

'I shall ask for the abolition of the punishment of death, until I have the infallibility of human judgement demonstrated to me.'

LAFAYETTE

In this Issue:

HYPOCRISY IN THE 'NEW' COMMONWEALTH
'OPERATION ABOLITION'
GUIDANCE IS GOOD FOR YOU—3
AROUND THE GALLERIES

APRIL 15 1961 Vol 22 No 15

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY - 4d.

NEXT Tuesday at the Albert Hall, there is a rally of the National Campaign for the Abolition of Capital Punishment. The organisers hope for much from this meeting. "A packed hall, plus overflow, may turn the scale!" is the slogan they use.

This worthy campaign poses the usual questions on reformism. The abolition of the death penalty would only be half-a-loaf, yet it could be claimed that it would be better than no bread. We have been treated to the mildewed crumbs of political compromise, after the last 'feast of reason and flow of soul'

DON'T ENTRUST YOUR LIVES TO THE SUPERMEN

Dr. Hugh L'Etang, a former airline medical officer, writes in *The Practitioner* about illness and the fortunes of war.

Hitler deliberately provoked war in 1939 because he believed he had not got long to live, says Dr. L'Etang. According to Goering he thought he had cancer.

An unsuccessful 1917 offensive by the French, which cost 95,000 casualties, was encouraged by a chief of staff dying of tuberculosis who wanted to be architect of a supreme gamble for victory.

The doctor names some top British officers who suffered from ill health in the last war.

Sir Dudley Pound, who became First Sea Lord in 1939 at the age of 62, often appeared to doze off. A colleague reported that he was asleep 75 per cent. of the time when he should have been working.

When he died in 1943, says Dr. L'Etang, a tumour was found in his skull—"it is only natural to speculate over what period of time the cranial tumour may have been responsible for fatigue and sleepiness."

The doctor names General Sir John Dill, a wartime Chief of the Imperial General Staff, who was criticised for his tiredness and lack of drive.

He had been suffering from severe anaemia, possibly for some time, when he died in 1944.

BIRMINGHAM PRINTERS VOTE RACIAL BAR

An emergency meeting of the *Birmingham Post and Mail* night chapel of the Birmingham Typographical Society decided by 38 votes to 24 to oppose the employment of coloured compositors. After the meeting the father of the chapel, Mr. G. Nash, and his deputy, Mr. A. Busby, resigned their posts.

Earlier Mr. A. Farley, the secretary of the society, had said: "This is a chapel matter. As far as the society is concerned, we do not take any cognisance of any man's colour. We are concerned purely about his craftsmanship and whether he can measure up to the high standards required."

Mr. C. Farrell, the works manager of the *Birmingham Post and Mail Ltd.*, had said: "We shall have no trouble, whether we start these men or not. There is going to be no strike."

Already eight or nine coloured linotype operators hold union cards in the Birmingham Society.

(Guardian)

HANGING IS NO ANSWER

Public Meeting
Albert Hall
Tuesday April 18 at 7.30 pm
Many prominent speakers.
Tickets 2/6 & 1/- from
National Campaign for
Abolition of Capital Punishment
14 Henrietta Street London WC2

Shorten the Rope?

in debate on the amendments to the law on murder and capital punishment. These crumbs have satisfied no one.

Rank injustice has still been perpetrated. No doubt, the usual innocents have been hanged, the guilty have been reprieved, the accident of youth has saved some, the accident of insanity has hanged others. Some have died because their crimes were too terrible to be allowed by society, some have been saved because their crimes were too terrible to be the act of a sane person, some were reprieved because their crime had no motive, others were hanged because their crime was unprovoked.

Neither the 'hang-em-all' school with its baying Fleet Street pack nor the school that reserves hanging for the worst kind of murder have been satisfied. This compromise of a law is a half-hanging, making the Courts of Law more than ever seem a lottery and justice a 'housey-housey' game.

Half a loaf is worse than no bread for one can point to the prefabricated, cellophane-packaged, starch, soda and colouring matter and claim that 'at least we have some bread!'

Gerald Gardiner, Q.C. (chairman of the campaign) wrote to FREEDOM (30/5/59), stating that "capital punishment can only be abolished by members of Parliament" and doubting that the present Parliament (Conservative) would

disobey the Party's whip shortly before a general election.

It was pointed out by the editors in reply that the achievement of the abolition through mere parliamentary methods will not lead to 'an understanding of human frailty', or an arousing of 'deep social conscience and therefore the substitute for capital punishment will be equally offensive to feelings of decency'. The history of muddle and compromise in the last two years have borne out this reply.

The pattern of opinion on the death penalty is noted by Arthur Koestler in *Reflections on Hanging* when he points out the influence of party politics on the

administration of the criminal law. The monotonous pattern of Home Secretaries from both parties ardently defending capital punishment when in office and ardently attacking it when in opposition.

J. R. Clynes (Labour 1924) was an abolitionist until he took office as Home Secretary then he signed all death sentences as he was assured "it was the thing to do". Samuel Hoare (later Lord Templewood) opposed before office, then supported, then out of office (1951) the death penalty, wrote *The Shadow of the Gallows*, an abolitionist book. Chuter Ede (Labour) was an abolitionist, became Home Secretary and signed the execution warrant for an obscure van-driver called Timothy Evans, and in 1955 Mr.



Macmillan's 'Unity' Russell's 'Unilateralism' WILL THEY MEET?

HOW long will it be before Harold Macmillan and Bertrand Russell are both advocating unilateral disarmament from the plinth at Trafalgar Square?

In last Sunday's *Observer* Bertrand Russell explains what he and his friends mean by unilateral disarmament. And in the same paper is a report of Mr. Macmillan's address at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in which he advocated unity of the Western powers (on previous occasions he recalled that he had spoken of "interdependence" as the keynote of the 20th century). "Today I say interdependence is not enough," declared Mr. Macmillan. "We need unity—a wider unity—transcending traditional barriers; unity of purpose, of method, of organisation."

Mr. Macmillan's "Unity" speech is as "daring" as Bertrand Russell's letter is respectable. And so before long we shall not be surprised if "unilateralism" and "unity" find common ground.

BUT let us first present the two proposals. Bertrand Russell in his letter protests at the *Observer's* "serious misapprehension of the position of those who are called 'unilateralists', and since they have not yet agreed on a creed, he sets forth his opinions which were expressed at a conference on March 11 and "seemed to meet with general approval". He writes:

I do not advocate American unilateral disarmament; I advocate unilateral dis-

armament for Britain, and I think that the same arguments are valid for other allies of America in the eastern hemisphere. I advocate this as a step towards general disarmament.

The arguments for British unilateral disarmament are national and international. National in that Russia could wipe out our island in half an hour "without bringing on a general nuclear war". There is nothing Britain or America can do to prevent this. On the other hand if Britain were neutral "Russia would have no motive for such an act".

Internationally Britain adds nothing to the power of America, but only a very burdensome liability. Disarmament conferences, so far, have always failed since 1945. The best hope for success would be a proposal drawn up by neutrals making no change in the balance of power, but possible for each side to accept since it would not be suggested by the other side. Britain as a neutral could do important work in this direction.

Mr. Macmillan declared that it was natural enough that there should now be some in Europe who felt unhappy that their nuclear defence should be left purely in Anglo-American hands. But it would be undesirable to "alarm and perhaps endanger the world by appearing gratuitously to encourage the uncontrolled spread of nuclear weapons from country to country."

May not Mr. Macmillan at some stage agree with *Tribune's* slogan of "let Britain Lead"—or words to that effect—and leave the nuclear "deterrent" exclusively in the hands of the U.S.A.? He went on to say

"We want a ban if we can get it on nuclear tests. We do not want our allies to feel it essential to their honour or to their safety to pour out their money in wasteful duplication. Probably the West does not need an increase in

total nuclear power.

"Nevertheless this is a real problem. We cannot just ignore it. We must find a way of meeting the legitimate feelings of our European allies. . . . The health of the whole NATO alliance depends on finding a way of building a partnership in the nuclear as well as conventional field and to make it live."

Not only does he recognise the "feelings" and the "honour" of "our allies", which may well indicate that the British Government is prepared to make a gesture to satisfy these "feelings", and at the same time dissuade them from developing their own nuclear weapons, but he also says "Probably the West does not need an increase in total nuclear power". The latter remark is not all that far away from Bertrand Russell's "Britain adds nothing to the power of America but only a very burdensome liability". Russell's "burdensome liability" presumably refers to the fact that Britain's possession of her own nuclear weapons is but a drop in the ocean of American productive capacity but at the same time is the excuse for other minor powers on both sides of the curtain aspiring to possess their own nuclear "deterrents". Macmillan has surely gone part of the way to recognising this, for after all short of an alliance of Western Europe, a United States of Europe (at least as homogeneous as the United States of America) no power of the West alone can be on equal terms with America in military or economic terms. No Western power therefore can challenge America, but they could resent Britain's privileged position and attribute it to the possession of her own nuclear "deterrent". (Personally, this writer, considers these

arguments a lot of nonsense but the political game, as distinct from the real international crises which are crises generally of an economic nature, is played according to certain rules; you can try to call the other man's bluff but you do not call the bluff on which all politics is based! For if you did the whole pack or cards would collapse, and this, no politician will do for it would be the end of politics and professional politicians).

But to return to our argument. It may well be that at their recent meeting Macmillan and Kennedy discussed the disadvantages of Britain possessing her independent nuclear "deterrent". So long as Britain was the only minor Power possessing the "deterrent" one can understand her spokesmen, Tory or Labour, being conscious of having an argument the others lacked. But nothing is permanent, or static, and the possibility that in the near future France, W. Germany and who knows how many other nations will also have their H-bombs automatically neutralises the advantages Britain might have enjoyed—not, be it noted in its dealings with the potential enemy, but in arguments with its so-called allies! Maybe, therefore, the time is ripe to trade the British "deterrent" for some other temporary advantage before it becomes a permanent liability. Mr. Macmillan did say:

"In this world of missiles we must not overlook our conventional forces. They are as essential as ever . . . but we must try to share the burden more efficiently." Surely it was illogical that "our teams of military planners, scientists, and technicians should waste any of their efforts duplicating work and projects."

Continued on page 3

FREEDOM SELLERS WANTED

WILL THEY MEET?

Continued from page 1

And after assuring all concerned that Britain was not suffering from "creeping neutralism" he added:

Happily, the present struggle was not primarily in the military sphere. The real test would not be on the battlefield but in the market place.

The urgent economic problem in Europe was to end the division between the "Six" and "Seven" groupings. "If this economic division persists, the political rift will inevitably follow, widen and deepen," he said. "This must, sooner or later, affect our military coherence and strength."

★

"THE real test will not be on the battlefield but in the market place" is a very frank recognition of what the anarchists (and a few "old-fashioned" socialists) have long been maintaining. And who can say that in the "market-place" Russia has, so far, challenged the industrial nations of the capitalist world? The struggle in the market place is between those very nations who are allegedly allies in the East-West struggle.

We do not know the ins and outs of the manoeuvres resulting in the creation of the "Six" or of Britain's reply with the "Seven". But just as it was not considerations of brotherly love that brought the Six nations together, neither, surely, was it some high principle that prevented Britain from joining in the first place. Now it would seem that Britain's industrialists favour joining the Six (whatever the other members of the Commonwealth may feel), and apparently Mr. Macmillan has secured Mr. Kennedy's support (in exchange for Britain's eventual abandonment of her independent deterrent?) and in their joint statement they declare that

they discussed how their countries could help to strengthen the free world as a whole, and measures "to ensure the cohesion, effectiveness of the Atlantic Community in a changing world." To this end they examined the world economic and financial situation, including the need for more effective assistance to under-developed nations. Both had recognised the urgency of further steps toward the economic and political unity of Europe. (Our italics).

★

ONLY a militant unilateral nuclear disarmament will fail to notice that President Kennedy's new "defence" policy puts the emphasis on conventional forces rather than on nuclear arms and that Mr. Macmillan in his address last week-end stressed that "in this world of missiles we must not overlook our conventional forces. They are as essential as ever". In the same speech he referred to the "health" of the entire NATO alliance depending on finding a way to build a "partnership in the nuclear as well as conventional field and to make it live". We do not think it impossible that the Powers could come to an agreement, which all concerned would honour, to ban nuclear warfare from their vocabulary, not because we think them motivated by any special love for humanity but because it is clear that such weapons are, to put it mildly, too efficient. Indeed, so efficient that their use would without a doubt obliterate mankind from our planet. And this writer has never been convinced that there is anywhere in the world today an Administration or Government so paranoid at all levels to unleash such a war of extermination. On the other hand the possession of these weapons by at least two

power-hungry nations tends to upset the conventional balance of power, to the disadvantage of the Big Powers.

The small and the weak nations are obviously able to achieve more by blackmail today than would have been possible in the bad old days of conventional weapons. The "independence" of colonial Africa is being achieved as it were in the shadow of the H-bomb (notice, for instance, how much slower is the process in Algeria, Angola and South Africa where the H-bomb blocs have so far chosen to ignore the struggle). Similarly in Cuba, Castro has expropriated American property with impunity only because he has relied on Russian threats being taken sufficiently seriously by the Americans for them to consider that the advantages of intervention are far outweighed by the risks of an armed clash with the Russians. The British, French and Israeli went further in Egypt but it was more the Russian threat of intervention than American disapproval, that made them beat a hasty retreat and seek the face-saving expedient of United Nations intervention.

The effect of this blackmail is that both power blocs are now vying with each other to provide economic aid for the underdeveloped countries, again not because they have any particular love for the "natives" but because the power game demands that you should get on economic foothold in those uncommitted territories before your enemy. Of course it is another form of imperialism, of colonialism, but it is not such a profitable kind, nor is the future as stable as it appeared in the old days. Nowadays you don't know when these ungrateful natives will bite the hand that has fed them, that is when they will nationalise the industries which have been financed with your capital, or when they will also accept aid from your enemy!

Much of this new state of affairs can be attributed to nuclear politics and while we cannot visualise the delegates at Geneva ever reaching agreement on world disarmament, even if they live to be a hundred years old, we can see agreement being reached for the abolition of nuclear weapons for the reasons we have exposed.

Because Bertrand Russell was a powerful influence in our youth, we feel sad that he should now be defending positions which theoretically, at least, may land him on the same platform as Mr. Harold Macmillan!

WITH Yeats at the Waddington and Nash at the Redfern this is a week for the Old Nostalgia even with Moretti edging into the act by announcing that he is Picasso's official successor but of all the clowns and hucksters only Jack Yeats will outlive his generation for he is the finest painter of them all. Doomed to flower in the shadow of his brother's reputation he reflected onto a canvas that blazed with ribbons of torn and ragged colours the stupidity and the beauty of the Irish people. The Waddington Gallery at 2 Cork Street, W.1. are to be congratulated for gathering together this collection of early Yeatsian watercolours. There is no hint of the magnificent later oils and if any comparison can be made it is that the early Yeats was a lighter, gayer, more rakish recorder of the raffish than his contemporary Sickert, that gloomy English puritan gingerly annotating his dreary version of lower middle classes at play,

(Continued from previous issue)

THE orthodox left-wing interpretation of MRA is that it is heavily financed by political reactionaries in order that it may advance their causes. The whole social background of MRA seems to reinforce this view. Its headquarters address in Mayfair, its hotel house-parties at Caux, and formerly at Brown's and the Hotel Metropole all back up the reported statement of Buchman "Why shouldn't we stay in posh hotels? Isn't God a millionaire?"

This accords ill with the other concept of Jesus Christ as a poor beatnik who got into bad company. The contention of the MRA is that they live on 'expenses only'. In 1936 Buchman claimed his private income did not exceed £50 a year. But . . . all their projects are financed by freewill offerings and 'where God decides, he will provide' and it would be a poor supporter of the groups who would defy the guidance of God that a project go forward.

Human will and determination is an underestimated quality and the fact that it attaches itself impartially to good, questionable and downright bad causes is undeniable. In fact a case can be made that the more dubious the cause the stronger the will that can be mustered for it. William James instances George Müller who maintained orphanages in Bristol and many other projects purely on the faith that if he let his general wants be publicly known and prayed for temporary necessities, believing that *sooner or later* (my italics) prayers are always answered if one has trust enough.

In slightly the same way the belief of some investors in the late Horatio Bottomley were not shaken even during one of his first prison sentences and after his release he started the organization of companies again.

There is faith in MRA's projects and the will (whatever the motives) to carry them through. The fact that MRA workers live on 'expenses only' is all relative, for a considerable proportion of the population are in a continual battle to achieve this standard of expenses and to live a life where 'merely' expenses were met would be bliss indeed! . . . especially on the Mayfair-Caux standard.

Arnold Lunn gives in *Enigmas* a list of donations to MRA funds, being extracts from their account books. His list reads: MP £2, East London Mayor £10, Accountant £50, Officer £194, Typist £10/-, Clergyman £1, Welsh playwright £50, Bus driver 15/-, Doctor £100, Miners' leader £1, L.C.C. employee £1, Children's nurse £10, Exporting firm £500, Railway executive £5, Masseuse £7, 35 Workers £37, Captain, R.N. £25, Privy Councillor £2, Engineering company £1,000, Head, Oxford College £10, Kenya farmer £250, Headmaster £49, Textile employee £25. If these figures are really random selections and typical they show that MRA is dependent for half its income from industrial concerns and for about another quarter upon upper middle-class donations.

An ex-communist MRA said "that some industrialists contribute. I wish more did, every worker should rejoice when businessmen begin to invest in a force that is fighting effectively for social justice and a new world order."

It may be that many firms look on MRA as a type of communism-insurance and add them to their list of charities, but it is obvious that much of their money comes from individuals who genuinely believe in the aims and principles of MRA.

This upper middle-class bias of MRA exposes another nerve of MRA. Frank Buchman was most impressed by his

Guidance is good for you

conversion of Marie, Queen of Roumania and the concentration of MRA on the souls of the rich and socially prominent has been noted with a counter-apology "well . . . even the rich have souls, you know". Among the scalps hanging on the belt have been King George of Greece, the King of Siam and MRA's are adept in name-dropping in order to imply that certain celebrities are with them . . . if not actually of them. Among the well-known who have for any period consistently subscribed to MRA ideas are John McGovern (Catholic and ex-I.L.P.), Arnold Lunn, 'Bunny' Austin, Beverley Nichols, General Pershing, William Green (American trade unionist), Reginald Owen (film actor) and Olsen (of *Hellzapoppin!*).

The passionate quest of MRA for celebrities leads to some rather unfortunate associations. For example President Kasavubu (in the MRA advertisement 5th February), said, "You [MRA] have found the secret of liberation for Africa. All men must think how to give this moral basis to the country."

In 1955 Colonel Gamal Abdel Nasser cabled "I wish to welcome to Egypt the delegation of Moral Rearmament. These principles and objectives are highly appreciated in Egypt, where all efforts are mobilised to restore moral values, social justice, human dignity, and freedom" (*An Idea to Win the World*). Twelve months later the Suez Canal was closed.

In *Ideology and Co-existence* it is tactlessly said, "Dr. Frank Buchman, who knows the Far East well, has paid nine visits to Japan since 1915 and has enjoyed personal friendship with four generations of Japanese leadership."

Everybody's silly sometimes and grab-all endorsements of a brand of cigarettes (for example) must catch the occasional non-smoker but MRA's passion for leadership does often mean they back the wrong horse and Buchman's offhand remark about Hitler is more a sign of political naivety rather than pro-Fascist leanings. On 25th August, 1936, on arrival in New York, he said:

"I thank heaven for a man like Adolf Hitler who built a front line of defence against the anti-Christ of Communism. My barber in London told me Hitler saved all Europe from Communism. That's how he felt. Of course I don't condone everything the Nazis do. Antisemitism? Bad, naturally. I suppose Hitler sees a Karl Marx in every Jew!"

"But think what it would mean to the world if Hitler surrendered to the control of God. Or Mussolini (*sic*) or any dictator. Through such a man God could control a nation overnight and solve every bewildering problem."

A man who takes political guidance from his barber and who is capable of grammatical solecisms such as wondering what could happen if Hitler came under the control of God, Mussolini or any dictator is politically inept. But perhaps it was all a mistake and was probably a series of answers to unreported questions.

In the political sphere this snobbery is disastrous. In the entertainment sphere it is amusing. Williamson in *Inside Buchmanism* gives an account of Buchman's speech at the Hollywood Bowl during which he said:

"Moral Re-Armament is the scenario of a Golden Age—a God directed production—a preview of a New World Hollywood, that goes to every home, can become the sounding board for Moral Re-Armament to the nations."

And the *Daily Express* reports Dr. Buchman's conversation with (of all people!) Mae West, in which she said, "You are doing wonderful work", to which the Doctor, not to be outdone, says, "You are a splendid character." Miss West's come-back is, "I owe my success to the fact that I have been practising your philosophy in recent years". Dr. Buchman (his four absolute working overtime), "You've done wonderful work, too, Miss West, in pleasing and entertaining millions with your charming personality."

JACK ROBINSON.

(To be concluded).



Around the Galleries

work and murder.

This will probably be Paul Nash's last major exhibition before all his work disappears into the limbo of the esoteric collections of those who claimed his friendship. The Right Hon. Sir David Eccles, P.C., K.C.V.O., M.P. has penned the valediction for this exhibition at the Redfern at 20 Cork Street, W.1., and Godfrey Winn has lent his "Cumulus Head" for this pale English ghost forever threatening to fade from the canvas caught the gutlessness of a certain type of English so much so that one feels that even the watery sunlight will wash his pale colours from off the paper and this is truly sad, for in 1931 he painted "In Andrew's Field" and because he used ink instead of pencil for his outline he

was forced to strengthen his colours accordingly but this is a work whose promise was never fulfilled.

A fresh gimmicky painter has hit the London scene via Biggins Gallery at 30 Old Bond Street, W.1. and it is worth at least a single visit. Brilliant is the operative word, for these gayly coloured, vibrant paintings have the eye-catching excitement of an Esquire illustration but just how long Moretti can gyroidal within his frames to please the dealers before he settles down to paint should and does pose an interesting problem. Alan Davie's paintings at Gimpel Fils at 50 South Molton Street, W.1. tend more and more to ape the covers of those cheap American pulp magazines of the thirties and the titles in his catalogue

offer the same pure corn; while Bernard Buffet at Lefevre's gallery at 30 Bruton Street, W.1. can only be regarded now as a dealer's painter for his canvases sail in with the same monotony and without depth or feeling they roll onto their grey backgrounds with the flat emptiness of worn linoleum pattern, for if one is wealthy enough to buy a Buffet one knows that one has only to put the money down and the ordered and the expected will be produced.

But of the living painters of the week Hermione Hammond at Arthur Jeffress at 28 Davies Street, W.1., and Albert Belasco at the Portal Gallery at 16a Grafton Street, W.1. offer the only painterly pleasure. Hammon who gives us the dying cadences of *Betjeman's* sweet and naive cottage paintings of sloe-eyed women swanning through the darkness of his dreams.

ARTHUR MOYSE.

