

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"What is the thirst for alcohol and morphia and all the poisons of the apothecary compared with the soul-destroying thirst for the poison of Laws?" ...
—HAVELOCK ELLIS.

'Democracy' in Practice

THE CYPRUS CLAMP-DOWN

Just before dawn broke today, squad cars drew up in Cyprus streets, hundreds of doorbells rang, and Cypriots still in their beds were taken out of them and hustled off to detention camps.

It was the beginning of the biggest clamp-down in the island's history. All phone and telegraphic communications were cut off with the outside world. All trunk calls in the island were stopped. Cyprus was blanked out and isolated.

"News Chronicle" 22/7/58.

Many of those detained are now in wire enclosures beside the road between Limassol and Nicosia, where, according to an eye-witness, "they are shouting and screaming their heads off."

"Manchester Guardian" 22/7/58.

THE above reports will sound familiar to the survivors of Fascist and Communist terror in Europe, and, we hope, will serve as a lesson to those naive people who still believe that totalitarian methods are never used by democratic governments.

The arrest of 1,400 Greeks and 50 Turks last week marks a return to the strong-arm methods used by the British administration in Cyprus before the retirement of Harding, and again shows the lengths to which the British occupation authorities are prepared to go to justify their ends, in spite of the 'peaceful' period which followed the appointment of Sir Hugh Foot.

We stated in FREEDOM at that time that however sincere Foot was in his desire to change the relationship between Greek Cypriots and the British authorities, he was limited by the badge of office and the inevitable intentions of the British to 'clean up' rebellious elements in Cyprus. We are not surprised at the re-imposition of tough methods, they have just come sooner than we expected, and are not entirely unconnected with the sending of troops to Jordan.*

There is little point in going over the entire weary and tragic history of Cyprus over the past few years, but it is necessary to state over and over again how the British Government has acted as an agency which inflamed the relatively peaceful relationships between the two communities. It is not denied that there are irrational divisions between Greeks and Turks, but these were not apparent before Cyprus came into the

*While Cyprus is being used as a jumping-off ground for troops bound for the Middle East, precautions have to be taken that no act of sedition will impede the progress. Arrests of suspect characters, in some cases where there is no real reason to do so, is a common tactic of all governments usually only attributable to totalitarian states.

news as an important strategical base for Britain.

Hatred Created

The occasional reports which manage to reach the public quoting the views of individual Greek and Turk Cypriots who are quite happy to remain a part of a mixed community, presents a picture of young and old people confused and unhappy about a situation which probably does not arouse strong emotions one way or the other. It is in this state after all that millions of people live out their lives, until suddenly they are touched by violence and pulled in different directions.

Now the hatred is real, if only felt by a minority in each community. But the minority is active, and Greeks and Turks are senselessly killing each other daily. The cunning policy of the British authorities has been divide and rule, favouring heavily the Turkish community, for reasons which we have discussed many times in FREEDOM. Last week's round-up, which imprisoned only 50 Turks compared to over a thousand Greeks, cannot be explained away by the argument that the Turkish organisations are not so widespread as E.O.K.A. (It is only now admitted that there is a Turkish terrorist organisation in Cyprus). A

month ago when well organised Turkish riots were taking place in Nicosia even a Conservative newspaper like the Times was astonished to report far more Greek Cypriots being arrested than Turkish.

In further evidence of the British authorities turning a blind eye on the scale of violence organised by the Turkish Cypriot leaders, a report from Reuter states that:

the Turkish leader, Dr. Fazil Kutchuk, warned by the Turkish Government, escaped the dragnet and flew out of Nicosia early to-day.

It is true that the Governor has now proscribed, for an initial twelve month period, "the Turkish terrorist organisation T.M.T.", which is reported in these terms in the Manchester Guardian:

"An extraordinary issue of the Official Gazette said T.M.T. was used for "the promotion of disorder and the spread of sedition within the colony." E.O.K.A. has been outlawed since September, 1955."

'Freedom from Fear'

Sir Hugh Foot in stating that he had ordered the arrests of ex-prisoners as well as new suspects, "Known or believed to have planned murder, arson or other violence and intimidation", claims that his action

Continued on p. 4

The 'Isis' Trial

Ours not to Reason Why

LAST February, in the 'H-bomb' issue of the Oxford undergraduate magazine Isis an article appeared under the title "Frontier Incidents Exposure". A fortnight later the agents of Scotland Yard's Special Branch descended on Oxford and also made what the press describe as a police tour of Fleet Street. And last week, after a trial at the Old Bailey, much of which was held in camera, two undergraduates, former National Servicemen, were each sentenced to three months' imprisonment by the Lord Chief Justice, Lord Goddard, for breaches of the Official Secrets Act.

Cases of this kind always have their absurd side (except for the defendants) since they always ensure that the original offence is re-committed with impunity by the newspapers. If no action had been taken, no-one outside Oxford would have heard of the article nor learned of its allegations, nor would they have been able to gauge how much of it was true. As it is, the police action has ensured that everybody knows what was said, even Moscow Radio devoted a broadcast to the subject, saying that these young men were being prosecuted for revealing something that the Russians already knew, and, as the Manchester Guardian has observed, the prosecution has "served as a world-wide advertisement that our security authorities

are hyper-sensitive and have something to hide".

But the Isis affair has another significance, besides the ham-handedness of the police. Alex Comfort writes, in a letter to the press:

"When security is being used to deceive not the enemy but the electorate, the citizen has a plain duty to blow the gaff—whatever the law may say, and whatever pledges have been extracted from him in advance of the event. That duty the two contributors to the Isis have discharged, and we ought to be grateful to them. They have shown that in a democracy a government which grossly abuses the confidence of the public cannot count on the silence of individuals. If that principle had been exemplified more often we might not have had Auschwitz—or Hiroshima".

What they have shown is that the principle that the Nuremberg War Crimes trials are said to have established—that a man under military orders has a duty to refuse them if they are, to quote the revised text of the Manual of Military Law contrary to the "general sentiment of humanity", applies only to the other side. Is the Official Secrets Act binding when the secrets hidden are contrary to the "general sentiment of humanity"?

"We wanted," said one of the students at his trial,

"to produce a completely rational argument, and we felt two things about this article—firstly that Russian attacks on Western planes had been used as evidence for suggesting that nuclear disarmament was impossible, and secondly, because the idea of an instant deterrent is not in my opinion consistent with any continual activity along the frontiers".

The article purported to show that border incidents had been deliberately provoked in order to gain information about Russian defences, an activity which, as the facts about the U.S. Strategic Air Command's "instant preparedness" system, gradually accumulate (in spite of Mr. Macmillan's bland declaration that "There is no permanent or standing patrol . . . nuclear weapons are only carried on special operational exercises"), is obviously criminal lunacy.

Lord Goddard, addressing one of the young men on trial said:

"If you publish an untrue account and there is not a word of truth in it, that is one thing. The trouble is you published information which you knew was true. At least you realise that now?"

And we all realise it. "Of course," Lord Goddard said, in pronouncing the sentences, "I take into account that this was an act principally of youthful folly . . ."

Middle East Politics

AS the Middle East crisis settles down—rather more quickly than was generally expected, and despite considerable anxiety as to whether or not it would develop into a shooting war of some magnitude—it is possible to look back upon events with a more calculating air.

With our accustomed sense of misgiving we are forced to conclude that the whole affair appears to have some extraordinary aspects. The facts were simply these: as a result of an uprising in Iraq, American Marines were landed in the Lebanon and British Paratroopers in Jordan; both forces being sent in such great haste as to provide another unnecessary example of dangerous "brinkmanship". Ostensibly these Western forces were to maintain in power the Iraqi government under Nuri es-Said; but this government had already fallen, the new one was installed, and was busily giving assurances that the precious oil would continue to flow.

Meanwhile King Hussein of Jordan was proclaiming his intention to restore peace in Iraq, having become its leader by default (if only in his own mind), and with assistance from the West, would no doubt have proceeded to the attack.

At this point Messrs. Dulles and Macmillan must suddenly have realised what a difficult situation they had created for themselves. (We suspect that orders for the British troops to go to the Lebanon were in fact cancelled just too late to do any good since the planes were already landing. A brilliant blunder which could have had ghastly repercussions). With the realisation of what might happen, a statement was issued to the effect that there was no intention to intervene in Iraq. This left Hussein looking ridiculous—a fate long overdue—and at the same time reduced the likelihood of any counter move by the Russians.

But Hussein is not the only one who now looks ridiculous. The Western powers appear in precisely the same light so far as the uncommitted nations are concerned, and in a far worse light from the point of view of the Eastern bloc and the United Arab Republic, who regard the whole business as little short of open aggression.

The only conclusion it is possible to reach is that the troops went in on the pretext of maintaining order, on the old gunboat diplomacy principle (see FREEDOM, 26th July), but in fact were there to protect Western oil interests—although the oil has not ceased to flow and there was no especial reason for supposing that it would (see FREEDOM, 26th July). By now it must be only too obvious that a strategical error has been made—but it must have been equally obvious before the event, even for Macmillan and Dulles, who were presumably in a position to know what their own intentions were.

In the face of the facts it is almost impossible to understand the workings of the minds of Western political and military strategists. Nothing could be gained from the actions taken, nothing could be lost from not taking them, but many things have now become more difficult to resolve from the Western point of view.

The next move is now in the general direction of the elusive summit which until now has remained at the same great distance from all "interested" nations however ardently they professed their yearning to reach it.

Since the Anglo-American landings, the Russians have made great strides towards the summit, dragging unwillingly behind them, the West. This is not surprising, for the Russians now consider themselves in a strong moral position. (Though of

course it is merely that the West is in a weak moral position).

We hold out no hope of any great achievements from a summit conference, whether it is held in New York, Geneva or even in Archangel; and it will make little difference whether de Gaulle is present, or sundry representatives from Middle East nations. It is only too clear that Eastern and Western interests in the Middle East are quite opposed, it is also clear that neither side ever gives way on issues of this kind; and plainest of all, neither East nor West is particularly alarmed at the prospect of a threat to peace, or a civil war or an Arab-Israeli dispute. The issue will be solved in the field not at the conference table—but it will be the wrong issue—the battle for the greatest influence in the Middle East.

The International Anarchist Congress

THE Second International Congress of anarchists to be organised since the end of the war is being held this week in London.

The task of organising this Congress has been carried out by CRIA—the Commission for International Anarchist Relations—centred in Paris, where the gathering was originally to be held. Owing to difficulties of physical arrangements in Paris, however, and in view of the political situation early this Summer, the Malatesta Club in London offered to undertake the responsibility for providing facilities for the Congress to be held here.

Thus the London comrades have a unique opportunity of meeting anarchists from several countries, of exchanging views and experiences, and of understanding more of the

difficulties which face the movement in very different circumstances.

There are seventeen movements, organisations or groups either present or represented, including delegates from France, Italy, Spain, Bulgaria, Chile, Germany, Holland, Belgium, Sweden, Argentina and the Libertarian League (of United States, Canada and Australia) are represented, as well as the IWMA and, of course, CRIA.

At the time of writing the Congress has heard reports from all the delegates on the state of the movement in their countries, as well as reports from CRIA on its contact with the comrades in Korea, Japan and Hong Kong, and on its own activity since the last Congress.

Full reports on this event will appear in FREEDOM in due course.

WELCOME TO THE CONGRESS —

THE Freedom Press Group associate themselves with the London organisers of the International Anarchist Congress in extending a welcome to all the delegates present and express their hopes that the work of the Congress will have the most beneficial results for the world movement in the future.

The Freedom Press Group also wish to join with the Congress in taking the opportunity to extend fraternal greetings to the Anarchist movements of the world and especially to reaffirm their solidarity with comrades in prison or suffering in any way under totalitarian régimes.

PEOPLE AND IDEAS

ANARCHY FOR ADULTS

THE article by George Molnar *Anarchy and Utopia* which concludes in this issue of FREEDOM, appears with extraordinary aptness at a time when a great deal of questioning and re-examination is going on amongst anarchists in this country, reflected by many recent articles in these columns (for example, "The Limitations of Anarchism", "Anarchist Ideas To-day", the interesting letter from M. Keith, who had the opportunity to slip a bit of anarchism into a teenage religious TV programme, and D.R.'s letter on "An Anarchist Revival?" last week).

The usual line of criticism advanced against anarchism as a social ideology is that it is utopian, stuck in nineteenth-century false optimism, based on a failure to understand the way in which human society works. George Molnar in his article charges "contemporary libertarian sympathisers" with "generally ignoring" the streak in anarchist thought which contradicts the utopian elements, and observes that "to the initiated as well as to the uninitiated anarchism is still the search for 'Nowhere'."

To correct such a "one-sided view" he reminds us that "in addition to a considerable amount of naive speculation anarchism also contains a realistic line of thought on the nature of society", and in drawing his illustrations for this argument from Bakunin and Kropotkin, he seeks also to show that

"those who work out this realistic line consistently, by freeing it from its utopian associations, are entitled to claim a stronger connection with traditional anarchism than the mere use of the word 'anarchist' as an appropriate label."

As a key to the concept of anarchism which Molnar puts forward, he cites a passage from Kropotkin (it is to be found in the French (1913) editions of *Modern Science and Anarchism*) which I have often used for a similar purpose in this column:

"Throughout the history of our civilisation, two traditions, two opposed tendencies, have been in conflict; the Roman tradition and the popular tradition, the imperial tradition and the federalist tradition, the authoritarian tradi-

tion and the libertarian tradition. Between these two currents, always alive, struggling in humanity—the current of the people and the current of the minorities which thirst for political and religious domination—our choice is made."

As Molnar says, this is a different conception of freedom and of the role of anarchism from that which postpones all solutions until the advent of a hypothetical "free society". It is a conception of freedom as "one thing along with other causes that can be supported or opposed", while "the coming or not coming of the social revolution recedes in importance, since freedom and authority are always struggling". Along this line, as he says,

"we can take freedom as a character, not of societies as a whole but of certain groups, institutions and people's ways of life within any society, and even then not as their exclusive character."

And how valuable is his conclusion, reminding us that,

"the contest between freedom and authority is the permanent order of the day. Doing politics, advancing freedom as a programme for the entire human race, cannot change this; it can only foster illusions about the way society runs."

★

WHEN you look at anarchism in these terms, the kind of questions that worry people are seen in a truer light. Arthur Uloth writes in FREEDOM for 21/6/58, "something is wrong somewhere. Anarchism has been preached for over a hundred years in Europe, but it seems less likely to succeed now than it did fifty years ago", and someone else writes last week, "But anarchism has been known for so long, and we're as far away from a free society as ever. It seems hopeless". This reminds me of Sid Parker's conversation with the advocate of socialism by universal consent. "Operator. Put me through to Cape Town. Hullo! Is that last Hottentot converted yet?" When both authority and liberty are permanent aspects of human society, to talk in general terms of success and failure is irrelevant. As Max Nettlau put it "Anarchism is equally dear to me whether held by five thousand people or by five hundred millions, or by a few individuals".

Equally irrelevant are most of the questions (FREEDOM 5/7/58) put to reader Keith in the argument that ranged around him in the rehearsal for the television show in which he took part. For they were concerned with the possibility or desirability of an anarchist society, while the questions which really

matter are those which ask which tendencies in our own society should be supported and which opposed, or which new ones set in motion.

This is not the narrowing horizon of anarchism in despair or in retreat. It is an undertaking that calls for a great deal more subtlety, more knowledge of the world as it is, and more thinking, than that which says "Only in a free society, where governments have ceased to exist, where exploitation has ceased, will mankind ever... etc., etc." But the very rejection of cut-and-dried blanket solutions brings its problems—problems neatly but fruitlessly by-passed by the application of the all-or-nothing formula, problems of evaluation and interpretation, which can be all too easily evaded when you take the line that because no road leads to Utopia, no roads lead anywhere. All roads lead somewhere and if you undertake the responsibility of choosing, what guides you in your choice? The yardstick is the distinction between Kropotkin's two opposing principles, the authoritarian and the libertarian, or as Gierke called them, the principles of domination and free association, or what Jayaprakash Narayan calls *rajniti* and *lokniti*, state-politics and people-politics, or what Martin Buber in his essay "Society and the State" calls the social principle and the political principle. (Buber's remarkable essay which appeared in *World Review* seven years ago has now found a permanent home in a book of his called "Pointing the Way", (Routledge, 1957).

★

BUBER works out the distinction with great subtlety and insight. He is not an anarchist, and he rejects the notion of an absolute choice; writing, in his essay on Landauer in "Paths to Utopia":

"We see that, practically speaking, it is not a question of the abstract alternative 'State or No-State'. The Either-Or principle applies primarily to the moments of genuine decision by a person or a group; then, everything intermediate, everything that interposes itself, is impure and unpurifying; it works confusion, obscurity, obstruction. But this same principle becomes an obstruction in its turn if, at any given stage in the execution of the decision reached, it does not permit less than the Absolute to take shape and so devalues the measures that are now possible."

If the State, he says, paraphrasing Landauer, "is a relationship which can only be destroyed by entering into another relationship, then we shall always

be helping to destroy it to the extent that we do in fact enter into another". And he goes on to declare that:

"People living together at a given time and in a given space are only to a certain degree, of their own free will, capable of living together rightly; of their own free will maintaining a right order and conducting their common interests accordingly. The line which at any time limits this capacity forms the basis of the State at that time; in other words, the degree of incapacity for a voluntary right order determines the degree of legitimate compulsion. Nevertheless the *de facto* extent of the State always exceeds more or less—and mostly very much exceeds—the sort of State that would emerge from the degree of legitimate compulsion. This constant difference (which results in what I call the 'excessive State') between the State in principle and the State in fact is explained by the historical circumstance that accumulated power does not abdicate except under necessity. It resists any adaptation to the increasing capacity for voluntary order so long as this increase fails to exert sufficiently vigorous pressure on the power accumulated. The 'principal' foundations of the power may

have crumbled, but power itself does not crumble unless driven to it. Thus the dead rule the living."

The anarchist would of course disagree with the notion of a "degree of legitimate compulsion" and would ask who is to be the judge of a "right order", but Buber continues:

"The task that thus emerges for the socialists, i.e. for all those intent on a restructuring of society, is to drive the factual base-line of the State back to the 'principal' base-line of socialism. But this is precisely what will result from the creation and renewal of real organic structure, from the union of persons and families into various communities and of communities into associations. It is this growth and nothing else that 'destroys' the State by displacing it. The part so displaced, of course, will only be that portion of the State which is superfluous and without foundation at any time; any action that went beyond this would be illegitimate and bound to miscarry because, as soon as it had exceeded its limits it would lack the constructive spirit necessary for further advance. Here we come up against the same problem that Proudhon has dis-

Continued on p. 3

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

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

New Books . . .

Bid for Power

G. Bull & A. Vice 25/-
Men Against the Desert

Ritchie Calder 18/-
Camino Real Tennessee Williams 8/6

The Long March
Simone de Beauvoir 42/-

Penguins . . .

The Death of Grass

John Christopher 2/6

The Human Situation
W. MacNeile Dixon 5/-

Cry the Beloved Country
Alan Paton 2/6

The Theory of Evolution
John Maynard Smith 3/6

The Charterhouse of Parma
Stendhal 6/-

Second-Hand . . .

Soviet Foreign Policy during the
Patriotic War, Vol. I. 5/6

Paradoxes Max Nordau 6/6

Manual of Child Psychology
(ed. Carmichael) 20/-

Movies for the Millions
Gilbert Seldes 7/6

Pilgrim to the Left S. G. Hobson 7/6

Proletarian Pilgrimage
John Paton 4/-

The Passing of the Gods
V. E. Calverton 8/6

The Book of Modern American
Short Stories Anderson, Faulkner,
Miller, etc. 2/6

Gas-House McGinty
James T. Farrell 5/-

The Spoil of Europe
Thomas Reveille 3/6

The Philosophy of Conflict, etc.
Havelock Ellis 3/6

Pamphlets . . .

Break Through Stuart Hall 1/6

What Happens to Communists
Michael Padev 1/6

Where do Marxists Go from
Here? J. E. M. Arden 2/6

Periodicals . . .

Universities and Left Review
No. 4 Deutscher, Berger, etc. 4/-

Liberation, June, 1958 1/9

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

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*

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. GUTKIND :

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.

RUDOLF ROCKER :

Nationalism and Culture cloth 21s.

MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI :

Neither East nor West paper 7s. 6d., cloth 10s. 6d.

PETER KROPOTKIN :

The State: Its Historic Role 1s.

The Wage System 3d.

Revolutionary Government 3d.

Organised Vengeance 2d.

Called Justice 2d.

JOHN HEWETSON :

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

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.

K. J. KENAFICK :

Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx paper 6s.

F. A. RIDLEY :

The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age 2d.

ALEX COMFORT :

Delinquency 6d.

★

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.

Controversy: Anarchy and Utopia - 2

(Continued from previous issue)

BEHIND these theories about the coming of the social revolution lie certain assumptions about the working of society. In the case of Proudhon's naive statement it is easiest to see what is being assumed: a unanimous agreement among citizens, and the power of education or propaganda to change people's beliefs and objectives. Such unanimous agreement is clearly impossible if people are in conflict on various demands, and, equally, the most powerful propaganda is doomed to failure where it goes against vested interests. This obvious truth about society was not completely ignored by anarchists. In criticising Fourier, Bakunin calls it an error to believe that peaceful persuasion and propaganda will "touch the hearts of the rich to such an extent that the latter would come themselves and lay down the surpluses of their riches at the doors of their phalansteries." It seems then that even the theory of class struggle held by anarchists contradicted their solidarist beliefs. In this vein Peter Kropotkin talked about the two currents of history: "Throughout the history of our civilisation, two traditions, two opposed tendencies, have been in conflict: the Roman tradition and the popular tradition, the imperial tradition and the federalist tradition, the authoritarian tradition and the libertarian tradition." So that even anarchists had to admit the solidarity of entire societies is a fiction. However, apart from the rulers who would not be interested in freedom, there is the large mass of oppressed, the workers, to whom anarchist theory was supposed to apply. But the working class itself displays no solidarity in support of any one cause, and anarchists, to uphold the view that a revolution from below is possible, had to fall back on the quite implausible theory of "real interests"—of underlying, non-apparent solidarity. Thus when Bakunin came to criticise the German socialists he explained the fact that German workers in general have no anarchist leanings by blaming Lassalle and Marx for misleading the German proletariat. This argument is very unconvincing. By the same reasoning it could be made out that Italian or Spanish anarchists were, underneath, "really" Marxists misled by Bakunin's glibness.

Equally unsuccessful are Kropotkin's efforts to show that the co-operative tendencies in workers, or any other tendencies held to be favourable to the spread of anarchy, are more real or more fundamental than those admittedly existing trends which are unfree, or which make for conflict. We could here object to the "psychologising" of social phenomena implied by the talk about tendencies in individuals favoured by Kropotkin. But

a more important point about the view that the workers have a "natural tendency" to anarchism or that it is in their "real interests" is that we cannot empirically distinguish natural tendencies from others we could call unnatural. Woodcock's argument is open to the same objection: the tendency towards the social revolution is not apparent because it consists of something the workers are supposed to have but do not in fact have—an interest in the general strike. In a realistic moment Bakunin himself admitted this on talking in detail about the working class. He found that there is a labour aristocracy of more developed, literate individuals, as well as an unconscious mass of workers. He found that artisans such as for instance, blacksmiths show signs of revolutionary instincts while other, mainly better paid craftsmen, have distinctly bourgeois ambitions and outlook. Among joiners, printers, tailors, he found, as a consequence of the degree of education and special knowledge required for these trades, more conscious thinking but also more bourgeois smugness; while, to instance a final example, he noted that those who are thoroughly imbued with a revolutionary spirit are in a minority and comprise what he called a "revolutionary vanguard." Observations of this kind, noting the variety of ways and directions in which workers are motivated, contrast sharply with the talk about workers' solidarity favoured by socialists of every kind.

Connected with this solidarist view, which sometimes goes so far as to lead to a description of the free society as one from which all disagreements have vanished, is the view that freedom is something which affects society as a whole. Bakunin takes the line that equality and socialism are necessary conditions of freedom. "The serious realisation of liberty will be impossible so long as the vast majority of the population remains dispossessed in points of elementary need." Accordingly, freedom means "freedom-for-all," and this is all that it means. The question raised by this way of talking is again whether the "serious realisation of liberty" is at all possible, whether freedom is something of which we can sensibly ask: is it realisable? It seems that if Bakunin was right we could not explain how the idea of freedom arose at all unless we postulate an original fully socialistic and egalitarian society, a sort of "condition of grace" from which subsequent human societies have fallen. Nor could we understand how the State encroaches on freedom unless we took the most illogical step of regarding it as standing *vis-a-vis* an already existing free society, attacking it from the outside. It is on this view hard to grasp how anarchists

came to support freedom in the first place, and, in fact, we do find them sometimes talking in a way which denies that the attempts to dominate and rule over people arise out of genuine demands for power. When in this mood, anarchists ask us to regard the State as a "distortion", as a "horrible fiction" somehow not of the human world. But anarchists, of all people, cannot deny the unfictitious, matter of fact existence of authority and we find that it was in drawing attention to it that they have over-reached themselves and have put forward a doctrine on which freedom (except in the nebulous future) is impossible. As a consequence of this false theory of freedom anarchists were utopian in their political pronouncements. On their totalistic view of freedom as a state of society yet to come they could not accommodate in their thought those piecemeal activities and social forces struggling against authority which in practice, they clearly recognised. Liberty is something not found at present, something that will "really" come only in the future: hence the utopian concern with the future of society.

There is a marked internal contradiction in anarchism between the utopian social reformer's outlook and the clear-cut attack on authority which does not invoke the common good. Evidence of this is that no matter how pronounced their escapist preoccupations were, anarchist thinkers never freed themselves from ambivalence when talking about the future. They recognised that "to indoctrinate and dictate to the future" is a form of authoritarianism, the more so since the social role of the picture of a happy future, in religion no less than in politics, is to cloak present demands which would not be as readily acceptable without the reference to the rewards of "kingdom come". One gains the impression that anarchists vaguely suspected the true function of utopian thought. In the case of their critique of socialism this is evident: they demonstrated that the socialist Utopia, the use of repressive institutions for the ending of repression, disguises an immediate demand for the leadership of the proletariat as a means of gaining power. Anarchists readily pointed out that it is a mistake to think that this sort of thing will lead to freedom. In spite of this, they commit a similar mistake in suggesting the final triumph of forces struggling for freedom. Bakunin's dictum "Liberty is the goal of the historic progress of humanity" fairly obviously involves the erroneous belief that there are special interests in politics—such as the interest in freedom or in gaining power—which can operate to the exclusion of all opposition. The point, expressed dif-

Continued on p. 3

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 19, No. 31. August 2, 1958

ANARCHISM & THE STATE

This translation of an extract from a work by Luigi Fabbri, one of the representatives of the anarchist community tendency among the Italian movement, is particularly interesting insofar as it concerns a difference between the ideas of a genuine liberative revolution, and a change of rulers. At the present time many such changes of régime are taking place in the Middle East, and in certain circles they are hailed as great social revolutionary events. No one would pretend that these never result in certain benefits to the people, but as far as the question of freedom for the people is concerned, they do not have any good result. The implication of that point of view for an inhabitant of such a country or a participant in such event remains for each person to decide upon.

A second interesting point raised by Fabbri is the essential similarity between the collectivist ideas of bolshevism and social democracy. The terrorism of the bolshevik state may or may not be temporary, but its basis of denial of individual freedom will remain.

The extract translated here by Philip Holgate was published in "Seme Anarchio".



ANARCHIST writers have time and time again repeated the well-known anarchistic interpretation of socialism which Karl Marx gave in the course of one of his most violent polemics against Bakunin:

"This is what all socialists understand by anarchism, that after the proletarian movement has achieved its aim, the abolition of the class system, then the power of the state, which only keeps the great producing majority under the power of a tiny exploiting minority, will disappear, and the functions of government will be transformed into simple functions of administration."

We are unable to accept this Marxist viewpoint on anarchy, because we do not believe that the state will be killed or die naturally as an automatic result of the abolition of classes. The State is not only a product of class divisions; it in its turn can generate privileges, and so produce a new division into classes. Marx was mistaken in thinking that if the class structure was abolished, the State would die a natural death, as if from lack of nourishment. The State will not cease to exist until it is destroyed from a deliberate intention, just as capitalism will not cease to exist until it is brought down by expropriation. If a State is left in existence it will generate within itself a new ruling class, even if it does not prefer to make peace with the old one. Basically, so long as the State exists, the class structure will continue, and classes will never be definitely abolished.

In general terms we believe, in the economic field, but most of all in political matters and we show a great hostility towards it—that centralisation is the least useful way of organising affairs, and the one least well fitted to realising the practical needs of social living. However, that does not prevent us from realising that there may be particular realms of public service, several administrative offices, offices of exchange, etc., in which centralization of function will still be necessary. In those cases we find nothing amiss. The important thing for anarchists is that there should be no concentration of power. That means that it should not be possible for a few to forcibly impose the solutions they desire, on some pretext of practical necessity. That danger will be abolished if, right from the start, every government authority, and every police organisation with power to forcibly impose itself by means of a monopoly of armed violence, is abolished.

We do not react to the errors of the neo-Marxists on questions concerning compulsory and absolute centralization by proposing to decentralize by force. That would be to commit an identical type of error in the opposite direction. We prefer tendencies towards decentralization; but in the final resort we treat all practical and technical questions by leaving them to be decided on as a result of free experiment, under the guidance of which solutions can be found according to the particular circumstances of the

case, in the interest of all, and for the benefit of high production, but in such a way that under none of the systems will the exploitation of man by man be allowed to develop.

The essence of the State, according to anarchists, does not then consist (as the authoritarian communists imagine) in the mechanical concentration of production—which is quite a different problem of which I have spoken above—but in the concentration of power, and above all in the power of coercion of which the State has the monopoly, in that organization of violence called "government" and in the hierarchical, judicial police and military despotism which imposes its laws on everyone in order to defend the privileges of the possessing class, and those created by property.

Class divisions will only be abolished by acts, that is to say by the direct (and not governmental) expropriation of the privileged classes by the proletariat. It is possible to do this straight away, right from the start after the old ruling power has been brought down, and it remains a possibility as long as no new power is constituted. If the proletariat is so dilatory in doing this that a new government arises and becomes strong, then it is running the risk of failure, and of remaining still an oppressed and exploited proletariat. The longer the expropriation is delayed the more difficult it will become, and if the proletariat fall in with the government because it is carrying out the expropriation, it will be thrust down and beaten. The new government could of course expropriate the old ruling class either partially or completely, but only under such conditions as to create a new ruling class under which the proletariat would still be subject.

What we are asserting is that those who form the government and the bureaucratic minorities and the military and police forces which keep it in power, become in fact the real proprietors of the wealth, in so far as all property comes to be attributed to the State. In the first place the failure of the revolution would be obvious. Secondly, despite the illusions held by many, the conditions of the proletariat would always remain those of a subjected class.

Capitalism will not lose its essential characteristics if it changes from being private, to being "State capitalism". When this happens the State has carried out not an expropriation but an appropriation. The many bosses will have been displaced by a single boss, who will be even more powerful, since apart from being infinitely rich, the boss will himself possess the armed force to crush the proletariat at will. Those in the fields and factories will still remain wage slaves, and be exploited and oppressed. The State on the other hand, which is not an abstract body but which consists of people, will be a body organised by the ruling and dominating class which has never lacked ways of finding legal justification for exploitation in legal formalities based more or less on elections and parliament.

Everyone must know how our ideal, summed up by the word *anarchy*, taken in its context of a libertarian form of organization of socialism, has always been called anarchist communism.

WHERE IS THE R.S.P.C.A.?

WHAT is going to be the reaction of the animal-lovers of Britain—that is, surely, the entire population of this Christian country—to the news that the British scientists who have been making merry with missiles at Woomera for years have now perfected plans for launching a rocket carrying animals into space?

When the Russians told a stunned world that they had launched a second satellite into orbit carrying a dog the first section of the free world's population to come to and realise the bestial significance of that infamous act were the dog-lovers.

These highly sensitive people had not gone on record in protest against the atom bombs on Japan—although probably they went into private mourning for the hundreds of Japanese doggies which were disintegrated with their masters—nor have we heard a single bark of protest against the development of the H-Bomb and the means to deliver it around the world.

Nearly all anarchist literature has been socialist, in the communist sense since the end of the *First International*. Legal, state collectivism on the one side, and revolutionary, anarchist communism on the other, were the two schools of thought into which the socialist movement was divided until the outbreak of the Russian Revolution in 1917. How many disputes we had with the Marxist socialists (the neo-communists), sustaining our communist ideal against their collectivism, which had the air of the German barracks about it!

Their ideal of organization has remained the same, and its authoritarian nature has even been accentuated. Between the collectivism which we are now criticising, and the dictatorial communist régimes of to-day, the difference is only one of methods, and some theoretical details, and not in the objects to be sought immediately. These are bound together with the State communism of the German socialists from before 1880 which Bakunin so acidly criticized, and the governmental socialism of Louis Blanc, which was so brilliantly refuted by Proudhon.

The dissention, the contrast, does not lie between anarchism and more or less scientific socialism, but between authoritarian State communism, which ultimately takes the form of dictatorial despotism, and anarchist, anti-state socialism, with its libertarian conception of the revolution.

If one has to speak of a contradiction in terms, it does not lie between Communism and Anarchy, which are so closely bound together that one is inconceivable without the other, but rather between communism and the State. As long as state or government exists, communism is impossible. To say the least the conciliation between them is so difficult, and so depends on the sacrifice of every human freedom and dignity, that it is almost impossible, now that the spirit of revolt, of autonomy and of free initiative is so widely diffused among the masses, starved not only of bread, but of liberty.

Their protest came, not at the prospect of humanity suffering by the million, but at the use of one dog—suitably cushioned, automatically fed and presumably painlessly destroyed when he had served his purpose, which is more than man can expect—for scientific research.

We wondered at the time, and we still do, how much of their indignation was due to the fact that the perpetrators of that ghastly crime against caninity were the godless Russians, for when, a few weeks ago, the American Government proudly announced that it had put a mouse into orbit, we didn't get a squeak out of the kindly gentlewomen of Kensington and Bath.

Of course, a mouse is not a dog. Those good ladies who were desolated by the fate of little Laika quite cheerfully set traps in their kitchens to break the back of any mouse cheeky enough to venture there.

The wee, sleekit, cowrin, tim'rous beastie may be one of God's creatures also, but the panic in his breastie just does not strike home like that of dear Fido, whose limpid brown eyes mirror his very soul. Has a mouse got a soul? Does Nature's social union really stretch from Man down to the lesser vermin? Well, not if the wee, sleekit, etc., beastie is bickering his brattle in an *American Sputnik*, anyway.

So the best-laid schemes o' Mice and

Men gang aft a-gley, and the Colonel's ladies must now decide how much indignation may safely be expressed at Britain's plans for a rocket manned (if that is the right word) by animals. So far the subtle scientists of perfidious Albion have not disclosed what species of beastie has been selected for the honour of playing this essential part in the defence of the free world. A bulldog would clearly be the most appropriate choice, and this is a breed of dog which, for obvious reasons, does not arouse so much maternal passion in the bosoms of Bath as say, a Spaniel or duckiest of all and frightfully fashionable just now—a poodle.

Perhaps a dachshund, as a gesture of solidarity with Dr. Adenauer and all those German scientists who have contributed so much to rocketry. Or why not a kangaroo, as an expression of gratitude towards Australia for providing the Woomera range in the first place (and Kaola bears are too cuddly). Or, to really impress the world and get India more firmly on our side, an elephant. That would show the Russians what's what!

No? Ah well, perhaps we must simply wait and see which of the animal kingdom is on the side of the West. We are sure that our scientists, who are doing so much for us at Woomera, will choose wisely.

Anarchy for Adults Continued from p. 2

covered from another angle: association without sufficient and sufficiently vital communal spirit does not set Community up in the place of State—it bears the State in its own self and it cannot result in anything but State, i.e. power-politics and expansionism supported by bureaucracy".



HERE again, anarchists cannot accept the idea of an "illegitimate" incursion into the State, but can surely see the force of Buber's underlying argument. He puts it more attractively in "Society and the State":

"The political principle is always stronger in relation to the social principle than the given conditions require. The result is a continuous diminution in social spontaneity."

"Yet the social vitality of a nation, and its cultural unity and independence as well, depend very largely upon the degree of social spontaneity to be found there. The question has therefore been repeatedly raised as to how social spontaneity can be strengthened by freeing it as much as possible from the pressure of the political principle. It has been suggested that decentralisation of political power, in particular, would be most desirable. As a matter of fact, the larger the measure of autonomy granted to the local and regional and also to the functional societies, the more room is left for the free unfolding of the social energies. Obviously, the question cannot be formulated as a choice between 'Centralisation' and 'Decentralisation'. We must ask rather: 'What are the spheres in which a larger measure of decentralisation of the capacity to make dispositions would be admissible?' The demarcation would naturally have to be revised and improved continually to conform to the changing conditions."

"Apart from this change in the appar-

tionment of power, it is also in the interest of a self-constituting society to strive towards a continuous change in the nature of power, to the end that Government should, as much as possible, turn into Administration. Let us put it this way: Efforts must be renewed again and again to determine in what spheres it is possible to alter the ratio between governmental and administrative control in favour of the latter."

Buber's non-anarchistic argument, suggests in fact the role of the non-utopian anarchist, that of the man who is continually pushing wider the limits of the social principle. I was talking last week to a reader of this paper about the various discussions in the press on the tenth anniversary of the National Health Service. I observed that many of these comments suggested not that the organisation is too centralised, but too localised, and implied that the Ministry of Health ought to undertake more of the administration itself in the interests of efficiency. But my friend, who works in the service immediately advanced a whole battery of practical arguments in favour of greater decentralisation precisely in the interests of efficiency and economy. Similarly I was delighted to find that another reader was working on a monograph to be read to a technical organisation on the application of syndicalist principles to the organisation of large-scale industrial operations. For he is taking the subject out of the sphere of the utopian into that of the practicable. Which in turn is moving it into that of the possible, into the sphere of the permanent struggle between freedom and authority, where there is a continual choice of solutions, authoritarian or libertarian. C.W.

ANARCHY AND UTOPIA - 2 Continued from p. 2

ferently, amounts to this: Bakunin's claim that history is on the side of anarchism implies that some day some social changes will take place that will have as their effect the elimination of social struggle. This possibility is highly metaphysical and we can safely ignore—both in Marx and Bakunin—the notions of inevitability which they had learnt from Hegel. History is not on the side of the working class, nor is it on the side of the State, Prussian or Oceanian. The analogy with "1984" is apposite even though in its content the anarchist Utopia is the exact reverse of Orwell's "world of victory after victory, triumph after triumph; an endless pressing, pressing, pressing upon the nerve of power". But it resembles the latter very closely in treating a mythical striving for one-sided success as a possible historical development.

The ambivalence of anarchists comes out, among other instances, in the fact that they did not adhere rigidly to their conception of the State-society as completely free, and the State-less society as entirely free. As in the case of its complement, the unitary view of society, there are gaps in this theory forced by the recognition of facts. Kropotkin's two currents of history is expressed in this way: "Between these two currents, always alive, struggling in humanity—the current of the people and the current of the minorities which thirst for political and religious domination—our choice is made." Here is a passage illuminated by a different conception of freedom, as something which is always alive and struggling within society against authoritarian tendencies which are every bit as genuine as what is opposed to them. Anarchism, in this untypical excerpt, is in support of freedom which is one thing alone with other causes that can be supported or opposed. The coming or not coming of the social revolution recedes

in importance, since freedom and authority are always struggling, and the chief issue becomes one of immediate opposition to the State. Contradicting a great deal of his utopianism Bakunin himself, echoing Marx, once said that "to think of the future is criminal." Malatesta, on occasions, also emphasised the anarchist concern with opposing presently existing, established authorities: "How will society be organised? We do not and we cannot know. No doubt, we too have busied ourselves with projects or social reorganisation, but we attach to them only a very relative importance. They are bound to be wrong, perhaps entirely fantastic."

It appears that not all anarchist thought was cast in a utopian mould. The statements quoted indicate, I think, an advance in realism. Along this line we can take freedom as a character, not of societies as a whole but of certain groups, institutions and people's ways of life within any society, and even then not as their exclusive character. Equally, on this view, piecemeal freedoms would always meet with opposition and those who are caught up in them will resist conformist pressures. The "permanent protest" implied by this is carried on without the promise of final triumph but in a spirit of "distrusting your masters and distrusting your emancipators," and with no intention of wanting to make the world safe for freedom. This security seeking ideal, or some variant of it, is the aim of the modern socialist movement, but it involves it in trying to capture power for the sake of enforcing its demands on the rest of society, thereby leading to the very authoritarianism that revolutionaries have ostensibly renounced. As against this way of proceeding non-utopian anarchism has to be described as futile. The futility consists not in being a failure at revolutionary politics but in refusing to deal in terms of success or

failure; in not attempting to carry out, or even propose, wide, all-embracing policies that bear on the whole of society and are meant to further the final revolution. Only in this way can one hope to avoid that illusory optimism which claims as its victims all those who try to engage mass support of workers, or who try to persuade quantities of people whose interest in anarchy is negligible.

There is considerable agreement between a position of permanent protest (such as the one formulated by Max Nomad) and what nineteenth century anarchists had to say. I am thinking especially of their attacks on the State, on the Church and other authoritarian institutions; their criticisms of the security-craving ideals of the bourgeoisie and of the workers who caught it from them; of the domineering relationships which characterise economic life; of the authoritarian ideology of Marxism and of the compromising stand of reformists, etc. But where upholders of permanent protest would part from old-fashioned anarchists is over the contention that in all this there is something that will lead to a social revolution and a rosy, free state of future society. Freedom has always had a hard road to tread, as the biography of any anarchist will amply prove, and nothing that anarchists ever said has succeeded in making the idea of freedom flourishing in safety and security in any way less implausible than it is. But some of the things they have said indicate, as I have tried to show, that the contest between freedom and authority is the permanent order of the day. Doing politics, advancing freedom as a programme for the entire human race, cannot change this; it can only foster illusions about the way society runs.

GEORGE MOLNAR.

The 'Freedom' Controversy

I WAS grateful for the summing up which S.F. made in FREEDOM 19/7/58, of the discussion provoked by his original letter, because, as a result of the discussion it was possible for his propositions to be put in a more clear fashion.

First of all he is advocating from a general point of view an entirely personal, individual and non-political approach to anarchism, and following that up by advocating that FREEDOM should reflect that attitude in greater part and devote less attention to "political" matters.

Quite a few of the problems which arise in the libertarian movement are due to the honesty and depth of thought of its own members, are derived from the fact that any honest revolutionary organisation, and in this term I include all the diverse groups which do anything of a practical, specific nature, must in one way or another have a kind of suicidal aspect about them. For example, if an anarchist society came about there would no longer be any need to propagate anarchism in Hyde Park, or to publish an anarchist weekly paper. This carries with it the implication that the more successful anarchists are, the less successful they will become, unless, and this is the important thing, they are sufficiently flexible to keep on taking up new positions. But do we want to be successful in the way in which the minority left wing politicians want success? The Libertarian Movement has made a far better reply to the challenge of the paradox than any other movement of a socialist tendency because it has laid

WHY NOT CONSIDER THE ARABS?

THE article signed by André Prunier and published in the last number of FREEDOM under the query "Will France be independent of Algeria?" seems to me completely to miss the point of this long-standing and embittered question. André Prunier has written an article such as we might expect from a foreign and detached observer, whose interest in Algeria is simply that it presents a problem to which a solution should be found because his and the world's, stock of questions to worry about is already overwhelming.

I am not a specialist on the Algerian problem, and what Prunier says about the economic consequences of a break with France may or may not be right, but I am greatly surprised to see his analysis appear in an anarchist publication. The reason for my surprise is that there is no mention whatsoever in it of the will and wishes of the great majority of the Arab population. The will and wishes of the National Liberation Front may also be or not be representative of those of the great majority of the Arab population, but Prunier does not give any indication that they should be taken into account. Surely in an anarchist appraisal of a problem such as this, the will and wishes of the parties most concerned should have priority of consideration.

Oxford. TOM PEARCE.

The Cyprus Clamp-Down

Continued from p. 1

is to prevent "the civil war from going further" and to achieve freedom from fear and an early return to normal life. Let it be noted that the prisoners can be held indefinitely without trial. In some cases it is only believed that the victims of British repression are guilty of violence. Does this not mean that many ordinary people who quite naturally want to help their persecuted fellow Cypriots in some way run the risk of reprisal? On the other hand if they attempt to safeguard themselves by co-operating with the authorities in their present "strong measures" Greek Cypriots are laying themselves open to attack from E.O.K.A. Freedom from fear indeed!

We are expected to believe that after the round up of so many suspects it is justified on the grounds that it will put an end to violence. To-day (Monday, July 28th), British United Press reports that thousands of pounds' worth of damage by fire has occurred in various parts of Cyprus. The result, in fact, of the

emphasis on organisations which could fulfil functions here and now but whose existence would not be rendered superfluous if a free society should become a practical proposition. The anarcho-syndicalist concept of the workers' movement is a well-known instance of this, as are the examples quoted by S.F. of the possible foundation of anarchist schools and communities. Even so there is still the aspect of the conflict remaining in the minds of the individuals who take part in these activities. Is a community or free school primarily for the direct benefit of the very people who take part in it, or is it primarily a kind of example to bring the whole world round to its ideas? It is easy to say that there is no conflict between these two intentions, that as according to S.F.'s point of view the presentation of living experiences which a person could use for his own life is the most effective way of propagating thoughts (and feelings) but unfortunately empirical results tend to contradict this.

Let us jump forward the required number of years (each person can supply the number according to his own theories) and imagine what a possible successor to FREEDOM would contain. Instead of appeals for help, and a few more participants to a community in town or country there would be piles of information coming in from communities all over the country, putting forward suggestions and discussions as to how life and relationships inside and between the communities could be carried on; instead of articles on working class and trade union affairs, the same thing would be happening with regard to factories and questions of distribution and exchange. When our articles appear in the column "From FREEDOM of — years ago" they will be hardly comprehensible.

The question is whether we want the anarchist movement to be a kind of anticipation of what we hope for in the future, or something which is very much influenced by the thoughts, ideas and problems of to-day, but which is fighting to rise above them. From my own limited knowledge of the anarchist movement, the two do not mix well. However, the fact that they do not is a definite failure of appreciation on the part of libertarians. If we find ourselves forced to choose between either being a revolutionary agitator or being a quietist communitarian then we are falling into a trap which is created by the very conditions of an authoritarian society. Living in a society, most of whose characteristics we despise, and having hopes of a better one, and knowing that we as well as everyone else have the power to start moving here and now in the direction of more satisfactory relationships, the only rational way of, to use a well-known phrase, "adjusting ourselves to the situation" is to do so in two ways, by finding the best kind of things that we can here and now, and by acting in a more or less agitational manner as well. To disregard or decry the importance of either of these aspects is a mistake. Since S.F. finds it difficult to read, and impossible to enjoy FREEDOM's comments on political affairs, perhaps it is because he does not attach as much importance as should be attach-

ed to these questions. To say that people in general are not interested is only a partial answer, because one of the functions in which anarchists of all tendencies take part is to try to interest people in matters in which they are not consciously interested already.

If we are going to devote time, money and brain energy towards having an anarchist paper in a capitalist country, it is important that it is definitely anarchist. Perhaps we do not have the journalistic facilities of the *Manchester Guardian* or *Observer*, and we have to depend on them in part for factual information, but there is something which we can contribute, as anarchists, and that is to try to interpret these facts from our own point of view. I cannot as yet believe that all readers or potential readers would find this boring.

I entirely agree that it would be a good thing if there were more articles describing what anarchists have to say about "their lives, their children, their work, their problems, their experiments or the countries and places they live in", provided that we do not develop an agony column over people's problems, and that they are from an anarchist point of view. There is no point in duplicating the work of say a progressive political journal, a cultural or literary review, or a general publication dealing with schools or communities. The person who is interested both in these particular aspects and in anarchism as a whole might read FREEDOM as well as the other points of view, and not choose between one or the other.

P.H.

measures adopted has been to add to the resentment of the Greek Cypriots.

Let us make it clear once again that we do not support the indiscriminate use of violence adopted by both Greeks and Turks against each other and, in many cases, against their 'own people' suspected of favouring the British. The right wing Cypriots and Turkish movements have nothing in common with any anarchist organisation, and their aims, insofar as they are intended to establish control on governmental and dictatorial lines, do not approximate to the anarchist conception of freedom.

But it is our job here in Britain to expose the hypocrisy of our government and try to influence as many people as we can to do the same. A tremendous task which is no more nor less difficult than persuading people on all levels to act responsibly towards each other. This, however, is the task we have set ourselves and one which we can only do within the means of expression we have available.

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

THE Editors welcome letters from readers, and unless an Editorial reply is specifically called for, we shall refrain from answering controversial letters until our readers have had a chance to do so themselves.

ed to these questions. To say that people in general are not interested is only a partial answer, because one of the functions in which anarchists of all tendencies take part is to try to interest people in matters in which they are not consciously interested already.

If we are going to devote time, money and brain energy towards having an anarchist paper in a capitalist country, it is important that it is definitely anarchist. Perhaps we do not have the journalistic facilities of the *Manchester Guardian* or *Observer*, and we have to depend on them in part for factual information, but there is something which we can contribute, as anarchists, and that is to try to interpret these facts from our own point of view. I cannot as yet believe that all readers or potential readers would find this boring.

I entirely agree that it would be a good thing if there were more articles describing what anarchists have to say about "their lives, their children, their work, their problems, their experiments or the countries and places they live in", provided that we do not develop an agony column over people's problems, and that they are from an anarchist point of view. There is no point in duplicating the work of say a progressive political journal, a cultural or literary review, or a general publication dealing with schools or communities. The person who is interested both in these particular aspects and in anarchism as a whole might read FREEDOM as well as the other points of view, and not choose between one or the other.

P.H.

The Perfect Excuse

A Letter from Lilo

When she got the mail from the letter box one morning last week, a Bavarian housewife noted that one letter was addressed to her absent husband, who had recently been enrolled in West Germany's fledgling army. She also noticed that the letter was daintily scented and that the handwriting was obviously feminine. After a minuscule struggle with her conscience, she ripped open the envelope, read:

My darling:
I still can't forget the wonderful hours I was able to spend with you. Unfortunately, it appears that you may not have taken adequate precautions. If this should prove to be the case, I will have to ask your wife to consent to a divorce. I'm waiting full of impatience for the hour when you will be in my arms again. Full of love,
Your
Lilo.

She was not the only wife to be similarly surprised. Hundreds of others in the Rhineland, Westphalia, and Bavaria were given similar mail, and, despairing or vengeful, according to their temperament, rushing off to military posts to wave the letters in the faces of their baffled husbands.

Bundeswehr officers began an investigation. The letters differed considerably in penmanship and phrasing. But though they also differed in length and degree of indiscretion, all of them fitted a recognizable pattern. Most of the letters had been mailed from small towns just on the western side of the zonal border with East Germany. The investigators concluded that the addresses were supplied by West German Communists, that the letters were written in the East zone and then smuggled across the border and mailed.

To put an end to the amoroso panic, the Bundeswehr had to ask the Bavarian radio to broadcast an announcement to quiet the aggrieved wives. But one officer felt not so much indignant at East German trickery as he did despairing about West German women: "They didn't stop to think, didn't use their heads, or refuse to believe the letters out of confidence in their husbands. No. They opened them, read them and, instantly, they were convinced." Another officer had a different concern. "I hope," he mused thoughtfully, "that soldiers now won't get the idea of nonchalantly palming off real evidence of unfaithfulness as nothing but "Communist propaganda".

Time, 7/7/58.

Our Policemen are Wonderful

Under the heading "Police Methods" the *Church of England Newspaper* stated in its issue for July 25th:

"Brenda Lamb, a 19-year old ex-cadet nurse, has had to put up with the insult of a free 'pardon' for an offence she did not commit two years ago. She confessed to having stolen from a patient three rings that had never been stolen at all. It is high time that this farce of the free pardon was ended. The Courts, presumably, must not be found to be in error, but if the majesty of the law depends upon unjustly maintaining a fiction of justice that majesty is only a tattered pomp after all.

"But why did Brenda confess? She alleges that she was subjected to such long and hard questioning by three police officers at a time that in the end she was driven to confessing what she knew to be untrue. What is horrifying is that, when asked about it, Chief-Superintendent Arthur Thompson, of Lancaster, said that she was 'not treated any differently from any other prisoner.' Perhaps the Chief Superintendent did not quite appreciate the significance of his remark. He may not have meant what his words seem to mean.

"Anybody can imagine what the difficulties of the police are in dealing with the thugs of the criminal world with whom too much kindness in interrogation might be misplaced. It is another question if any average citizen of any age can be grilled into untruthful confessions that can become the basis of a conviction. Evidently there is need for an enquiry into these methods of interrogation and there is need of more care by the Courts before accepting 'confessions' made to the police."

Briefs:

System Run Riot?

A Kent bank official tells me he has received the following from an insurance company concerning one of his customer's standing orders:

"I shall be glad if you will please make the following amendment to our existing reference when making future payments. The revised reference will now be: 1/84177/112483/116920/124880/164140, 3/87466, 31/152943."

Compliance, the company adds, "will simplify the work in this office."

Daily Telegraph.

Co-Education Ends in Spain

MADRID, JULY 19.

The Spanish Government has ordered that all co-education in the country must cease from the start of the October term. The new order is aimed at the few hitherto privileged schools, the most famous of which is the Estudio High School in Madrid—a school of considerable prestige.—Reuter.

Softening the Blow

STOCKHOLM, APRIL 24.

Stockholm police are to be given rubber truncheons which, if "respected by unruly elements," would replace entirely the swords the police now carry.

—Reuter.

Thanks!

We wish to thank all those comrades and friends who offered accommodation and equipment in regard to the recent International Conference.

LONDON PRE-CONFERENCE COMMITTEE.

PLEASE!

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!

WEEK 30	
Deficit on Freedom	£600
Contributions received	£360
DEFICIT	£240
July 18 to July 24	
London: T.F.* 5/-; Ilford: C.S. 7/6; Denver: W.S. 14/-; London: J.W.A. 2/-; London: J.S.* 3/-; Fulla: E.B. 5/-; Cromer: M.J.S. 10/-; St. Helena: S.S. 9/9; Cleveland: T. & D.H. £1/15/9.	
TOTAL	4 12 0
Previously acknowledged	355 18 9
1958 TOTAL TO DATE	£360 10 9

Gifts of Books: Moline: E.J.; London: C.W.; London: R.G.; Uckfield: A.A.

*Indicates regular contributor.

FREEDOM 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

AUG. 3—Summer School; (see announcement)

Questions, Discussion and Admission all free.

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP 1958 SUMMER SCHOOL

August 2nd—4th.

THIS year's Summer School will be held in the Malatesta Club, 32 Percy Street, W.1. (Nr. Tottenham Court Road), from 12.30 p.m. Saturday, 2nd August to Monday, 4th August.

Theme: WAR & PEACE

PROGRAMME

Saturday:

12.30 p.m. Buffet Service at the Club.
2.30 p.m. Speaker: Giovanni Baldelli.
6.00 p.m. Supper.
7.45 p.m. Jazz Session & Social.

Sunday:

10.30 a.m. Speaker: Jack Robinson.
1.30 p.m. Lunch.
3.00 p.m. Meeting in Hyde Park.
6.00 p.m. Buffet Service at Club.
7.30 p.m. Speaker: Tony Gibson.

Monday:

10.30 a.m. Summing up & Discussion led by Philip Sansom
Alan Albon.

1.30 p.m. Lunch.

Lectures 1/- each or 2/6 for four. Meals will cost 2s. 9d. each.

Provincial and London comrades are asked to book meals in advance.

London comrades who can provide accommodation and provincial comrades requiring accommodation are asked to write:

JOAN SCULTHORPE,
c/o Freedom Press,
27 Red Lion Street, London, W.C.1.

★ 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

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