have said so often before, is viewed by the leaders only as the instrument in the power struggle. This does not shock us; what does, and makes us into anarchist propagandists, is that the brainwashing is so thorough that the majority of the people do not consider themselves capable of being anything but instruments who need the directing hand of politicians and leaders! So much so that when some of the "instruments" refuse to acquiesce, or express their discontent by disobedience, the majority joins the politicians and the ruling-élite-minded press in denouncing them as "bandits", "traitors", "rebels", "terrorists". They even accuse strikers of "holding the nation to ransom", and those who refuse to kill their fellow men, are singled out as "cowards", "fascists" or "communists" (depending on who the enemy happens to be). Yet when the leaders fall out among themselves, instead of welcoming the palpable evidence that the quest for personal power is still a dangerous occupation containing within itself the seeds of destruction for those who aspire to it, the public, hypnotised by the sloppy sentimentality of an interested press, goes into deep mourning for the victims!

(Let us make our position quite clear. Whilst welcoming the mutual destruction of the power maniacs, there is all the evidence we want, to show that the possibly dangerous nature of their "occupation" no more dissuades others from stepping into their shoes than the death penalty dissuades crazed people from committing murders. Palace revolutions leave untouched the relationship between the rulers and the ruled. However, from the point of view of the latter a period of upheaval in the ruling hierarchy may well be a propitious moment to strike out, since not only are the leaders divided but it is reasonable to suppose that the coercive machine through which they implement their power is equally divided, and therefore weakened. But . . .).

★

BUT . . . a public which canonises a Nagy, why should it not have an equally short memory the day when Khrushchev himself is the victim of a new power-ridden clique? After all, at that exalted level it is might not right which succeeds. And

the liquidation of Mr. K. would only mean that someone else has more power than him; and therefore by contrast Mr. K. is really a more democratic member of the hierarchy!

Let us refresh our memories. Mr. Paul Ignatus in his profile of Mr. Nagy in the *Manchester Guardian* (June 18) presents us with a picture of this "Hungarian farmer's son" absorbed with agricultural problems and politically a "moderate in everything excepting moderation", though there "is no doubt about his having been a sincere Communist". (Wasn't Lenin a sincere Communist, Mr. Ignatus? Or is it that "sincere communist" is not a swear word if applied to the Kremlin men when, much against their will, they are eliminated by their power rivals?). Imre Nagy spent several years in Russia, "returning to his country in 1945 in the wake of the victorious Soviet Army". And he was given a job in the government right away. To ask us to believe that with such a background (and let us not forget that this was the Stalin era, the "thaw" setting in only

Continued on p. 3

The Archbishop on H-Bombs & Makarios Render Unto (the British) Caesar

THE dictum of 'Render unto Caesar . . . ' has proved of tremendous value to the heads of established Churches through the ages when they have been faced with a choice between the tenets of Christianity and the ambitions of the secular powers that they serve.

During the years of the Inquisition the Catholic Church rendered unto Caesar the bodies of those who it had proved—being itself prosecutor, judge and jury—to be heretics, and to this day faithful Catholics maintain that it was not the Church which tortured and burnt, but the State. In 1929 the Pope signed the Lateran Pact with Mussolini, rendering unto the fascist Caesar the bodies of the Italian people in return for uninterrupted domination of their spirits.

And the very beginning of the established Protestant Church in England stemmed from the willingness of a number of churchmen to jettison established doctrine in return for establishment.

All for Survival

In each case the issue has been the survival of the Church as an institution whilst the maintenance of an unsullied religion has taken second place. Thus have the words of Jesus been "used to corrupt his own teachings whilst, ironically enough, the very existence of the Church during the first two centuries was due to the martyrdom of those Christians who refused to render unto Caesar all that he claimed and were thrown to the lions.

Again ironically, it was clearly the conversion of Caesar (Constantine) to the idea of making Christianity the official religion of the Roman Empire (even though it meant shifting the seat of empire to Byzantium from Rome, where paganism still held sway) which ensured the continued survival of the Christian Church but the corruption of Christ's teachings.

The alliance of a religion which preaches meekness and love, forgiveness of enemies, turning the other cheek and rejection of material values in favour of the spiritual, with the institutions of secular power is clearly a contradiction in which one or the other must suffer. Perhaps it can be said that the decline of the Roman Empire indicated the victory of the Christian ethic over the militarism of the Caesars, but certainly Constantine himself did not cease to rule by the sword and there is evidence to suggest that his 'conversion' was more a matter of political expediency in that he had foresight to see a great future for Christianity and sought to hitch his chariot to its star, whilst at the same time it provided him with an ethical basis for what was in fact a power struggle with the rest of the Senate of his day.

The Needs of the State

And to this day, through the breakaway union tactics which led to the establishment of the Catholic Church in Rome (whilst leaving the Orthodox Church in Constantinople, which was first called Byzantium but is now Istanbul) through the Crusades, financed by Venetian and other businessmen to extend their commercial empires, through the Inquisition and the Reformation and the new breakaways into Protestantism, to the alliances with the dictatorships of this century and the unique interpretation of the gospels as preached by the Dutch Reform Church in South Africa, the established institutions of Christianity have allied themselves consistently with the needs of the States which they serve and which protect them.

This being so, the continual demands from 'people of good will' in Britain for a lead from the Church on such troublesome issues as the H-Bomb are as naive as the hopes for honest socialist policies from the

Continued on p. 4

The Day We Got on the Telly

IT seems that one of the comrades had got his name in the papers for his anarchist views, and that led to another article in another paper, this was in turn picked up by the B.B.C.'s Television producer of 'To-night' who wanted to 'do' a programme on (a) The I.A.C., (b) The L.A.G., (c) The Malatesta Club, (d) 'Anarchism', he wasn't quite sure which.

We had what might be termed a 'story conference', if there had been a story; or a 'briefing' had anybody been briefed. The famed Malatesta Jazz Band (trad.) was out from the start because nobody could be heard talking while it was performing and also as it was all to go on film the cutting with music was rather difficult.

We got off to a rather frosty start when an egghead wanted to know what 'To-night' was. It was explained to him and the other comrades who hadn't the courage to ask, that it was a magazine programme of items lasting six to nine minutes each, which was screened about four or five times a week in the early evening. The production schedule was rather flexible, to allow of topicality, and whilst some of the items were 'live' the Malatesta Club item was to be filmed. Its viewing figures were estimated by the producer at five million. Most of us were unimpressed as most of us were non-viewers.

When the history of anarchism on television comes to be written it will not be a happy one. Whether there will be television in a free society is a point mooted than most. The comrades who have appeared on this 'idiot's lantern' claimed to have had an unfair deal from the proprietors of the peepshow. However these were the Other People so whilst we got sympathy from this lot we had no guarantee that similar misunderstandings would not arise. The whole power lay in the shears of the film-cutters who would prepare our pearl of wisdom for the casting. For his part the producer would work with an interviewer who would ask questions to which we could give pithy answers. It was pointed out that one of the maxims learnt at mother's knee was 'ask silly questions and you'll get silly answers', however it was thought that a rehearsal before the filming would elicit questions and answers that were suitable.

From the start it was insisted that the ideas had to be simple in 'terms that the man and woman in the street would understand'. It was generally implied that the average I.Q. of T.V. viewers was low and the programme could not therefore be pitched too high or our five million captive audience would not know what we were talking about. Furthermore subjects such as religion and sex were definitely 'out' as far as this programme was concerned and proposed questions would not touch on these topics.

We were still a little concerned about the effect the item would have, but the thought of getting Our Message to five million people (however moronic they were thought to be and however untelegraphic the comrades might be who put it over); seemed something not to be

Continued on p. 2

DEMONSTRATIONS IN S. AFRICA

SINCE it was returned to power a few months ago, the South African Nationalist Government has been forging ahead with plans to keep South Africa white, at least that part of it which holds political and economic power.

Last week thousands of South African Indians were demonstrating against Government proclamations which will eventually deprive them of homes and livelihood. These proclamations, issued under the Groups Area Act, are aimed at the "racial re-zoning" of South Africa and will affect 50,000 Indians and 100,000 Africans. It is reported that almost the entire municipal area of Pretoria has been proclaimed a "white area", and non-whites have been given one to three years to get out. No plans have been made about where they have to go, and existing areas are already overcrowded. One report from South Africa says:

"All over South Africa Indian communities are to be uprooted. In scores of smaller towns entire Indian settlements are to be evicted and dumped on the veldt. Trading in towns is prohibited, and the settlements face economic ruin. Indian property-owners declare they will be dispossessed of property and land worth more than £15 million."

One of the tragedies of South Africa has been the lack of unity between the 'coloured' and African groups, much of it springing from the superior attitude of many 'col-

oured' to the Africans which has only strengthened Strydom's position. The recent Government proclamations, however, may encourage some kind of alliance between Indians and African groups which, if it happens, will unhappily be for the wrong reasons. But alliance or not it is obvious that property-owning and wealthy Indians are not going to give up their possessions without a struggle. It is therefore likely that they will support any resistance movement which springs up as a result of the Government's plans.

Meanwhile we wait in vain to hear the indignant protests from the Western world which only last week expressed its horrified disapproval when the hanging of Nagy was disclosed. The rules of politics are such that when the 'enemy' disposes of people it does not like, this is called murderous brutality. But, when an ally, or potential ally, gets rid of 'undesirables' this is either ignored, or excused on the grounds of law and order, or dismissed as 'internal matters' which only concern the Government involved.

No doubt the British Government will be ready with excuses why it is unwise and unnecessary to protest against the expropriation of property and removal of thousands of people to unspecified areas, so that the white man will not be disturbed by the close proximity of that strange animal with the brown face.

Hard Facts!

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 26

Deficit on Freedom	£520
Contributions received	£340
DEFICIT	£180

June 20 to June 27

London: J.A. 1/7;	London: B.L. £1/0/0;
London: P.F.* £1/0/0;	London: J.S.* 3/-;
Los Angeles: £6/6/0;	Glasgow: L.B. £1/0/0;
Vermont: E.L. 19/-;	Dundee: A.S.L. £3/0/0;
Glasgow: J.S.A. 10/6;	London: T.F. 5/-;
Total	14 5 1
Previously acknowledged	325 5 1

1958 TOTAL TO DATE ... £339 10 2

*Indicates regular contributor.

EDUCATION: Free, Compulsory, Universal . . .

IN a letter to FREEDOM 1/2/58, Ernie Crosswell raised some pretty basic questions about education. Should parents be at liberty to send their children to the school they thought best? "I should have thought," he said, "that the individual concerned, whose liberty we should be ready to honour, is the child, not the parent," but "one cannot ask a child how it would like to be educated. What to do?" He then made his suggestion that

"all children should be directed to a universally agreed type of school at which the curriculum would be directed by an international body consisting of sociologists, philosophers, educationalists, parents, religious leaders—and anarchists. Should differences of opinion arise (this is conceivable in the case of the religious leaders!), the children would be instructed in each of the disputed subjects and by each of the disputed methods".

I don't think he really believes this is a good idea, but he throws out the challenge "Crazy? Let's have some better suggestions then." One might have expected some of FREEDOM's teacher readers to take up the discussion, but nobody did, and a month ago Ernie repeated his question in a slightly different form. Still no answer, but meanwhile, with the publication of the Labour Party's policy statement on education *Learning to Live*, this matter of Educating Ernie has become one of the questions of the hour. An anxious mother, for instance, writes to the *Daily Telegraph*:

"I view with alarm the increasing use of education as a pawn in the political game. Would it not be possible to put education under a non-political board such as those which run the nationalised industries?"

She wants to nationalise education, Ernie Crosswell wants to internationalise it, the anarchist wants, ideally, to autonomise it. The autonomous self-governing school is the aim, and in view of the obvious limits within which children may be said to govern themselves, this means in practice a school controlled by teachers, by virtue of their functional responsibility to children, and by parents because of their biological responsibility for them. But the issue is more complicated, for in both primitive and complex communities it is recognised that all adults have a responsibility towards children, which because of the vagaries and vicissitudes of individual parentage, may have to be exercised on its behalf or on the child's behalf. Once this is admitted we have of course admitted that education is the concern of the community.

But what community? The State as in France, the local authority as in the United States, or a mixture of both as in Britain? And where does the responsibility of the community begin and end?

Should education be compulsory anyway? (And is the compulsion to be applied to the child or the parent? Bakunin saw the question dialectically:

"The principle of authority, in the education of children, constitutes the natural point of departure; it is legitimate, necessary, when applied to children of a tender age, whose intelligence has not yet openly developed itself. But as the development of everything, and consequently of education, implies the gradual negation of the point of departure, this principle must diminish as fast as education and instruction advance, giving place to increasing liberty. All rational education is at bottom nothing but this progressive immolation of authority for the benefit of liberty, the final object of education necessarily being the formation of free men full of respect and love for the liberty of others. Therefore the first day of the pupil's life, if the school takes infants scarcely able as yet to stammer a few words, should be that of the greatest authority and an almost entire absence of liberty; but its last day should be that of the greatest liberty and the absolute abolition of every vestige of the animal or divine principle of authority."

Ethel Mannin, in her 'utopian survey' *Bread and Roses* takes a more absolutely libertarian line:

"At this point you perhaps protest, 'But if there is no compulsion, what happens if a child does not want to attend school of any kind, and the parents are not concerned to persuade him?' It is quite simple. In that case the child does not attend any school. As he becomes adolescent he may wish to acquire some learning. Or he may develop school-going friends and wish to attend school because they do. But if he doesn't he is nevertheless learning all the time, his natural child's creativeness working in happy alliance with his freedom. No Utopian parent would think of using that moral coercion we call 'persuasion'. By the time he reaches adolescence the child grows tired of running wild, and begins to identify himself with grow-ups; he perceives the usefulness of knowing how to read and write and add, and there is probably some special thing he wants to learn—such as how to drive a train or build a bridge or a house. It is all very much simpler than our professional educationists would have us believe."

The point is really academic, for in practice the decision is that of the parents. Nowadays it is only highly

sophisticated and educated people who bother to argue about whether or not children should be made to learn the three R's. The law in this country does not in fact require parents to send their children to school; it imposes on them an obligation to see that their children while within the compulsory age, are receiving "an appropriate education". The occasional prosecutions of recalcitrant parents usually reveal an apathy or indifference or parental incompetence which hardly provide a good case for the opponents of compulsion, though they do sometimes rope in highly conscientious parents whose views on education do not happen to coincide with those of the local authority. Apart from some of the rich, with their governesses and tutors, there are not many parents with the time or skill to teach their children at home, and of those many must feel it unfair to deprive their children of the pleasure and social experience of belonging to a community of their peers, or may cherish the right of parents to get the kids out of the way for a while, and *vice versa*. Patrick Geddes the biologist and town-planner taught his children at home, and one cannot help feeling rather sorry for them, exposed to his rather overpowering influence even in those hours of the day when most children are out of the parental reach.

★

HISTORICALLY, in this country, the struggle to make education free, compulsory and universal and out of the exclusive control of religious bodies, was long and bitter, and the opposition to it came, not from libertarian objectors, but from the upholders of privilege and dogma, and from those (both parents and employers) who had an economic interest in the labour of children or a vested interest in ignorance. The very reason why it had to be made compulsory ninety years ago was because children were an economic asset. Readers of the works of J.L. and Barbara Hammond, or of chapters 8 and 12 of Marx's *Capital* will not dissent from the assertion that the industrial revolution in this country was made by the children of the poor. As late as 1935 when Lord Halifax, as President of the Board of Education, opposing the raising of the school leaving age from 14 to 15, declared that "public opinion would not tolerate an unconditional raising of the age" and the Bradford textile manufacturers assured him that "there was work for little

fingers there". And in formulating libertarian objections to the way in which our educational system is organised, we find ourselves in very dubious company. Nevertheless, in thinking about the implications of Ernie Crosswell's questions, as well as those of the Labour Party's policy statement (which, limited in a greater or lesser degree, by recurring economic or 'balance of payments' crises, is likely to be the basis of change in the education system from at least 1960 to 1965), we are bound to postulate not only the way in which we think the education of children should be organised in the abstract, but also which tendencies we support and which we oppose in the educational *status quo* of our own country, in our own time, and within the economic framework of society as it is.

The notion that primary education should be free, compulsory and universal is very much older than the English Act of 1870. It grew up with the print-

ing press and the rise of protestantism. The rich had been educated by the Church and the sons of the rising bourgeoisie in the grammar schools of the Middle Ages. From the 16th century on arose a gradual demand that all should be taught. Martin Luther appealed "To the Councilmen of all Cities in Germany that they establish and maintain Christian Schools", observing that the training children get at home "attempts to make us wise through our experience" a task for which life itself is too short, and which could be accelerated by systematic instruction by means of books. Compulsory universal education was founded in Calvinist Geneva in 1536, and Calvin's Scottish disciple John Knox "planted a school as well as a kirk in every parish". In puritan Massachusetts free compulsory primary education was introduced in 1647. The common school, writes Lewis Mumford in his *Condition of Man*,

"contrary to popular belief, is no belated product of 19th century demo-

Continued on p. 3

The Day We Got on the Telly

Continued from p. 1

missed and, after all, it's all experience! So, eventually, a time-table of comrades was worked out.

* * *

The day we got on the film for telly, about six technicians descended on the club at first with spotlights, a camera, a recording apparatus and yards and yards of cable and that fascinating instrument of two boards which says "Take one, number three 'To-night'."

Later the producer, the assistant producer, and a secretary turned up. The interviewer was the last. Firstly they took shots of the club, the notice-board with its posters for FREEDOM and conscientious objection and the wall covered with anarchist newspapers in all languages. Then the interviewer came, an intellectual Wilfred Pickles, as it were, or a rather dim A. J. P. Taylor. He seemed to think that whilst we knew what it was all about, the vast unseen five million hypnotised hen's beaks firmly fixed in the streak of light wouldn't have a clue unless he asked the really significant questions. We had a real pickle of a question. "If you were in power what would you like to see done away with?" Our answer to this convinced him that he wasn't going on the right lines. He skipped the one about what was our most embarrassing moment. It took six hours to record what the seven

members of the L.A.G. and the Malatesta Club thought were sensible answers to questions which we thought a little foolish. That six hours work of eight people will flash on and off about four million telly screens for about five minutes leaving very little behind.

It seems symptomatic of this encapsulated age that one is expected to take in anarchism with a glance of the eye and a twitch of the ear. It is not that anarchism is merely regarded as trivial, everything is regarded as trivial, save the really trivial which is accorded high importance (sport for instance).

Whether the time of those technicians could have been more fitly employed is doubtful. If it were not the Malatesta Club/L.A.G. item on Anarchism they had been working on they would have been recording some other more banal item. But is this ceaseless flow of triviality and chatter necessary? Is not the urge for perpetual distraction a sign of the inability of the viewers to switch off and face the void that is their usual lives?

However, be that as it may, the Malatesta Club/L.A.G. programme will probably swim into the fishtank any evening when the programme "To-night" is on; producer Gavin Lyle, interviewer Trevor Philpott. But if you (and we), don't like it, don't be surprised—you can switch off! J.R.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

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

New Books . . .

The Anti-corn Law League 1838-46
N. McCord 25/-
Democracy versus Liberty
Salvador de Madariaga 10/-
Teddy Boy's Picnic
Elizabeth Stuclely 16/-

Pelican . . .

Body and Mind in Western Thought
J. W. Reeves 5/-

Second-Hand . . .

The Rape of the Earth
G. V. Jacks & R. O. Whyte 8/-
Fifty Mutinies, Rebellions and Revolutions
8/-
Lover Under Another Name
Ethel Mannin 3/6
Theism or Atheism
Chapman Cohen 3/6
The Astrologer
Edward Hyams 3/6
The World Cannot Hear You
Gwyn Thomas 3/-
Now Lead us Home
Gwyn Thomas 3/-
The Popes and their Church
Joseph McCabe 3/-
Saint Colline
Gabriel Chevallier 3/-
All the King's Men
Robert Penn Warren 3/6
The Cost of English Morals
Janet Chance 3/6
The Perfect Wagnerite
Bernard Shaw 3/-
Monkey
Wu Ch'eng-en 3/-
A Dream of John Ball and a King's Lesson
William Morris 2/6
Allanforth Commune
Findlay Watt 3/6
The Monster, &c.
Stephen Watt 3/6
A Manual of Psychology
G. F. Stout 6/6

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

L.A.G. Sunday Night Lectures

ANARCHIST IDEAS TODAY

(Continued from previous issue)

FOR those who agree, and I think that this point is so obvious that it doesn't need arguing, that there is no real chance of establishing a "News from Nowhere" type of society in the immediate future but who for any reason at all feel that anarchism has become a part of them, and that it is too good a part of them to be forsaken are forced to rethink the problem, "Why am I an anarchist", or "Why should I go on being an anarchist?" We have to admit, and I don't see any reason for being ashamed of it, that at times the rational reasons for being interested in anarchism become pretty weak, and we are maintained by irrational, perhaps sentimental attachments to the movement. Perhaps many of those who are now passively associated with anarchism in Britain fall into this category. I think it is particularly important if one is in this state of mind to really start thinking about the problems involved, and not just to drift, possibly into a position of total apathy.

One possible answer to the problem lies along the lines of admitting that our protests may not change the course of events, but of asserting that we must make them nevertheless, for our own reasons. This idea was current among the Spanish anarchists, and Gerald Brenan, in his book "The Spanish Labyrinth" remarks that the word "protesta" was one of the most frequent to occur in the movement's publications. When the government or the employers did something outrageous, the only thing a good man could do to retain his dignity and self-respect was to protest. I have seen a view similar to this expressed for instance by M. L. Berneri in her essay "Neither East nor West", by Dr. Bronowski in a speech which he made to a protest meeting against some trials in Barcelona, and more recently in talks by Rita Milton.

Put in another way, this is an attempt to reconcile the individualist insistence that we should always act rationally in our own interests, and the feeling that the old ideas of working for the good of others, and even for humanity still contain a lot of value and should be carried on with. Although this is in many ways an admirable solution of the problem, I think that it has some dubious aspects. I cannot really reconcile myself to the idea that a person should get positive satisfaction out of making a protest which he knows will be ineffective. To feel that protest might be effective in the sense that out of every ten cases in which anarchists raise

protests, one will succeed is a different matter entirely. To say that protest in itself, however futile is valuable to the individual who makes it is to take up a rather heroic stance which will appeal to only a few people. Besides that, it has the disadvantage that it is irrational and could have the effect, in fact I am sure it does, that we persist with less useful forms of propaganda instead of concentrating on more useful ones. Nevertheless, I will quote from an essay by David Wieck published in "The World Scene from the Libertarian Point of View" in which the protesting attitude is very fairly, although I am afraid not too stylishly expressed:

"Assume the worst: that if it were so (if it were so) for example that our neighbours, even our friends (our enemies cannot disappoint us as our friends can) are, forever will be as they are (which we know too well); or, the same thing, the prevailing social orders are immutable in their central principle of slavery: were this really so (some argue) our anarchism has no meaning, we ought to become one with the ideals and acts of the society and its population. No! Not so that a thing is better for being inevitable; not so that our happiness and health would no longer depend on rejection of this social machine, its inhuman demands, its suffocating terms: so on the other hand, that a man must be as free as he can, make a revolution of indefinite (most possible) extension.

Were it really so—some argue this too—that the mass is by nature docile, unrebelling, must be led and herded, it does not then follow that we should lead, herd and slaughter them into (former!) utopia. Even so, when we observe the state seeming omnipotent we cannot become its slaves, masters or loyal opposition; again we protect ourselves, shelter ourselves, undermine it in its locus of power (minds of subjects).

Or assume that no alternative to destruction can be: Could we then be "realists" as we are bidden to be, argue the relative merits of a bomb now or two years from now; support (that is help create) a war, be its soldiers, fabricate its weapons? No! If our belief is in life, community and freedom. No! Not by participating in a lesser evil (killing strangers to the gain of our oppressors) but by rejecting all the evils will we mitigate them all (and I deny that we will not one day abolish them.)"

I must point out that David Wieck is describing here the reasons for being an anarchist, if the worst can be true, and that in that essay he is concerned to show that he doesn't think that it is true. That is the proper place for the "protest for protest's sake" theory of anar-

chism, not as a basis but as something on which to fall back on in moments of despair. We need something more positive and constructive to provide a framework for the day-to-day activities of the anarchist movement.

Perhaps it can be regarded as a practical example of the need for, I won't say revising or rethinking anarchism so much as rebuilding it that I have given half this talk without saying anything constructive about either anarchism or what we can hope to do with it. What I would like to do during the second half is to try to outline some ideas which I think might be useful to anarchists, and then to go into greater detail in showing how they can be applied to the everyday activities of the movement. I think it right to say at this point that I do not want to appear to be claiming too much for what I have to say. Other anarchists have provoked revolutionary uprisings and come near to building anarchist societies temporarily, while we sit here in nice rooms in London and talk about them.

First I think that we need to recapture the courage and clearheadedness which has distinguished anarchists in the past. The courage to which I refer is not so much the courage to bear physical danger or even what is more often referred to as "moral courage"; that is the ability to withstand criticism and unfair attacks, but the courage to believe in one's own ideas. A. S. Neill has written in the preface to "The Free Child" . . . Many have said and written that I am a brave man to pioneer in Education. I could never see it because I could never see any danger to face. They called it moral courage, a kind of courage that has never been considered of much value . . . Moral courage is misnamed; it should be faith courage, that which springs from belief in what one is doing. A so-called moral coward is one who loses his faith, a doubter, a sitter on the fence . . ."

The writer has been very fortunate if it is literally true that he has never seen any danger to face in pioneering work in education. What many of us, when wondering about anarchism think is that we are afraid that anything we do might be useless. We are not afraid of either physical or verbal attack from without, but we are afraid of ourselves. We do not want to feel ourselves to be cranks, or psychologically peculiar people. When capitalist society was at its most vicious, it was easy to be an "enemy of society" because society was so revolting. Now however, the Welfare State and the material benefits, and in some directions cultural benefits that it confers here and there make it more difficult to declare oneself an anarchist, that is one who rejects the whole structure which involves authority. This makes it all the more important that we should be quite clear about what we do mean by anarchism.

(To be continued)

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 19, No. 27. July 5, 1958

Mock-Indignation & the HUNGARIAN EXECUTIONS

Continued from p. 1

after 1953) Nagy was a mild, gentle, moderate "somewhat phlegmatic" personality is pushing the traditional respect for the dead too far! Even Mr. Ignatus admits that "what made him embrace a doctrine as extreme as Leninism has never been properly explained".

His first act, when he was offered—and accepted—the Premiership by the Communist Central Committee, during the popular uprising in October 1956, was to declare a state of emergency. And these were his words:

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

Because we do not believe that Nagy was either a political innocent, or a stooge, we feel justified in commenting on his fate that he has now been hoist with his own petard. We neither gloat over the fact, nor imagine that the world is any the worse for his death (unlike the *News Chronicle* which discovered "a message of hope . . . by the murder"†), since we are horrified by judicial murder without exception, and because we do not believe that individuals, least of all politicians, have ever been responsible for changing the social structure of the world (if challenged we will be glad to enlarge on this bald statement!).

★

IN fact, if only our values were less distorted by a Press which fosters, and thrives, on the cult of the personality, we would consider the continued massacre by the hundred every week of humble *fellagah* in Algeria as something more offensive to our better feelings than the cold-blooded liquidation of Nagy and his friends by their former political colleagues.

After all the *fellagah* are only doing what the Hungarian students and workers tried to do, but whereas the French public was "electrified" into organising relief and homes for the gallant Hungarian fighters, it is they who by their apathy or their active participation are seeking to drown the Algerian Arabs' fight for independence in blood and torture.

And it is not only Algeria that comes to mind but Kenya and Cyprus, Suez and the unending list of man's inhumanity to man disguised in high-sounding phrases of freedom and legality. When the British and French press echo Tito's protests at the bad faith of the Russians in abducting Nagy from the Yugoslav Embassy in Belgrade, have they any right to preach morality to Moscow with a record which includes Seretse Khama, the Kabaka of Buganda or the diversion to Algeria of the *Tunisian* plane carry-

*See FREEDOM "Hungary: Revolution or—?" Nov. 3, 1956, and in *Freedom Selections*, Vol. 6, pp. 259-64.

†"Probably the Chinese Communists have found, like the Russians, that concessions to freedom are dangerous to their power. That is the message of hope conveyed by the murder of Nagy. The dictatorships cannot conceal the crisis that assails them."
(*News Chronicle*).

MOST anarchists agree with the general contention put forward by Lord Acton that power tends to corrupt, and in fact some even go so far as to admit that even they themselves would be corrupted by power if they had it! It is one of the prime reasons given by anarchists for their complete disbelief in even the *good intentions* of government bodies, let alone the *actions* of governments.

Some would contend that certain individuals in positions of power do not abuse their power, and occasionally do some specific good for society. This may be so, but only in very rare instances and comparatively small enterprises. The exceptions are so unusual as to make the general rule almost a principle. Over a period of time it is certain that any individual who achieved power is either corrupted by it or is forced to relinquish it.

The process is always particularly noticeable in politicians, who of necessity at election times must give some account of their theoretical aims and beliefs. Sooner or later (usually sooner), a situation occurs in which they must make a choice of sticking to their principles (though there are very few politicians who can be said to have, or have had any great wealth of these political luxuries), or obeying the Party Whip. This is one of the

major weaknesses of the Parliamentary system, for in order to have a "strong" government the Party in power must vote "together", which is not even remotely democratic; yet if the Party votes as it pleases nothing is ever decided and the situation develops as in France where stable Governments have become unknown. This of course is precisely the argument of the Fascist-inclined, who then say that it is therefore necessary to have a single leader who makes all the decisions, right or wrong, but at least something gets done . . . The results of this type of government are well-known, and the degree of corruption with which they are associated is infinite.

The corrupting influence of power takes many forms, foremost of which is the lust for more and more power and an increasing indifference to the methods by which it is achieved. And there are all the subtler variations of corruption in high places and low, from the degeneration borne of lost illusions and a consequent unconcern, to the equally degenerating effects of a conviction that one is always right. But the most obvious sign of corruption, and the only one which is generally brought to the attention of the public, is that of personal financial gain. The acceptance of bribes of money or goods in return for ser-

vices rendered by virtue of holding an office or position from which to favour the briber.

★

IN the U.S.A. it is accepted practice for men in power to render their services in exchange for inducements of one kind or another. Bribery and corruption is regarded as one of the only means by which it is possible to "get on". This automatically produces a climate in which the men with money assist the men with power, and *vice versa*, each hoping to gain more money and more power. It is a vicious circle from which great rewards may be derived, and the only sin is to be found out. It takes place throughout the world, but nowhere does it flourish so exotically as in the U.S.A. In that country, in certain forms, it even has official sanction, as when a millionaire chain-store owner makes a sufficiently large donation to a political Party, he may eventually be rewarded with a job in the Government for which he is particularly unsuited.

Nevertheless most of the corruption by personal gain is of a more informal nature. Most recent case of this kind, at present creating a furore throughout the length and breadth of the States, is the acceptance of gifts in kind by no less a personage than Sherman Adams, the

President's Assistant, second most powerful man in the Administration, and self-appointed, chief-guardian of the integrity and incorruptibility of the Administration itself.

It is admitted by Adams that he has in the past accepted two rugs and a vicuña coat, and permitted his hotel bills at the Waldorf-Astoria and another hotel in Boston to be paid for by a rich businessman called Bernard Goldfine. In his appearance before the House Special Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight, Adams altered his original argument that statements attacking him were "unwarranted and unfair insinuations", and adopted the line that he had been "imprudent", that the "error was one of judgment not of intent". He insisted that Goldfine, a personal friend for many years, had not benefited from their relationship. Under continued questioning this statement became unlikely in the extreme. Bernard Goldfine's business activities have been under investigation for the last two years, and it would appear that at the very least some of his methods are ethically, if not legally, dishonest.

It might be thought that Sherman Adams must inevitably be for the high jump—especially in view of the much-publicised pronouncement by President Eisenhower, his immediate boss, on just such matters as these: "I can't believe that anybody on my staff would ever be guilty of an indiscretion. But if ever anything came to my attention of that kind, any part of this Government or that individual would be gone."
May 4th, 1956.

" . . . he (Adams) has been, as he stated yesterday, imprudent . . . I personally like Governor Adams . . . I respect him because of his personal and official integrity . . . I need him . . ."
June, 1958.

So Sherman Adams stays, despite his "indiscretion".

One of the main planks upon which the Republicans won the 1952 election was their indictment of the graft and corruption of the Truman Administration. There is no reason to suppose that the Eisenhower version is any different, but it will now be difficult for the Republicans to throw mud at the Democrats on this issue in the 1960 elections since the same mud can now be made to stick so easily on their own Administration. What has hitherto been regarded as a probable Democratic victory in 1960 has now become almost a certainty.

But the importance of the Adams affair rests upon the lesson it provides in corruption. Probably Sherman Adams was one of the least likely men to fall into *this kind* of corrupt behaviour. His reputation for integrity was up to this moment extraordinarily high, he appeared to be the dedicated servant of the Administration. His fall from grace is consequently all the more dramatic.

If the second most powerful man in the Government of the United States is to be corrupted by a few thousand dollars, it is not hard to believe that in one way or another, sooner or later, all men in power become corrupt. The crime of Sherman Adams by some standards is not very terrible, but it is a dreary indication of a recurring theme. Government is power and power corrupts.

It's more Readers and Support for the Deficit Fund that FREEDOM Urgently needs!

The Sherman Adams Case Spotlights an Old Problem: Government is Power - and Power Corrupts

Education: Free, Compulsory, Universal

Continued from p. 2

cracy: "I have pointed out that it played a necessary part in the absolutist-mechanical formula. Friedrich Wilhelm I of Prussia, following Luther's precept, made primary education compulsory in his realm in 1717, and founded 1700 schools to meet the needs of the poor. Two ordinances of Louis XIV in 1694 and 1698 and one of Louis XV in 1724, required regular attendance at school. Even England, a straggler in such matters, had hundreds of private charity schools, some of them founded by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, which had been incorporated in 1699. Vergerious, one of the earliest of renaissance schoolmasters, had thought education an essential function of the State; and centralised authority was now belatedly taking up the work that had been neglected with the wiping out of municipal freedom in the greater part of Europe."

All the rationalist philosophers of the 18th century concerned themselves with education, and of them, the two acutest educational thinkers ranged themselves on opposite sides on the question of the organisation of education. Rousseau for the State, Godwin against it. Rousseau, whose *Emile* postulates a completely individual education (human society is ignored, the tutor's entire life is devoted to poor Emile), did nevertheless concern himself with the social aspect, arguing, in his *Discourse on Political Economy* (1758), for public education "under regulations prescribed by the government", for

ing leaders of the F.L.N?†

We expect governments to get up to every trick in pursuit of their ends. What we regret is to see how easily the public can be made to swallow some and wax indignant about others. A trick is a trick even in the best of causes. When we learn to recognise this, we shall have taken the first step towards our liberation from that humiliating role of brainwashed instruments in the hands of politicians and the dishonest manipulators and dispensers of information, which the public today is without the shadow of a doubt. The Nagy case is the latest example of this double-think, of this nauseating mock-indignation!

†And on matters Hungarian—though not so recent but not less important—who has read the story of Joel Brand "Advocate for the Dead", without a deep feeling of nausea not only for what the Nazis did to their victims but for the tricks the British, and the rest of them got up to in order to do nothing for them? We shall deal with this important book shortly.

"If children are brought up in common in the bosom of equality; if they are imbued with the laws of the State and the precepts of the General Will . . . we cannot doubt that they will cherish one another mutually as brothers . . . to become in time defenders and fathers of the country of which they will have been so long the children".

This notion is at the root of the American philosophy of education and is the social basis of the Labour Party's present proposals for 'comprehensive secondary education for all'.

★

WILLIAM GODWIN, who, in his *Enquirer* attacks the concealed authoritarianism of Rousseau's educational theories, criticises in his *Enquiry Concerning Political Justice* (1792), the idea of national education. He summarises the arguments in favour, which are those of Rousseau, adding to them the question:

"If the education of our youth be entirely confined to the prudence of their parents, or the accidental benevolence of private individuals, will it not be a necessary consequence, that some will be educated to virtue, others to vice, and others again entirely neglected?"
Godwin answers:

"The injuries that result from a system of national education are, in the first place, that all public establishments include in them the idea of permanence. They endeavour, it may be, to secure and to diffuse whatever of advantage to society is already known, but they forget that more remains to be known . . . But public education has always expended its energies in the support of prejudice; it teaches its pupils not the fortitude that shall bring every proposition to the test of examination, but the art of vindicating such tenets as may chance to be previously established . . . This feature runs through every species of public establishment; and, even in the petty institution of Sunday schools, the chief lessons that are taught are a superstitious veneration for the Church of England, and to bow to every man in a handsome coat . . . Refer them to reading, to conversation, to meditation, but teach them neither creeds nor catechisms, neither moral nor political".

If you think that this is by now a merely historical point, read Clause 25 of the Education Act of 1944 which declares that "The school day in every County School and in every Voluntary School shall begin with collective worship on the part of all pupils present."

Godwin goes on:
"Secondly, the idea of national education is founded in an inattention to the nature of mind. Whatever each man does for himself is done well; whatever his neighbours or his country undertake to do for him is done ill. It is our wisdom to incite men to act for themselves, not to retain them in a state of perpetual pupillage. He that learns because he

desires to learn will listen to the instructions he receives and apprehend their meaning. He that teaches because he desires to teach will discharge his occupation with enthusiasm and energy. But the moment political institution undertakes to assign to every man his place, the functions of all will be discharged with supineness and indifference . . .

"Thirdly, the project of a national education ought uniformly to be discouraged on account of its obvious alliance with national government. This is an alliance of a more formidable nature than the old and much contested alliance of church and state. Before we put so powerful a machine under the direction of so ambitious an agent, it behoves us to consider well what we do. Government will not fail to employ it to strengthen its hands and perpetuate its institutions . . . Their view as instigator of a system of education will not fail to be analogous to their views in their political capacity: the data upon which their conduct as statesmen is vindicated will be the data upon which their institutions are founded. It is not true that our youth ought to be instructed to venerate the constitution, however excellent; they should be instructed to venerate truth . . . (Even) in the countries where liberty chiefly prevails, it is reasonably to be assumed that there are important errors, and a national education has the most direct tendency to perpetuate those errors and to form all minds upon one model."

His arguments are worth quoting at this length, not only as the classic statement of the anarchist position on this issue, but because they have had such ample subsequent justification. Godwin on the other hand does not really answer the question of how we can ensure that every child can have free access to whatever educational facilities will suit its individual needs. He does however answer Ernie Crosswell's point about an international body, and an internationally agreed curriculum. They would only be of any use if we assumed that there could ever be one permanent set of truths to be inculcated, one scientifically correct method of teaching them, and that the purpose of education was "to form all minds upon one model".

Happily this can never be so, and his ill-assorted Unesco committee of experts would be bogged down in a permanent deadlock, for there are so many teaching methods, so many fashions coming and going, that agreement is often impossible between two teachers, let alone between countries. The 'right' method varies from subject to subject, from school to school, from teacher to teacher and from child to child. If this were not so education would be like making pastry. Mix flour, fat and water and bash 'em into shape.
C.W.

(The Labour Party's education policy will be discussed in next week's FREEDOM).

Apologia for 'Good' Government

DEAR COMRADES,

I was interested to read recently in **FREEDOM** that your paper probably has more non-anarchist readers than anarchist readers. As I belong to the former category several interesting questions naturally arise (and I'm sure they apply to others too)—why do I keep subscribing to a paper whose principles and ideas I don't altogether adhere to? What is there in anarchism that I don't like? Does anarchism fail in its propaganda in some way?

These questions have intrigued me for some time and I thought it might be of interest to set down a personal balance sheet concerning the impact of anarchism on myself. First of all let's examine the credit side. The fundamental reason I subscribe to **FREEDOM** is that I agree with the outlook of the paper as a whole—the idea that government is an expensive farce dedicated to maintaining power for the mediocrities of the establishment, the idea that only in freedom do people develop themselves to the full, the idea that it is by co-operation and not by competition that we become truly human beings, the idea that technological advancement is of little use as a factor in increasing human happiness unless tempered by the ideal of the welfare of the community as a whole. These are the basic reasons why I like **FREEDOM**. In addition of course I respect the integrity, understanding and humour of those who write your articles (C.W. should especially be singled out for attention, whoever he or she may be). Indeed the whole tone of the paper may be the fundamental reason why **FREEDOM** is appealing, since after all if people are really understanding of others then all the dogma in the world doesn't matter a damn.

The debit side however seems to lie in the application of these ideas to present society. Many articles in **FREEDOM** seem to imply that all governments are equally bad and therefore nothing much can be done until government as such is finally done away with. This may not be the intention of such articles; I am only trying to describe their impact on me. From this premise also seems to stem the idea that since one government is as bad as any other, then the outcome of any war is a matter of indifference to the anarchist. The result of all this is of course that the anarchist seems to be reduced to sitting on the fence shouting sardonic (but often very witty) remarks in all directions, but unable and unwilling to do anything because of his basic attitude.

My disagreement with this attitude is due to the fact that I do not believe that all governments are equally bad. After living in three different countries—Britain, Canada and the United States—I am convinced that some governments are much worse than others. As far as personal freedom is concerned Canada for example has a lot more to recommend it than does the United States. In fact from a purely personal point of view—attitude towards public health, education system, etc.—local government in the southern state where I live at the moment is positively alarming. Now from the long range viewpoint it may be immaterial whether we have moderately bad politicians or downright evil politi-

cians, since in an anarchist society neither variety will exist, but it makes a hell of a lot of difference right here and now. Where the downright evil type is in power, freedom of thought becomes almost impossible. In this city we take great pride in the fact that we have no controversial publications (might make people think—eh what?) and no subversive bookshops (can't have those evil Reds retailing their atheistic conspiracies). The newspapers don't allow letters to the editor signed with a pseudonym (very undemocratic practice) and the teachers have to sign loyalty oaths to keep their jobs (loyalty presumably to the gods of bootlicking and bumsucking).

This kind of paralysing stupidity makes it difficult for libertarian ideas to stay alive far less flourish. One of my acquaintances recently told me that she strongly believed in the ideal of the survival of the fittest as applied to human beings! Fortunately her ideas are belied by her actions, but the fact that such unadulterated fascism is still taken for granted is a tragic commentary on modern civilization.

As a result of all this I am forced to the conclusion that some sort of stand, however feeble, has to be taken. I have voted in certain elections and will continue to do so not because I believe in government as such but because there are occasions when one kind of government is preferable to another. I adhere to certain ideas not because they are correct or even logical but because they are the only ones possible in hopeless circumstances.

Consider for example the question of capital punishment. I don't believe that the death penalty for murder is always wrong. In Britain and Scandinavia the death penalty may well have little effect on the murder rate but in other parts of the world this may not always be true. The city where I live is in permanent competition with another southern American city for the title: "The Murder Capital of the World", i.e. as to which city has the greatest number of murders per year per 100,000 of the population. Incidentally many deaths which would be called murder elsewhere are not so regarded here, e.g. shooting any man who is in bed with your wife. This is classed as shooting in self-defence since clearly the other fellow was attacking your wife with a dangerous weapon! Actually the death penalty is in force in this state but is seldom applied, certain sections of the law being very poorly enforced. I honestly cannot see any way of improving this state of affairs, given the present set-up, without an authoritarian solution. Again the fact that the tensions and pressures of living here would not exist under anarchism is largely irrelevant. The question still keeps arising:—what should be done here and now?

I am sure other people must have similar questions in mind when faced with the ideas of anarchism. In conclusion I hope you will accept the fact that these questions have not been put forward in a spirit of carping criticism, but rather for the purpose of finding out.

Sincerely and fraternally,

B.T.

Texas, June

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

The Golden Age

COMRADES,

It is an engrossing circumstance—for me, at least—that your issue 21/6/58 has on the same page of it letters from W.M. Skegness and Arthur W. Uloth. Mr. Uloth I always look upon as the "Golden Age" man, and I am going to remember W.M. by this first letter of his to **FREEDOM** because of its unconscious contradiction of Mr. Uloth.

"Golden Age" must be a purely subjective term, depending so wholly as it does upon what is personally meant by "golden". In Mr. Uloth's sense of the word it means anarchism; a time when each man was in himself all-sufficient, wholly independent, acquiring all he felt in need of by work of his own head and hands. In the days of such men there were few people on earth, and there was no "golden age", because there was no gold as men have since become to know gold. There was no money, and the "golden age", which is the age we live in now, began when pressure of population created problems which compelled men to invent a medium of exchange as a substitute for cumbersome barter.

W.M.'s "Quite clearly one and all are so pleasantly occupied pursuing money and making money and enjoying the comforts money can bring that any agitation, left or right of centre, is frowned on with the greatest disgust," must be numbered the chief of all pregnant words ever printed in **FREEDOM**. Incidentally, though W.M. destroys his own bogey, authoritarianism, by exposing it as an effect and not the cause it is so erroneously held to be. Only when the cause of authoritarianism is seen for what it is will there be possibility of its extermination.

Yours fraternally,

22nd June. DAVID MACCONNELL.

Questions for Anarchists

DEAR COMRADES,

On Sunday the 15th June I had the rare honour, for an anarchist that is, of appearing on a T.V. Programme designed for young people. The show was the "Sunday Break" put on by A.B.C. Television from Birmingham.

A few weeks before a rather garbled definition of Anarchism had been given on the programme and I wrote in criticising it. Not with the desire of seeking distinction for myself but because I felt that the ideals that men had defended in Portugal, Spain and Bulgaria should have a fair hearing. I am glad to say that I was allowed to put the case for Anarchism and this, below is the outline of my argument.

1. Anarchists are serious people.
2. We do not advocate bomb throwing for violence's sake.
3. We believe that there is too much Government in the world. (I had to say too much Government because people find it difficult to understand the principle of organisation without Government.)
4. Anarchists believe that every individual has the right to refuse to obey the opinions of the majority so long as that refusal does no harm to the group.
5. Anarchists believe that society should be based on free association with Communes federated one with another. I pointed to the British Empire and made the point that Kropotkin had made when he said, that where the ties between Britain and her colony were authoritarian, as in the case of Ireland—Britain lost Ireland. However, where the bonds were loose, as in the case of Canada, the two countries had remained firm friends and partners.

This then is the gist of what I said, but even more important to my mind, is the argument that ranged around me during rehearsals before the show. It

proved to me that the youth of the country are not so lethargic as their elders and though many of them do not know what Anarchism is, when presented with it THEY ARE NOT DISINTERESTED. Here are some of the criticisms that I had to face:—

1. Why use the word Anarchism when you really stand for pure communism?
2. Wouldn't life be dull in a Free Society where there was nothing to spur us on?
3. Anarchism is too Utopian!
4. Some people are born leaders. What would they do in a Free Society?
5. How would you make sure that everyone pulled their weight?
6. Aren't some Anarchists, particularly Spanish Anarchists, rather cruel?

I have listed these questions here because I believe that we must go out and tackle the youth of the country and if we do it is just as well that we know what questions they might ask. Furthermore, I believe that they are questions that should be discussed in **FREEDOM** so that we can turn on our young critics and show them that they are wrong.
London, June 22. M. KEITH.

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

July 6.—Arthur W. Uloth on
MAN AGAINST SOCIETY
JULY 13.—Donovan Pedelty on
ANARCHISM & DEMOCRACY
Questions, Discussion and Admission
all free.

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP 1958 SUMMER SCHOOL August 2nd—4th.

Subject: "WAR AND PEACE"
Speakers to be announced

Bookings are requested as soon as possible. Write: JOAN SCULTHORPE, c/o Freedom Press.

★ 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)

Trad Jazz at the Malatesta

Every Friday and Saturday from 7.30

THE MALATESTA JAZZ BAND

Members(1/6) and their guests (2/-) only.

MALATESTA CLUB
32 Percy Street
Tottenham Court Road W1

Jazz Men welcome
Organised by IAC

Every Wednesday at 7.30 (prompt)
BONAR THOMPSON speaks

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*
Vol. 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

E. A. GUTKI'ND:
The Expanding Environment 8s. 6d.

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

V. RICHARDS:
Lessons of the Spanish Revolution 6s.

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

RUDOLF ROCKER:
Nationalism and Culture cloth 21s.

MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI:
Neither East nor West
paper 7s. 6d., cloth 10s. 6d.

ERRICO MALATESTA:
Anarchy 6d.
Vote—What For? 1d.

HERBERT READ:
Art and the Evolution of Man 4s.
Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism 3s. 6d.
Poetry and Anarchism cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d.

The Philosophy of Anarchism boards 2s. 6d.
The Education of Free Men 1s.

TONY GIBSON:
Youth for Freedom paper 2s.
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.

Render Unto Caesar Continued from p. 1

Labour or Communist Parties, and the recent statement by the Archbishop of Canterbury on H-Bomb tests was as honest as could be expected.

'Obey Caesar and God'

Dr. Fisher, in an interview on television, said:—

'I think nothing would be lost by suspending nuclear tests for a time. Someone must take the first step.

Nuclear weapons and tests are terrible. I only wish we had taken the lead in this matter and I would like to see us take it now while there is a possibility of us doing so in a way which will not jeopardise the Government's responsibility to protect our security.

All war is detestable, horrible and sinful in the sight of God.

But in a sinful world good people have to do sinful things sometimes. You have to obey Caesar and God and the task of humanity is to reconcile the two.

Very often in a sinful world you have to support Caesar even though it is far less than the complete will of God.'

Less honest, in our opinion, were his answers in another TV interview to questions about Archbishop Makarios of Cyprus, whose invitation from Dr. Fisher to the Lambeth Conference created a disturbance among those who think that terrorism should be the monopoly of properly constituted governments only.

Readers may remember that Makarios was asked to attend the Lambeth Conference because he is after all the accredited head of the Christian Church in a British colony. And originally the attitude of Dr. Fisher was that the question was a purely religious one and 'politics' did not come into it.

In fact, last week on TV Dr. Fisher said:

'his (Makarios') personal character, quite apart from his politics, is no concern of mine.

When I ask official people who are heads of churches I can't examine their characters any more than if the Prime Minister wants to invite the Prime Minister of Russia he has to examine his character.'

Sup, Nevertheless

Now this seems to us to be a relatively honest attitude. When you sup with the devil you use a long spoon, but you sup nevertheless. But then Dr. Fisher went on to say:

'I know as well as anybody what a bad character he is.

I regard with abhorrence his general political behaviour and his association with terrorism.'

he was being far from honest.

For Makarios' association with the Enosis movement in Cyprus or with EOKA in particular is after all nothing more than *his* rendering unto Caesar that which is Caesar's. It is, however, a different Caesar, and therein lies the cause of Dr. Fisher's moralising.

But he has no grounds on which to judge Makarios for his association—if any—with terrorism. For what is the H-Bomb but the supreme terror-weapon of them all. And if Dr. Fisher is prepared to render up to the British Caesar the right to hold this terror over the heads of the peoples of the world (because other sinners are doing the same) he can have no moral arguments against Archbishop Makarios condoning or supporting a much more limited terror on behalf of the Caesar *he* supports.

In the Background

However, to his credit let it be said that unlike the Pope, the Archbishop of Canterbury lays no claim to infallibility.

All he says is:

'What surprises me is that anyone treats what I say controversially.

What I say is really the contribution of a reasonably intelligent person who has a Christian background, about things that are going on.'

But Dr. Fisher is too modest. In fact the 'Christian background' definition is a bit rich. After all, he is the head of the established Church in one of the 'great' nations of the world. In fact, though, perhaps 'background' is the right word. For that is where Dr. Fisher and all his forerunners and contemporaries have pushed the ethics of Christ. But Caesar is well to the fore.