

In this Issue :

The Happy People - p. 2

Pasternak's Outsider - p. 3

What's Behind the Scout Movement? - p. 4

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"Society has now definitely got the better of individuality . . . and whatever crushes individuality is despotism, by whatever name it may be called, and whether it purports to be enforcing the will of God, or the injunctions of man."

—JOHN STUART MILL.

Vol. 19, No. 38.

September 20th, 1958.

Threepence.

Eisenhower on the Formosa Crisis. But What's it About - and WHO'S 'THREATENING' WHO?

MORE than three and a half years have passed since the last Formosa "crisis" and it seems incredible that Communist China, which, even then according to American spokesmen, was preparing to attack the off-shore islands as a first step to an invasion of Formosa itself, should still be impotently pumping tens of thousands of shells on to the islands of Quemoy without apparently any attempt at getting down to the business proper of occupying these islands! There is something as phoney about the present Formosa crisis as there was about the one which hit the headlines back in 1955!

For instance, is it credible that Communist China should choose the moment to start an invasion when large American forces are concentrated in the Formosa area in connection with an amphibious training exercise planned apparently in May last, and unconnected with the present "crisis"? According to Vice-Admiral Beakley the Seventh Fleet "was now at its greatest strength since the Korean War, with 125 ships—including five aircraft-carriers—and 65,000 men." He added furthermore that in his estimation the Chinese Communists

did not have the naval strength to invade the Pescadores or Formosa and they would not have the strength for some time to come.

Even though Admiral Liu Hoh

Tu, of the Nationalist government's Defence Ministry reported the gradual movement of about five thousand craft southward along the Communist Chinese coast, an American official said that there was "absolutely nothing" to indicate that an invasion fleet was heading towards Formosa. Indeed as Admiral Beakley so undiplomatically put it: the present situation in the area appeared to have "greater political than military significance".

In his much heralded television broadcast, President Eisenhower makes great play of the fact that the Chinese communists "say that their present military efforts are part of a programme to conquer Formosa". But the Chinese communists were saying the very same thing at the time of the 1955 "crisis" and Mr. Eisenhower was then also exploiting these statements to justify American policy in the Far East! It should of course be added that the Chinese Nationalists in their turn have been talking for a very long time about invading the Chinese mainland, and it is not surprising if the Communists have been using these threats as an excuse for demanding the evacuation of the off-shore islands on which, according to the President himself, about one-third of the Nationalist forces are now deployed.

But are we to believe that in the past three-and-a-half years the Chinese communists could not have

mounted the necessary military equipment and personnel to "liberate" the off-shore islands had they considered it of vital military and political import to do so? If the answer is in the affirmative, then the fact that they are simply making a nuisance of themselves pumping shells into Quemoy, would indicate that they are not really worried about the fate of the islands or of Formosa at this stage. If the answer is in the negative—that is that they cannot mount a potentially successful attack on the islands—then all the arguments of the Americans about threats of aggression against the "free-world" (so Chiang's Formosa is "free" Mr. President?) fall to the ground and must be treated as lying propaganda to cover up America's hegemonic ambitions in the Far East.

Yet in his broadcast President Eisenhower declares that

It is as certain as can be that the shooting which the Chinese Communists started on August 23rd had as its purpose not just the taking of the island of Quemoy. It is part of what is indeed an ambitious plan of armed conquest.

This plan would liquidate all of the free world positions in the Western Pacific area and bring them under captive governments which would be hostile to the United States and the free world. Thus the Chinese and Russian communists would come to dominate at least the Western half of the now friendly Pacific Ocean.

A few sentences later the President pointed out that

If the Chinese communists have decided to risk a war, it is not because Quemoy itself is so valuable to them. They have been getting along without Quemoy ever since they seized the China

mainland nine years ago.

If they have now decided to risk war, it can only be because they, and their Soviet allies, have decided to find out whether threatening war is a policy from which they can make big gains.

It would seem then that all the hue and cry about Quemoy being a necessary first step in Communist China's conquest of Formosa, and therefore to be defended at all costs, has much more to do with American political considerations than with military strategy—as if the world didn't know that already in 1955!*

*Max Freedman, *Manchester Guardian* correspondent in New York was pointing out in 1955 (Jan. 28) that: American sources have made it clear privately that the decision to hold some of the off-shore islands rests less on military grounds than on two diplomatic reasons. The first of these reasons is that to give up the off-shore islands at once would destroy the morale of Chiang's forces. The second is that the islands might turn out to be useful trading points in a cease-fire with the Communists. (Quoted in *Freedom Selections*, Vol. 5, 1955, p.31).

Continued on p. 3

The Pope Pontificates on Blood & Marriage Not for this Earth

THE Pope is a busy man. He has to be, one realises, in order to make any serious effort to maintain his fictions in the increasingly scientific world of to-day. Moreover, the popularity of sunny Rome as a venue for international conferences of persons in a great variety of professions gives His Holiness ample opportunity to make sure that the word of God is available for those in a position to influence others.

It is of interest to note that in all his pontifications the Pope is never so dogmatic as when his subject has some relationship with demon sex. While addressing sportsmen or journalists he may waffle away in generalities like any politician (and why not?). When attempting to give the world's Christians the true word of the Lord in re. the H-Bomb, we find the Vicar of Christ more than somewhat equivocal. But in matters involving sexual activity, this celibate septuagenarian is most clear and precise.

He treated us to a new example of this last week when he addressed a large international group of medical specialists attending a congress in Rome on blood diseases, of which two are particularly prevalent in Mediterranean countries. One of them, Cooleys disease, was to be found in certain areas of Italy, throughout Greece, and in all areas of the Mediterranean basin where Phoenician civilisation has left traces. A child could be apparently normal at birth, but the doctor could already see the marks of the disease which would lead to death more or less quickly, usually before the age of ten.

In the other diseases adults living a relatively normal life showed

symptoms which were interpreted as a decrease of the duration of life of the red blood corpuscles.

He Can Only Moralise.

Both these diseases are hereditary and can only be stamped out by extensive limitation of children among those suffering from them. This the Pope sees clearly enough, but because of the Church's attitude towards birth control, he can only moralise on the issue.

His Holiness is prepared to go so far as to advocate blood tests before marriage. He was asked: *Is a medical and blood check before marriage desirable in general, and particularly in Italy and the Mediterranean?* His answer was that such a check is advisable and that if the danger is really serious it might even be enforced in certain provinces.

On being asked: *Is it permissible to advise against marriage if the tests are positive?* The Pope replied that if one of the engaged couple carries the Mediterranean blood disease he or she may be advised against marriage but may not be forbidden to marry. Marriage is one of the fundamental rights of the human person and it may not be restricted.

Now this is an issue on which anarchists may well be divided. Leaving aside the moralistic dogma that 'marriage is one of the fundamental rights . . . we would certainly find it hard to deny the freedom of anyone to get married if they so desire, even though the child of their union might be diseased. We are not genetic fanatics, though we should certainly prefer to see a

Continued on p. 4

Colour Prejudice and Economics

They Are Our Problems Too

THE reasons advanced as causes of racial disagreements, either in London or anywhere else, are monotonously few; the white people dislike the coloured ones because of fear of competition for jobs, fear of being turned out of their homes for economic or social reasons, fear that their children will be kept awake by wild parties, etc. Coloured people who are generally less affected by prejudice against whites can justifiably point to their economic exploitation in the past and to-day, the history of slavery, and to the unfriendliness to which they may be subjected in many parts of Britain, or indeed Europe. And on both sides there are the questions of love and sexual relations, shown through the parallel institutions of marriage and prostitution which have been built up by European civilisation, and also in the attempts by both white and coloured people to find ways round these institutions.

Each of these problems has been ripe in Europe and America for centuries: they are part and parcel of the capitalist way of organising society, and we are beginning to see that they still persist even when capitalism drifts gradually into managerial socialism. But from the shouts of the enraged psychopaths of the right, and from the smug and tacit assent of the respectable middle class and its newspapers, it seems we are asked to believe that threats of unemployment, competition for work, oppressive and greedy landlords, prostitution, and love affairs carried on against the wishes of parents had never been known in England before, and are purely a consequence of the immigration of coloured workers.

It is precisely on these questions, which are dragged into the arena of racial discussions, where the British economy, the British social set-up, and the British sense of propriety are getting a shake-up which is giving a shock to the disciples of democracy, who put so much faith in the nation which gave its all to make the world safe for freedom, and to the planners of the welfare state who pretended that to streamline and modernise the way in which the ruling clique held on to its power would solve the problems created by its existence.

Whatever may be the distinctions between the older forms of capitalism and the modern state machine, it is still true that the vast majority of the people of the world, including the British Commonwealth regarded as a fairly well interrelated economic group, have to sell their daily life to a master in order to secure the necessities of life. This is true of men and women of all colours and nationalities, and if the term "wage slave" seems old-fashioned and mock heroic, it is a fact that by this sale of body and mind, and of the abilities inherent to produce the most varied forms of wealth and add richness to life, each one sinks a little way towards slavery; each one loses not only the eight hours of the day which for most people are spent in physically performing the work in which they are engaged, but also a little of his freedom as a human being, and becomes a little more of a tool in someone else's hands; perhaps a tool which can be used by anyone who knows how to.

And the greatest of all the charges which can be brought against the forty hour week, the sale of the worker to his employer, the necessity of keeping to the physical and mental grindstone and of putting life in the hands of someone else or of some tyrannical institution is that it paralyses the ability of the sufferer to be able to see his way to a clear solution of the problems. For most people it is not only as if they were trying to find their way out of a maze, but they are blindfolded as well, and generally give up as a bad job, just occasionally rising to their feet with snarls of anguish.

Yet, apart from these difficulties, and they are the only obstacle, it would be possible to solve, within a short space of time, all the other superficial problems which make for the unhappiness which pervades the world, and which bears with equal weight on men and women of all races.

How many people, when doing their best to explain, think about or solve the troubles created in recent weeks, and make any sense out of the press comments on them, have realised that there would be no fear of unemployment if work and production were controlled and held in the hands of the people themselves,

who wanted to create a world according to their desires, or that tenancy and landlordism would no longer be a source either of political dispute or of inter-racial friction if houses were built to satisfy the needs of ordinary people and for no other reason, and not as a method by which the rich may extract even more money from the poor. That if it were not for the combination of economic exhaustion and social anchoring in religious hypocrisy which denies to so many people the chance of a happy love life, there would be no question of prostitution at all, and the relative colours of its personages would be no concern. And if the mothers of Nottingham had ever had the chance of happiness in their own marriages they would not be so angry about their daughters' adventures.

Can anyone get out of the mess? The vicious circle is completed and made seemingly more unbreakable when along comes a new scapegoat, which can be used to even further befuddle the thinking of the people of whatever class or position. But it is a circle which has many weak points, and perhaps the few individuals who manage to break through at one point or another can provide a way towards a solution.

P.H.

Shall We Stop Appealing?

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!
WEEK 37
Deficit on Freedom £740
Contributions received £466
DEFICIT £274

September 5 to September 11
Middlesbrough: P.E. 14/6; London: T.F.* 5/-; Shepton Mallet: C.L.N. 1/-; Oxford: Anon.* 5/-; London: J.S.* 3/-; Lakewood: S.M. £5/0; Llanelly: L.W. 2/6; Leicester: E.B.N.A. £1/0; Stockholm: G.S. £1/8/6; London: P.H. 5/-.

TOTAL 9 9 6
Previously acknowledged 457 2 10
1958 TOTAL TO DATE £466 12 4

Gift of Book: London: C.W.

*Indicates regular contributor.

THIRD OF THE L.A.G. SUMMER SCHOOL LECTURES ON WAR AND PEACE

(Continued from previous issue).

It cannot be repeated often enough that modern wars are between States and not between peoples. The essential characteristic of the soldier is his submissiveness, not his aggressiveness. He must be trained to obey, to subjugate his will to the will of his superiors. His feelings must be suppressed if they conflict in any way with the actions which are demanded of him in his rôle of soldier. The most natural target of his aggressiveness is his own superiors who order him about and rob him of the attributes of manhood, but such aggressiveness has to be suppressed, and expressed if at all against the amorphous figure of "the enemy". The farcical myth about war being caused by the aggressiveness of ordinary people is manifest in wartime. During the war you found that a great number of pacifists and other war-resisters were rather aggressive people—too aggressive to be pushed around in the armed forces, while the really meek and docile people joined the forces and did what was required of them.

It is true that some individuals found satisfaction for their morbid aggressiveness in the war. They got a lot of kick out of writing sadistic matter for the newspapers, or flying bombing aeroplanes, or training commando troops, or sending large bodies of men to destruction. In wartime there is plenty of scope for obscene and bloody-minded psychopaths to shine in their patriotic duties. But still, it is nonsense to claim as Freud claimed that the latent aggression in the average man is in any way responsible for the international wars. One could make a better case for the fact that the mass conditioning of people in modern society engenders such a sheep-like docility and supine lack of aggressiveness that they can be herded into uniform and made the fodder of their rulers' war-machine without a bleat of protest.

As I mentioned earlier, many of us thought during the 1930's that war had in fact been outmoded as far as large international slaughters went. We were concerned to obtain a complete disarmament, a complete demilitarization because

the problem was to free the colonies from military oppression and to disarm the ruling class at home of the weapon which they used to maintain their misrule in Britain. Organizations like the Peace Pledge Union had, I believe, hundreds of thousands of members and that body maintained large and expensive premises in Regent Street. There was of course no military conscription and no one who was not starving through unemployment, or a real social degenerate, thought of joining the army. When military conscription was first mooted in 1938, the leaders of the Labour Party, Ernest Bevin, Clem Attlee and that lot, sent up a howl of protest. Conscription in Britain—it was unthinkable. What did they think we were, Prussians, Frenchmen? The youth of Britain would never stand for being hounded into uniform. Ernest Bevin afterwards became Minister of Labour and instituted a system of conscription more complete than anything they ever had in Nazi Germany.

I must confess that I was wrong, very wrong indeed. Even when we heard them digging air-raid shelters in Torrington Square not far from here, in the Autumn of 1938, I was sure it was all part of a tremendous bluff. I reasoned that the rulers of the great States might be criminal but at least they were not mad. They had made Hitler's rise to power possible; they had supplied a disarmed Germany with the wherewithal to arm as a "bulwark against bolshevism"; they had winked their eyes at the terrible atrocities of the Nazi régime and published glib lies about it in their newspapers. They had supplied Mussolini with petrol to fly over Abyssinia and spray the African tribesmen with mustard gas, and justified this commercial transaction in the Council of the League of Nations; they had seen to it that a farce of non-intervention was maintained in Spain while Hitler and Mussolini assisted Franco to crush the Spanish people. They had done all this and were undoubtedly utterly immune to any humane or moral considerations, but obviously they were not quite without sanity, so I thought. They would not deliberately create a situation which ended in the bombing of their own cities by the monsters they had created abroad. They had used the excuse of necessity and long-term wisdom to justify their many policies of violence and cruelty—but if all these policies were simply to end in a major European war carried on with the new bestiality of bombing civil populations, then these rulers were simply lunatics. If policies of violence and treachery led to this holocaust then they might as well have pursued policies of peace, virtue and honesty in the first place. The path of virtue couldn't have had any more disastrous outcome.

I was wrong. It was not a bluff; the rulers of the great States really were

lunatics. This was the outcome of years and years of careful planning by statesmen, men of long experience and cunning diplomatic wisdom. I was forced very much against my will to acknowledge the uncomfortable truth that by cherishing some sort of confidence in the respectable institutions of democratic government I had been had for a sucker along with the rest of right-thinking people of Liberal opinion.

In 1938 I had come in contact in a very distant way with the anarchist movement. I came across a paper called *Revolt* which, I believe, only ran for two or three issues. This must have been in 1939 I think. It was the only news-sheet which seemed actually to permit itself to tell the truth. It seemed odd to see simple, plain facts printed on paper. The Tory press was wallowing in its sort of lies, the Labour press in Labour lies, and the *Daily Worker* pursuing its own brand of lying.

War was declared in September, 1939, and it was horrible, utterly horrible. I don't mean that anything happened—nothing happened for about nine months. But it was horrible to see the change which came over people; they were eaten up with fear, bewilderment and guilt. They were guilty because they had acquiesced for so long in policies which had involved so much villiany abroad,

but it only involved foreigners. They trusted in their government, the men who spoke with calm, authoritative voices to keep such horrors from ever coming within the shores of this island. Now these men still spoke with calm, authoritative voices and the people hung upon their words, but it seemed that the price that their guilt demanded was that they should face the ordeal of Guernica. I doubt if many people had seen Picasso's horrific painting of Guernica, but most people in Europe at that time were well aware of what it meant. And the people at home, and even in country places fairly safe from bombing, were eaten up with that curious fear that goes with guilt, because they'd never suffered anything and had trusted to their government to keep them out of war at any price.

People were happier, I think, when the bombing started, when France had fallen and we were in imminent danger of being invaded by the Germans. It relieved the tension and people settled down to make the best of a bad job. What the government did or didn't do was really rather remote. We had to dodge the bombs, put the fires out, organize rescue, ambulance services, meals services, emergency housing, re-evacuation of children, etc., etc. It was all a matter of common-sense organization, and the war might have been a flood or an earthquake rather than a man-made affair. It all seemed pretty impersonal. With regard to the alleged aggressiveness of the man in the street which was causing all this nonsense, well you did hear people say

how they would like to crucify Hitler, or that Berlin ought to be bombed flat. But they were generally parroting slogans and opinions they had read in the *News of the World*, *The Times* or some other irresponsible, war-mongering rag. I was a conchie but I never had any trouble in upholding my opinions against those who supported the war. Anarchists and Pacifists held excellent meetings at Hyde Park, and we sold more of the anarchist paper *War Commentary* at the Park than we can sell FREEDOM now.

War Commentary told the truth about the war and did not mince its words. It became evident to me that the humanist intellectuals of the 1930's had been wrong about the nature of war, and events had contradicted them right, left and centre. Papers like the fellow-travelling, liberal-minded *New Statesman* were shown to be bankrupt in their ideas and integrity during the war. The anarchists did not turn political somersaults during the war. Their viewpoint was clear and it did not change or become clouded by the changes in alliances within Europe. For instance, the anarchists denounced the Russian régime for what it was before the Stalin-Hitler pact, during that alliance, during the Stalin-Churchill pact (a period during which the *New Statesman*, etc. hailed the bolshevik tyranny as a model of democracy!), and when Russia was again denounced as a sort of devil-pit the anarchists never altered their clearly-formulated analysis of the bolshevik régime.

TONY GIBSON.

(To be continued)

BOOK REVIEW

The Happy People

NOONE OF THE ULU, by
Dennis Holman. Heinemann,
21s.

IT is the first part of this book that will be of interest to anarchists. It describes the customs and way of life of the Temiar, a tribe in the remote interior of Malaya. Their way of life is not far removed from anarchism.

Pat Noone was a young anthropologist who penetrated an area of deep jungle in Central Malaya, which had barely been visited by Europeans, and never systematically explored. He studied the way of life of the aborigines he found there, and became so fond of them that he married into their tribe and settled down among them.

He became their protector against the encroachments of civilisation, and was called by them "Tata", which means "grandfather", a term of great respect. He brought in medicines and new seeds for them to plant. He protected them from the exploitation of the Chinese traders on their borders. Unfortunately he was unable to shield them from war and its horrors. First of all there came the Japanese invaders, then the Communist terrorists. The book ends in blood-

shed and chaos. It seems unlikely that the Temiar will survive as a people. As usual, a discussion of their way of life must be taken as referring to past time, even if the present tense is used.

"Extensive research had confirmed Pat's early observations concerning their social behaviour, which was characterised by an almost complete lack of discord. Except for the single instance already recorded, he encountered no friction between the groups. There were occasional disputes between unrelated individuals over women: these were heard by a jury and the matter settled by the payment of a fine by the offending party. But quarrels between relatives within the group were unknown. Odd individuals, who might otherwise have caused trouble by reason of their bad-tempered, selfish or anti-social actions, were invariably regarded as backward, overgrown children and treated with tolerant good humour. Pat encountered no theft, no sexual offences and no offences against children. Homosexuality was unknown, and tribal customs included no practices such as cannibalism, head-hunting, child-betrothal, immolation of widows, or ritual mutilation of the body."

It is not true however to say, "Anthropologically, such a racial personality was a unique phenomenon . . ." There are on record quite a number of cases of small "backward" tribes of whom this could be said. In fact I would go so far as to say that it was once the universal state of humankind. Indeed, apart from the homosexuality, this description would fit the anarchist movement, if one regards it, as one should, as a small society within a society. Quarrels are rare, if not totally unknown, and do not lead to bloodshed.

There is a tendency in modern anthropology to see each little human group as a totally isolated phenomenon, without either contact with the outside world, or a history. This is no doubt a reaction from an excessive preoccupation with origins and derivations, a healthy movement in the direction of studying a culture as it actually operates to-day. Unfortunately it becomes a narrowing attitude. A culture does not exist in a vacuum. One can no more study it as if it did than one can understand a few years in an individual's life, without relating them to what has gone before.

Though the Temiar are technologically backward, psychologically they are in advance of the West. Dr. Kilton Stewart, a New York psychotherapist, is "successfully applying techniques learnt from the Temiar in his treatment of neuroses and other forms of mental illness."

The Temiar attach great importance to the dream.

"To them the dream is a mystical experience which occurs when one of the person's souls leaves the body during sleep and wanders about the jungle in search of guidance. Therefore important decisions are seldom made by a group without one of its members having had a dream that prescribes a certain course of action. If a man dreams of a particular spot in the river, he will fish there. If his dreams suggest a valley or settlement in which he should seek his bride, he will certainly follow his dream

directions. Most Temiar inspiration comes from their dreams. Pat met men who dreamed mechanical inventions such as fish traps, complicated puzzles, decorative patterns and medicinal remedies. All their epic poetry, all their dances, all their rhythms, all their songs are dream-inspired. . . ."

"The key to the system is action. The child is not just told to sleep and dream, he is taught how to dream correctly, and in particular what he should do in his dreams. To begin with he must never be afraid in his dreams. If he dreams of smoke he must not avoid it as he would smoke during his waking hours, because it stings the eyes: he must go boldly into the dream smoke, for only thus will he conquer the smoke spirit and bend it to his own will.

"By the same token he must attack dream animals, dream monsters and dream ghosts that try to block his path. If he defeats them they become his slaves, but if he runs away they will persecute him until he seeks them out and fights them. This, according to Stewart, is sound psychiatry, since every image that appears to the dreamer is charged with the force of the dreamer's subjective emotions, and the image must be destroyed in order to release his objective emotions which are associated with it.

"For example, when a person does something, even if it is a good act, an image is left in your mind that is filled up with your subjective reactions, possibly anxiety, guilt, fear, envy. In your dream the person's image will possess these subjective attributes, but if you destroy the dream image you have paid him off subconsciously and thereafter you will be able to regard him and his act with complete objectivity."

The dream in Western psychology is regarded passively, almost as if it were a cinema show. The patient is expected to understand his dream but not to act in it. I have never heard it suggested that a patient should learn how to behave in his dreams (still less a healthy person).

"Implicit in all dream instructions is the idea that a man, with the co-operation of his fellows and the assistance of friendly spirits, can dominate the forces of evil, provided he has the spiritual courage to assert himself."

Although violence is not countenanced in Temiar society it is allowed in dreams, if the dreamer has no alternative. He may fight close relatives, it may be an evil spirit masquerading, he may have sexual relations with mother or sister. But he must reveal the dream to the person whose image was involved, and apologise to him, for it might have been "a legitimate soul whose intentions were mistaken by the dreamer."

To the rationalist the Temiar theology, with its multiplicity of souls in each individual, and its good and evil spirits, may appear far-fetched. The psychology based on these theories works well however. Perhaps these various souls may be regarded as a metaphorical way of expressing psychological truths. After all, Freud had his ego, super-ego and id, and in his later days spoke of the conflict, which he considered eternal, between Eros and Thanatos (the so-called

Continued on p. 3

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

[Open 10 a.m.—6.30 p.m., 5 p.m. Sats.]

New Books . . .

- The Vichy Régime Robert Aron 35/-
- No More War! L. Pauling 16/-
- Myth, Ritual and Kingship S. H. Hooke (ed.) 25/-
- Oppression and Liberty Simone Weil 25/-
- The London Years Rudolph Rocker 25/-

Reprints and Cheap Editions . . .

- Pity the Innocent Ethel Mannin 6/6
- Old Fourlegs: the Discovery of the Coelacanth J. L. B. Smith 3/6
- Riot J. Wylie 2/6

Second-Hand . . .

- City of Dreadful Night, &c. James Thomson (2 vols.) 6/-
- The Russian Peasant &c. John Maynard (2 vols.) 5/6
- Rural Rides William Cobbett (2 vols.) 10/-
- No Ordinary Summer Konstantin Fedin (2 vols.) 5/-
- Mental Healers Stefan Zweig 5/-
- The Wall John Hersey 5/-
- An American Tragedy Theodore Dreiser 8/6
- Evolution of the Idea of God Grant Allen 4/-
- The Valley of the Moon Jack London 3/6
- A Chance for Everybody Hyacinth Dubreuil 3/6
- The Danger of Being a Gentleman Herold J. Leski 3/6

Periodicals . . .

- Views and Comments, August 3d.

Pamphlet . . .

- Introduction to Rudolf Rocker: An Autobiography 1/-

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

Booksellers' Bread and Butter Line

THE SOFT SELL

WHEN a poor hard-working bookseller in these illiterate TV-ridden days receives a letter from a well-known firm of publishers starting like this:

"Dear Bookseller. A six guinea book with a mass sale naturally represents a very attractive and profitable proposition for both of us." He reads on. He works out little sums "one third of six guineas is two guineas, or even at 25% even minus carriage . . . firm . . . sale or return". Visions of sales to hundreds of customers at two guineas profit a time envelop him in a haze of glory.

The publishers have also allocated £5,000 for advertising and if you can prove it would be useful they will pay 50% of the advertising in local papers.

"The book makes the perfect wedding present and the ideal gift for any special occasion such as Christmas, a baptism, a first Communion or a birthday" (so announces another leaflet). This all sounds like the dream of a book for everybody has to give or receive presents on these occasions.

What is this irresistible, omnipresent book? The book that doesn't have to be sold. The book which has ready-made customers, the book which is a soft sell. Of course, the Holy Bible for the Family (Catholic), I suppress the publishers.

But is it such a soft sell? Well there must be a softening up process. Advertising will be in big-circulation Catholic papers and brochures are being mailed to parish priests with a pad

of reply cards for the use of parishioners.

Members of the Catholic hierarchy will be receiving presentation copies (for review no doubt) and (what sounds like a *non sequitur*) there will be a great deal of editorial attention paid to it in the Catholic Press—and (impious hope!) in some organs of the secular press.

The contribution to advertising is made in areas with a large Catholic community or some other reason.

With the priest, the hierarchy, the catholic press all enrolled as salesmen this book may be the best seller in 1958.

The production costs have been kept low by pooling the market—America, Canada and Great Britain, thus following the pattern set by the printers of the Bible who set up a monopoly in the nineteenth century.

This, of course is not the unexpurgated edition, it is the Douai version in technicolour with a shot of His Holiness, Pius XII, with a family record section on rich parchment for hatches, matches and despatches, in addition it has 48 full-page plates in colour, annotations, a commentary and indulgences, holy days of obligation, a table of moveable feasts and maps. What more could you want for six guineas?

So the sales campaign moves into its groove. There stand the faithful with the six guineas clutched in their hot little hands. Here comes the bookseller ready to do his bit for the Holy Church all for the sake of two guineas.

All orders c/o the Editor!

CRUSOE.

Who's 'Threatening' Who?

Continued from p. 1

THAT Communist China should aim as a long-term plan to "liquidate all of the free world positions in the Western Pacific area"—which means in more down-to-earth terms, that Mao aims at removing the United States armed bases, and influence, in the Far East, is an objective with which no self-respecting power-politician, least of all the Americans, can quarrel. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander! But that is not the same as saying that all politicians will in the present set-up consider Chinese ambitions acceptable.

The gulf between British and American policies so far as Communist China is concerned, is proof indeed that the world is not divided between free and unfree nations or ideologies. There is no unity of ideologies or purpose in the world. What passes as unity is in fact a marriage of political convenience between some nations against others, based neither on culture, race, colour nor on that much-abused term "way of life". World affairs are regulated and alignments determined by the power struggle. All national political leaders preach the virtues of freedom as well as posing as its staunchest exponents and defenders. Yet each is calling for more power in order to protect the people from those who seek to destroy it. Most people in the West see through the sham that passes as freedom in the so-called People's Democracies. What they cannot understand is that "democracies" such as America and Britain should increasingly be at loggerheads. Yet surely the answer is so obvious! The expansion of the "communist"-dominated world is a threat to both British and American power in the world and to this extent these countries have a common enemy. But it cannot be overlooked that if Britain has ceased to be a "first-class" power in the post-war world it is due to the emergence of America as the most powerful force in world economics and politics. Consequently if Britain is ever to occupy the dominating rôle that it enjoyed in the past—and we have no doubt that British political leaders still think in these terms—then it is clear that America is a greater obstacle to these ambitions than even Russia is. So far as Britain is concerned American policy in the Far East is less one of containment of Communist expansionism than the consolidation of American military and financial hegemony.

Eisenhower knew what he was saying when he declared:

I do not believe that the United States can be either lured or frightened into appeasement. I believe that in taking the position of opposing aggression by force, I am taking the only position which is consistent with the vital interests of the United States, and, indeed, with the peace of the world. (Our italics).

It seems clear to us that American policy is designed first and foremost to defend America's "vital interests". The "peace of the world" is a secondary matter and will depend on America's ability to defend her "vital interests" without resorting to war. Russia and China use the same arguments and no one can accuse the East of thereby threatening world peace without laying the same charges at the door of the Western Powers.

Britain's only hope of regaining power and prestige in the Far East depends on a weakening of American power in that area. Hence the

In me are people without names,
Children, stay-at-homes, trees.
I am conquered by them all
And this is my only victory.

—DR. ZHIVAGO.

IN one of his post-war essays the old Russian naturalist, Mikhail Prishvin describes how 'the earth shows itself again' after the long winter, in this wonderfully evocative passage:

"Petya looked long and hard at the thinning vapour. He noticed something dark in the field, and shouted: 'Look, the land is showing!' He ran into the house, and I heard him shouting there: 'Lyova, come and have a look, quick! The land is showing!'"

"Even Mother could not hide her excitement, and came out into the yard, shielding her eyes from the glitter of the snow. 'Where? Where?'"

"Petya stood in front and pointed into the snow-covered distance, like Columbus over the sea, and repeated: 'Land! Land!'"

The earth shows itself again. The phrase has unmistakable overtones for Russians, and when Ilya Ehrenberg chose *The Thaw* as the title of his first book after the fall of Zhdanov and the death of Stalin, everybody knew what he meant, but the trouble was that Ehrenberg had been a party hack for so long that his was merely a sanitary inspector's view of the thaw. When two years ago Vladimir Dudintsev's *Not by Bread Alone* came out in instalments in the magazine *Novy Mir* and was discussed at Moscow University, the students shouted that the whole of Soviet fiction was a lie with the exception of this one book.

They may now add another, if they are permitted to read it. During the first hopeful years after Stalin, a novel by the most outstanding Russian poet, Boris Pasternak, was accepted for publication, but has not yet appeared in Russia. The text found its way to an Italian publisher who obtained permission to translate it, and it now appears in an English version* by Max Hayward and Manya Harari.

Yury Zhivago is a physician and poet from the middle-class intelligentsia, and Pasternak's long and episodic novel follows him from his mother's death in 1903 to his own in 1930, and beyond, to the recollections of the friends who survive him during and after the second

**Doctor Zhivago*, by Boris Pasternak. (Collins & Harvill Press, 21s.)

more tolerant British attitude towards Communist China but equally logically, the apparently ridiculous American boosting of puppet Chiang and his Nationalist army. The loss of Formosa would make little change in the military and strategic set-up in the Far East. But as Eisenhower hinted, it might well spark off uprisings in those areas now under American domination (he calls them "free world positions in the Western Pacific area") and upset the existing balance of power. Furthermore since nothing is static in the power struggle, America looks upon the Formosa puppet military government as a long-term investment, a useful fifth column in the event of an "ideological" split in Chinese communist leadership.

In all this Britain can only watch and wait and hope that America will make a few diplomatic blunders from which Britain can derive some benefit. After all it seems to us that Britain is behaving in the Far East "crisis" rather in the same way as America behaved in the Middle East "crisis" of 1956. But all this has nothing to do with peace. So long as every nation is governed by its "vital interests" there can be no real unity in the world. And what is "living in peace" if not a world united by the recognition and respect for the common needs and aspirations of mankind?

CORRECTION.

In "Reflections on the Riots" we are made to say (FREEDOM 13/9/58) "After all, does not the writer of the letter admit to sharing his flat with a coloured friend, so obviously it's the person inside the skin that he wants", whereas in fact what we wrote was "so obviously it's the person inside the skin that counts".

PEOPLE AND IDEAS:

PASTERNAK'S OUTSIDER

world war. It is certainly the best modern Russian novel to appear in English, sharing with the classical Russian novels the feeling of the vastness of a country which spans continents, the feeling for changes in season and landscape, for the growth of character over generations, and for the indirect portrayal of great and catastrophic events by building up detail. It is full of loose ends, characters disappear and are met again by coincidence. Through the eyes of Zhivago and his friends we follow the history of Russia in this century, the revolution of 1905, the first World War, the February and October revolutions of 1917, the Civil War and the years of foreign intervention, the NEP period, the famine following the forced collectivisations, the purges, and the last war. But many of these events though they impinge terribly and senselessly on the lives of Pasternak's characters, are more implied than described. Lenin and Stalin are not mentioned, Trotsky appears only in an old tailor's jest: "... If you asked old Schmulevich why he thought the country was in such turmoil and disorder, he wriggled, twisted his ugly face into a grin and said: 'That's Leibochka up to his tricks!'"

And when Lara, whose life has been intertwined with Yury's since childhood disappears after his death, all we learn is that,

"She must have been arrested in the street, as so often happened in those days, and she died or vanished somewhere, forgotten as a nameless number on a list which later was mislaid, in one of the innumerable mixed or women's concentration camps in the north."

FOR this is a worm's eye view of events, which roll over the characters of the novel, sweeping them sometimes forever out of each other's sight, allowing them pockets of happiness and fulfilment, before catching them up in some new 'mass insanity', some new wave of the 'savagery of daily, hourly, legalised, rewarded slaughter'. Zhivago is the opposite of a Soviet Hero. He despises those whose zealous concern for the workers of the world and for changing the universe makes them care nothing for individual human beings. He is contemptuous of Marxism:

"Marxism a science? ... Science is more balanced. You talk about Marxism and objectivity, I don't know of any teaching more self-centred and further from the facts than Marxism. Ordinarily, people are anxious to test their theories in practice, to learn from experience, but those who wield power are so anxious to establish the myth of their own infallibility that they turn their back on truth as squarely as they can. Politics mean nothing to me. I don't like people who are indifferent to the truth."

Ruminative, addicted to religious symbolism, and a pantheistic love of natural phenomena, his values are individual:

"The great misfortune, the root of all the evil to come, was the loss of faith in the value of personal opinions. People imagined that it was out-of-date to follow their moral sense, that they must all sing in chorus, and live by other people's notions, the notions that were being crammed down everybody's throats."

His highest value is love, but, torn and buffeted by events, even the ordinary continuity of domestic life is denied him. His legal wife is virtually a stranger, for the war of 1914 sweeps them apart, and when after the war he takes his family on a nightmare journey to a village in the Urals, in search of peace, quiet and

THE HAPPY PEOPLE

Continued from p. 1

"Death Instinct". What else are these but spirits? They are usually spoken of as if they were almost personalities in their own right.

The social organisation of the Temiar is libertarian. The office of headman is an alien importation, or rather imposition. At the councils of the family group he has only one vote. Decisions are by majority vote, but the individual can go off on his own, provided he does not harm the others. The attitude to women is unfortunately patriarchal, and from this flow the quarrels over women which mar an otherwise peaceful picture.

Since writing this review I have seen another book on the Temiar in the shops. It is possible that we are in for a spate of works on the Malayan jungle peoples, just as we have recently had one of books dealing with the Indians of the South American jungles. I suppose it is too much to expect that Western man will learn from people like the Temiar, and modify his society accordingly.

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

food, he is kidnapped by a partisan band to serve as their medical officer. His wife goes back to Moscow and eventually to Paris, with the children, one of whom he has never seen. Lara, his mistress, the deepest love of his life, is spirited off into Mongolia with an unsuccessful commissar, "a monster of mediocrity, busy dashing about in the mythical byways of Asia, known only to stamp collectors", returning only after his death. Their daughter becomes one of the *bezprizornye*, the hordes of homeless children who roamed the country as the flotsam of each of the succession of catastrophes in the 'twenties and 'thirties.

FINALLY he has a third family with Marina, a telegraphist in the Moscow post office who looks after him in the last years when,

"He went more and more to seed, gradually losing his knowledge and skill as a doctor and writer, emerging from his state of depression and resuming his work only to fall back after a short flare-up of activity, into long periods of indifference to himself and to everything in the world."

For Zhivago has become one of those 'superfluous men' of Russian society, familiar to us from Turgenev and Chekov, sympathetic to the inevitable revolution but recoiling from the double-think and humbug and brainless cruelty of the new régime, and unable to compromise with it. Meekly he listened to the conversation of the friends of his childhood:

"Dudorov had recently come back from his first term of deportation; his civil rights had been restored to him... His comments were not influenced by cowardice or by any external consideration."

"He was saying that the arguments of the prosecution, his treatment in prison and after he came out, and particularly his heart-to-heart talks with the interrogators, had 'ventilated his brains', 're-educated him politically', opened his eyes to many things he had not seen before and made him 'grow in stature as a person'..."

"Dudorov's pious platitudes were in the spirit of the age. But it was precisely their correctness, their transparent sanctimoniousness, that exasperated Yury. Men who are not free, he thought, always idealise their bondage. So it was in the Middle Ages, and the Jesuits always played on this. Yury could not bear the political mysticism of the Soviet intelligentsia though it was the very thing they regarded as the highest of their achievements and described in the language of the day as 'the spiritual top-flight of the age'."

To the fact that "in his heart everyone was utterly different from his words and the outward appearance he assumed", Zhivago attributed the prevalence of heart disease:

"The great majority of us are required to live a life of constant systematic duplicity. Your health is bound to be affected if, day after day, you say the opposite of what you feel, if you grovel before what you dislike and rejoice at what brings you nothing but misfortune. Your nervous system isn't a fiction, it's a

part of your physical body, and your soul exists in space and is inside you, like the teeth in your head. You can't keep violating it with impunity. I found it painful to listen to you, Nicky, when you told us how you were re-educated and grew up in jail. It was like listening to a circus horse describing how it broke itself in."

YEARS afterwards Gordon and Dudorov meet in the war, the war which, even to them, favourably situated, with books, money and comfort, came "as a breath of fresh air, an omen of deliverance, a purifying storm."

"I think", Gordon declares, "that collectivisation was both a mistake and a failure, and because that couldn't be admitted, every means of intimidation had to be used to make people forget how to think and judge for themselves, to force them to see what wasn't there, and to maintain the contrary of what their eyes told them. Hence the unexampled harshness of the Yezhov terror, and the promulgation of a constitution which was never intended to be applied, and the holding of elections not based on the principle of a free vote."

"And when the war broke out, its real horrors, its real dangers, its menace of real death, were a blessing compared with the inhuman power of the lie, a relief because it broke the spell of the dead letter."

And finally, on a quiet summer evening in Moscow, "five or ten years later" in the vague timing of Pasternak's book, the same pair, the Nicky and Misha of Yury's childhood are sitting together reading a book of his poems compiled after his death.

"Although the enlightenment and liberation which had been expected to come after the war had not come with victory, a presage of freedom was in the air throughout these post-war years, and it was their only historical meaning."

"To the two ageing friends sitting by the window it seemed that this freedom of the spirit was there, that on that very evening the future had become almost tangible in the streets below, and that they had themselves entered that future and would, from now on, be part of it."

"They felt a peaceful joy for this holy city and for the whole land and for the survivors among those who had played a part in this story and for their children, and the silent music of happiness filled them and enveloped them and spread far and wide. And it seemed that the book in their hands knew what they were feeling and gave them its support and confirmation."

What do these almost mystical closing words mean? That the superfluous man, unable to make the necessary adjustments to Soviet reality, triumphs in the end through his very fidelity to his own values? That "Zhivago's" poems which fill the last 50 pages of the book have a meaning which will reach the newest Russian generation, as they lower their eyes from the dog in the sputnik, the generation to which the external events of Zhivago's life are merely a heretical version of the history they have been taught? That to the students who cried two years ago "Our literature has been a literature of a great lie", here at least is one work of truth written for the time when the earth shows itself again?

C.W.

FREEDOM PRESS

SELECTIONS FROM 'FREEDOM'

Vol. 1, 1951, *Mankind is One*
Vol. 2, 1952, *Postscript to Posterity*
Vol. 3, 1953, *Colonialism on Trial*
Vol. 4, 1954, *Living on a Volcano*
Vol. 5, 1955, *The Immoral Moralists*
Vol. 6, 1956, *Oil and Troubled Waters*
Vol. 7, 1957, *Year One—Sputnik Era*

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.

PETER KROPOTKIN: *The State: Its Historic Role* 1s. *The Wage System* 3d. *Revolutionary Government Organised Vengeance* 3d. *Called Justice* 2d.

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

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.

RUDOLF RÖCKER: *Nationalism and Culture* cloth 21s.

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

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

K. J. KENAFICK: *Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx* paper 6s.

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. *Neither East nor West Journey Through Utopia* cloth 18s. (U.S.A. \$3)

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

Not for this Earth

Continued from p. 1

socially responsible attitude among all those who can see the dangers in procreation.

Our attitude, however, stems from a different source from that of the Pope. We seek the satisfaction of individuals and defend their right to seek happiness by all means that do not impinge on the rights and happiness of others. The Catholic Church, on the other hand, is determined to subjugate the happiness and satisfaction of the individual to the will of God—as interpreted by the Catholic Church. If the two aims happen to coincide, that is all to the good, but if not, then God's will be done and it's too bad for the individual.

How Generous Can You Get?

In the case of the principle of couples genetically unsuitable to produce children not being forbidden to marry, the Pope had this to say:

"If people sometimes have difficulty in understanding the Church's generous point of view it is because they disregard too easily the premise laid down by Pius XI in his encyclical, "Casta Conubii" on marriage: "Man is begotten above all not for this earth and for temporal life but for heaven and eternity." This essential principle seems to be alien to the problems of eugenics. And yet it is just. It is even the only one that is fully valid."

In interpreting this premise, the Pope's instructions to married couples, diseased or healthy, is therefore quite clear. It is that whatever the consequences to their own health, the health of their offspring, their responsibility to society

or any aspect of their life here on earth, they may do nothing to interfere with the 'natural' processes of procreation. A couple likely to produce diseased children may be advised not to have any but not forbidden to have them, and the only methods of control they may use are continence and the Ogino-Knaus ('safe' period) method—which is, after all, a form of continence by the calendar.

Add to this the Pope's ruling that a discovery after marriage that the partners are genetically unsuitable is no ground for a nullification of the marriage and we get the condemnation of unlucky couples to lives of misery and frustration.

'This situation' says the Pope, 'is obviously tragic but the reasoning (that it may cause nullity of the marriage) is based on a consideration which does not apply. The object of the marriage contract is not the child but accomplishment of the natural matrimonial act, or, to be more precise the right to accomplish this act. This right remains completely independent of the hereditary situation of the child and even of its ability to live.' (Our italics).

Now this seems to us to be a slight shift of position. We were under the impression that the object of Christian marriage was the procreation of children and that the Catholic objection to birth control was simply that it was an interference with this divine function. Now we find that the object of marriage is only to provide the right to indulge in the sex act! Even though the married couple may lie beside each other for years afraid to accomplish the act for fear of producing sick children who will die before the age of ten!

No Amoral Solutions!

His Holiness may smugly admit that this situation is obviously tragic, but the simple methods of combating it he will not tolerate. If either or both of the parties present the danger to the health of the child, ordinary birth control methods or voluntary sterilisation provide at least the opportunity for a satisfying sexual relationship short of having children. And if an unwanted pregnancy does occur, abortion should be made available. If it is the man who is unsuitable, either artificial insemination or voluntary adultery can provide his partner with the satisfaction of having a child of her own if not of their own.

But these are all amoral solutions which the Catholic Church abhors. Human beings must not be allowed to choose for themselves in matters which the Church regards as its domain. The Pope said of sterilisation: 'Direct sterilisation is not authorised by the right of man to dispose of his own body and cannot therefore be considered a valid means of preventing the transmission of a defective heredity.'

In the view of the Church (and the State) neither men nor women have the right to dispose of their own bodies. Although we are begotten for heaven and eternity we are not allowed to spend our brief span on this earth as we see fit—it is all a dreary preparation for the next world, for which the Church tries to make us fit and the State is developing the quickest possible means of transport.

What other position can an honest, responsible human being adopt but that of the anarchist?

MENTION the word 'government' to an Anarchist, even if the prefix 'world' is added, and immediately a defence mechanism comes into action. As did S. E. Parker in last week's FREEDOM, arguments against are at once put forward—arguments based upon present and past conditions—instead of discussing the advantages for.

Godwin based his society upon the parish and ever since then Anarchists have based it upon a similar unit; Anarcho-syndicalists base it upon the factory or place of work. But the majority will agree, I think, that in order to eliminate wasteful competition and to be able to fully utilise available resources, there will have to be some centralised control integrating the activities of each parish, or whatever the near-autonomous unit is to be called, and of each individual factory. No factory or parish can exist in a vacuum or be a law unto itself, and neither do we want it to. A factory cannot provide its own raw materials or market its own products any more than can a parish provide its own power stations, schools, railway services, or such like.

An anarchist society would be a decentralised one, but at the same time there would also have to be a degree of centralisation. If not, we would merely be perpetuating that absurd state of affairs whereby one country is busy ploughing-in wheat while another is suffering from famine, where isolated groups of scientists and technicians are working on identical problems that could be solved in half the time and at a fraction of the cost if there was some means of pooling resources and information.

There's room in our correspondence columns for more letters from readers with something to say.

'Government' is an emotive word, but unless we can think of another to use in its place we will, unfortunately, have to continue to talk of 'world government'. To attack world government simply because we do not like the terminology or the picture it conjures up is the height of folly, for although de-centralisation alone will produce a host of autonomous units incapable of dropping H-bombs on each other, they will still be in a position to use broken bottles and razors on their economically more fortunate neighbours. And unless there is some over-riding authority to share out the fruits of the earth, there will continue to be disparity between one unit and another.

If there is no world-authority to which men can give their allegiance they will give it to their immediate unit, and look with envious eyes upon richer units. Wars are caused by a state of mind, but that state of mind is either fostered or legitimate jealousy.

De-centralisation is impossible without centralisation, and vice-versa. No matter how small the world has become, it is still too vast for it to be ruled in entirety by one authority, so that we should welcome world-government as one means of attaining the self-government of de-centralisation and Anarchism. Whichever comes first is immaterial, for neither can exist without the other.

Yours fraternally,

NORMAN DAY.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

Owing to the expiry of lease at the Malatesta Club no L.A.G. meetings will be held till further notice. New premises are being sought for the winter series of Lecture-Discussions.

MALATESTA CLUB

52 PERCY STREET, TOTTENHAM COURT RD., LONDON, W.1.

We are sorry to announce that the Malatesta Club has been unable to secure a renewal of lease on its present premises, and cannot see any likelihood of obtaining other suitable premises in the near future. The Club will therefore discontinue all its activities, and cease to exist or function as a club or a group with effect from October 11, 1958, the date of expiry of the lease.

Catering equipment and furniture is being stored in various places, so that it will be available to any anarchist group which may start a similar club in future. It is hoped that all debts will be paid by October 11, but there are unlikely to be any funds left.

ACTIVITIES

Saturday, September 27 at 8 p.m.
Malatesta Club farewell party, Admission 3/- in aid of the Freedom Press Group and the University Libertarian.
Wednesday, October 8 at 8 p.m.
Farewell Meeting of the BONAR THOMPSON SPEAKS committee, with many attractions including the personal appearance of Bonar Thompson.
Every Wednesday until October 8
Bonar Thompson speaks.

CROYDON AREA

Will all comrades and sympathisers interested in libertarian activity in the Croydon area please communicate with:
S. E. PARKER,
228, Holmesdale Road, London, S.E.25

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

RECENTLY, a few days after Chief Scout Lord Rowallan had occasion to publicly deny that the Scout Movement is "semi-militaristic", the following report appeared in a local paper:—"A refresher course for motorists took place at Halton Camp for R.A.F. personnel and members of the Traffic Division were examiners when members of the 6th Aylesbury Scout Group took practical tests for Boy Scout Dispatch Riders' Badges."

This report by itself is sufficient reason to cast doubt upon the professed idea of Brotherhood in the Scout world. But there are other reasons which might prompt Chief Scouts to make public denials of military influence. Indeed, since its founder was a Lieutenant-General one might think Lord Rowallan foolish in taking such a stand. They say Old Soldiers never die—and there is little reason to believe that Baden-Powell performed a metaphorical perishing act either. This in spite of the fact that his idol, Kipling, grew weary of flag-wagging before he died.

According to a well-known children's encyclopedia, B.P. was impressed with the usefulness of Scouting as training in good citizenship. It also states that "The Movement is wholly non-military". Yet, this same article displays a photograph, in which Scouts are shown receiving instruction at an R.A.F. service aerodrome, with the caption informing us that "The Air Scouts were formed in 1941 and officially recognised by the Air Ministry in 1950." Another photograph shows Air Scouts studying aircraft recognition in order to qualify for a proficiency badge designed for them by the Air Ministry.

We are asked to believe that whilst the background of the Air Scout's badge is "Royal Air Force blue", the background of the Air Scout is not.

The fact may be that Lord Rowallan

What's Behind the Scout Movement? 'Be Prepared to Die'

was placating a guilty conscience for, not many months previously, he gave a talk on Leadership to the Army School of Education, particularly for the benefit of Senior Officers of Boys' Units. Moreover, when asked by a colonel if Baden-Powell's "Scouting For Boys" was still the best text-book for Army Officers, he enthusiastically re-recommended it.

The Chief Scout, so secure in his belief that Scouting is synonymous with Pacifism, can also boast that his movement "helped the R.A.F. . . ." in its revision of training through the initiative of one of his Chief Commissioners, Canon Giles. Canon Giles, as one might have suspected, is Chaplain General of the Royal Air Force.

There are other big military names not entirely estranged from Lord Rowallan and his merry men. General Sir Richard Gale, deputy Commander of S.H.A.F.E., for example, who recently accepted a "Silver Wolf" for services to Scouting as Commander for British Scouts in Western Europe. Another "big gun" is the Chief of the Imperial General Staff who is a member of the Central Branch of the Scout Guild.

Lord Rowallan's utterance assumes a more desperate nature when one surveys the type of game indulged in by his Boys. Anyone who thinks they play Ring-a-ring-a-roses, or even Cowboys and Indians, is in for a shock. Prominent among the Wide Games that are recommended and explained in *The Scouter* one finds such titles as "Enemy Paratroops", "Flag Raid", "Naval Engagement", "Blowing up the Enemy", "Rockets", "Incendiary Raid", etc., etc., in which "secret agents", "ships", and

"submarines"—the lot—are involved and deployed. Happily the "killings" are effected by breaking arm-bands. Last year, the Huddersfield Scouts carried out "Operation Chindit" as a competition judged by an Executive Committee member, Colonel Sugden of the Duke of Wellington Regiment.

However, none of these things—however damning they may seem—are really essential to the question under consideration, the relationship between Scout and Soldier. All that is necessary to the unblinded mind is the content of Scout Law and Promise. One of the Scout Laws (yes, there are ten—how inevitable!) states "A scout is loyal to his Queen and to his country". True, this is compromised by another which says: "A Scout is a friend to all and a brother to every other Scout", but there can be no doubt that any Movement founded on opposing principles such as these can hardly be expected to honour that principle which is more difficult to carry into practice. It never happened in the League of Nations and it doesn't happen in the United Nations Organisation. The nature of any organisation can be ascertained from its Principles: if they amount to double standards, write the organisation off.

Baden-Powell must have been mentally blind or dishonest when he stressed, in his books, the necessity of thinking things out oneself. Did he ever realise that conflicts can arise between individual judgment and the Queen's command? But then B.P. was a queer old bird with a queer taste in sport as well as logic. The original Chief Scout, we read, "excelled in", and had a "keen relish for", pig-sticking. He wrote two books on the game, recommending it to the Scout and the Soldier and noting that it was a good means towards "getting to know the native". Pig-sticking, said the Founder, resulted in the "mutual esteem" of rider and horse, the horse taking "a real delight in the sport"! One might be excused for suggesting that B.P. had the "horse-sense".

To the credit of the Scouts, one does hear stories of heroism and faithfulness to the brotherhood part of the Movement's dual code. There are reported, and obviously authentic, stories of the courage of German Scouts in opposing

the Hitler régime. But, how many German and Italian Scouts refused to massacre the children, brothers and sisters of their brother Scouts in England? How many English Scouts refused to massacre German families? What action did Scout Headquarters take to prevent Scout murdering Scout? One gets the impression that they are not, generally, alarmed by such prospects. It would seem that the insistence upon *Duty* and *Obedience* and *Loyalty* accomplishes a deliberate intention with outstanding success: the intention being to produce good Soldiers of the Queen.

In the view of W. Olaf Stapledon, advocating the extirpation of military influences in C. E. M. Joad's 1934 "Manifesto", it is the "Red Indian spirit" that appeals to young Scouts. To encourage and sanctify such pre-human and early-human aggressive behaviour as one of the most honourable activities of civilised man, wrote Stapledon, is disastrous. It was his opinion that pacific leaders would not cancel out the danger. (And we have an idea how pacific those leaders might have been!)

Certainly to-day we know that some of the leaders are hardly what one might call pacific. The Scout motto might well read: "Be Prepared to Die for whatever Constitution you may happen to come under".

ERNIE CROSSWELL.

MORE READERS

MORE FINANCIAL SUPPORT

IS

what FREEDOM

URGENTLY NEEDS

Now Ready!

Year One - Sputnik Era

Selections from Freedom

Volume 7

1957

266 pages paper 7/6, cloth 10/6

Order Now!

As with earlier volumes, to FREEDOM readers ordering their copies direct from F.P. the price of the paper edition is only FIVE SHILLINGS post free (U.S. \$1.00) Volumes 1-6 are still available at 5s. per volume (paper) and 10s. 6d. cloth.