

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 19, No. 24

June 14th, 1958

Threepence

Five Prisoners Appeal to World Opinion from the Depths of KENYA'S HELL PRISONS

It is five years since the Mau Mau troubles in Kenya were at their height; and since the public memory short the record of mass punishments, beatings and attacks by Mau Mau bombers is long-forgotten by most everyone. Kenya is again a fully abiding Colony in which the minority rule is unchallenged and peaceful exploitation continues its ordered course.

But what of those men who were fortunate enough to be captured and still remain within the walls of Majesty's prisons in Kenya? Some of these men are political prisoners who have been incarcerated for about five years at Lokitaung in the desert of the Northern Province, 600-miles from their homes.

A letter (about 900 words in length) was published in the *Observer* of June 8th from five such men, which if it is true (and to judge from past records there is no reason to doubt its validity), is a further telling indictment of the sort of treatment meted out by British representatives in Crown Colonies to those who fall foul of the laws, regulations and prohibitions which govern the lives of so many unwilling subjects of the British Government.

The letter outlines some of the conditions which exist in Lokitaung, starting by making the point that the prison is in the Twkana District which is closed to all except those with special permits, and the families and friends of prisoners are not permitted to visit them—nor in fact is the Prison Visiting Committee.

Writing and receiving letters (theoretically once a month) is a farce, and mail may take months in either direction. In Britain this state of affairs alone would create a *furor* in the press.

But the letter has much more to tell:

"During the past five years we have suffered a great deal. We have been beaten in the most brutal manner. Our rations are inadequate, we do not get vegetables or fruits. We live on mealie meal and beans of the worst quality. Owing to insufficient and unbalanced diet we have become prone to many kinds of diseases. Most of us have been ill many times, and some for long periods. Some have almost lost their eyesight. In all these diseases no adequate medical examination and treatment is provided, and the Government do not provide spectacles for those who need them except in the worst cases."

Brutality, appalling food and almost no medical attention. Democratic man's inhumanity to man. But men can continue to live in such conditions, if only as animals. The letter however does not end there:

"... about five months ago, water became so scarce in Lokitaung that it had to be rationed. We prisoners were allowed four gallons per person a day, which is insufficient for people doing hard labour in hot climate."

On April 23 the District Officer, Mr. C. L. Ryland, who is in charge of our prison, curtailed our water ration to two gallons per person. We appealed to him but he refused to listen to us. The following day the D.O. said we were not to get any water at all. We demanded to see him, but he refused.

On the twenty-fifth we went to the well for our share of water. The D.O. came to the well and told us to draw our water from a nearby old and discarded well which had long ago been condemned by the doctors and in which dogs' carcasses and filth have been thrown for years. Vehicles are also washed on the top of the well, the dirty and oily water and petrol returning into the well. The well has no lid and when it rains the flood collects rubbish and excrement into it.

The D.O. told us the clean well is for

Europeans only. Knowing very well that the water is unfit for human beings, we refused, and demanded the clean water which we have been drinking in the past five years and which is now reserved for six Europeans only. The D.O. maintains that we cannot get any water from the clean well. Now as we write this letter we are entering our fourth day without water in a desert while the now 'European' well is full of clean water."

No further information as to the results of this treatment of prisoners in Lokitaung is forthcoming as yet. If it is true, then the history of barbarism in the twentieth century, which has generally been regarded as the prerogative of outright Fascist countries, is still ignobly continued in the dark, festering corners of the lands which are ruled by Her

Majesty's duly elected Government. It is the kind of barbarism which must inevitably lead to the deaths of those on whom it is inflicted. Death by starvation, thirst or disease. It is little different from the barbarism which took place in the savage hell-holes of Europe, in the gas-chambers of the German Reich. The effects can be the same.

The writers of the letter, after four days without water have few doubts left:

"It now appears to us that it is the intention of the Kenya Government to starve us to death... If that is not the Government intention we cannot understand why they should continue to keep us here without water when there are many other prisons in other parts of the country where water is plentiful."

The final paragraph of the letter

is a desperate application to an abstraction which can, but seldom does, exert its influence for the good of suffering humanity.

"We consider this the most brutal and inhuman treatment ever compared to that of the Nazi concentration camp. As we have nowhere to appeal we now appeal to the High Court of the World Public opinion—Yours faithfully,

(sgd.) B. M. KAGGIA, PAUL J. IVGEI, FRED KUBAI, KUNGA KARUMBA, KARIOKI I. CHATARA.

C/o H.M. Prison, Likitaung N.F.D., Via Kitale, Kenya."

An appeal to nowhere and yet to everywhere, and to everyone. Let us hope that a sufficiently great proportion of "everyone" in Britain can break free from the morass of indifference which is the general characteristic, and force the responsible authorities to have the facts investigated and give an accurate report of the findings, and take action to prove at least that inhumanity may still be subdued by the conscience of public opinion and disgust.

The Bus Strike in Perspective

THE dispute which has brought about the current bus strike is not by any means a remarkable one. The workers in nationalised industries perhaps more than others have become accustomed to regular, almost annual wage increases designed to compensate them for losses in real living standards caused by the upward trend in prices. They must by now also be well used to the position where the authority in question hedges, offers half the increase claimed by the union, and at a later date, and not applied to all the workers for whom it was claimed, the union issues solemn threats regarding industrial action, and after relays of negotiators have disputed the matter in board room and council chamber, and perhaps the Minister of Labour has made appeals and interventions, a compromise is reached, and the affair rests for a year, while other unions are taking their turn.

Before considering more closely the particular problems of the London bus strike, let us notice some of the assumptions, made by both sides in accepting this situation of claim-refusal-threat-negotiations-compromise. Besides the general assumption on the part of the unions that the exploitation of workers by private capitalists and by the State is going to be a permanent feature of society, which is implicit in the whole structure of the Labour movement, there are more specific assumptions about the economics of capitalism. One of these is that inflation is a necessary feature, another that it is quite an adequate way of "fighting" it to simply put 3 per cent., or 5 per cent. more money into everyone's pay packets each year, to compensate for whatever increase in the cost of living has been calculated. Both parties to the above set up, more than anything else, depend on the gentlemanly agreement of the other side, and the confidence that they will not break the unwritten rules.

Whereas, however, the unions, to their discredit, are essentially national organisations whose fraternal delegates would never dream of advocating real international action on vital matters, governments are involved in international politics, and cannot follow the routine so doggedly. It has been decided, and it

is only by electoral luck that it happens to be a Tory government, that the time has come when assumption one must go, the rising price spiral must at least be slowed down, and with it assumption two; no more automatic wage increases. Hence the collapse of assumption three; the government is no longer going to adhere to the rules!

This action presents a challenge on two levels. To the bus workers it is a blow to the pocket. Where prices have gone up over the past eighteen months, the worker and his family will have to do with less, instead of having a little more money to spend on that commodity. To the union leader the blow comes to his position. From the General Secretary through the serried ranks of minor officials the fear spreads that "the accepted machinery is breaking down", that no longer will the duties of a union leader consist of friendly conversations with employers, having as foregone conclusions an increase of half what was asked for.

The result was that the bus strike, although supported by the majority of the workers, was launched officially, and under the firm control of the leaders. It is not a strike of workers against definite grievances which demand correction, although the grievances are there true enough. It is largely a "political" strike, caused by a combination of bluff and counter-bluff breaking down, and forcing a reluctant Mr. Cousins to carry out threats which he had been making more or less as a matter of form. This is why so much emphasis has been placed on what seems like a 'mystique' of striking. Having been content for years to regard industrial action as something of the past, which could only be dusted up and used again under the greatest provocation, they have forgotten what in practice a large-scale strike is.

In the simpler periods of capitalism it was possible to strike against a particular employer, and by the pressure of financial loss, force him to give way on

Continued on p. 4

Discrimination in U.S. & Rhodesia

IT was reported from the United States at the beginning of the week that further acts of brutal violence in Dawson, a small Georgia town, have caused the death of two Negroes. Not caused on this occasion by an unruly mob but by the police in the course of their "duties". The F.B.I. is now investigating a whole series of cases which might well have never come to light if the police had not been involved in the deaths of these two men who, it is claimed, were resisting arrest: One was shot in his back yard the other, "pulled senseless into court and died from a crushed skull".

In Dawson, police enforce a 11 p.m. curfew and any Negro found on the street after this time is jailed. The white man has frightening powers in this little town and justice is strictly his privilege. In "democratic" Britain the power to vote is regarded as every citizen's right (over the age of 21), but in Dawson "twenty-four Negroes who tried to register to vote—most of them teachers—were 'failed'. One teacher, a man with a degree 'failed' a test for illiterate voters and was sacked from his job".

But the British people should not be too complacent about British democracy, or how well-treated are 'our' coloured. Britain's refined (and sometimes not so refined) methods of racial repression in the Colonies can be just as horrible as the cruder tactics used in the deep backward South.

In this issue of FREEDOM we reprint a letter written by African prisoners who have enjoyed for five terrible years the benefits of British prison methods in Kenya—for black men.

We could cite innumerable examples of cruelty and deliberate sadistic torture carried out by the British authorities against 'the natives' in countries which they have conquered. We do not suppose that torture has been official policy, but we do know that in many cases which have been made public over the last few years, officialdom has closed its eyes to brutal methods which it knew were being used in Colonial prisons.

Physical suffering is one way of keeping people under. Another is by the deprivation of their basic human dignity by legislating for racial discrimination. British Colonial Administration has little to learn from the South.

In Southern Rhodesia last week any hopes for a more 'liberal' policy died with the total defeat of Garfield Todd's United Rhodesia Party in the elections—all candidates were defeated. The voting for seats went in favour of the United Federal Party which is supposed to be 'moderate'. Nevertheless the Dominion Party which favours South Africa's racial policies gained twelve seats to the United Federal Party's eighteen.

As an example of how this moderate party intends to continue British type democracy in Rhodesia, let us quote from their leader, Sir Edgar Whitehead, on labour relations (*News Chronicle* June 6th):

"A 'Poor White' population cannot be allowed to develop in Southern Rhodesia, says Sir Edgar Whitehead, the Premier, explaining his statement that certain jobs must have to be reserved for whites. 'The growth of a class of unskilled Europeans could result in undercutting by Africans. This would antagonise the whites'."

And After De Gaulle?

IT was inevitable that once General de Gaulle opened his mouth he stood to lose some of his more fanatical sponsors without necessarily winning support among his opponents. Last week in Algiers in spite of the monster demonstrations that were laid on for his visit, and his (as it turned out, ambiguous) opening words "J'ai compris," de Gaulle, refused to be drawn by his militant sponsors into making the kind of speech which would add fuel to the flames of their rebelliousness. On the contrary, one felt that the General was giving them an elementary lesson in the game of politics. Their *putsch* had provided the psychological climate in metropolitan France for the return of a strong man at the helm of government, but once in power they were the first elements he must needs seek to curb.

It's obvious! In the eyes of the public, French politics and politicians were *pourri* (rotten), and the insurrection in Algeria, followed in Corsica by a hint of the things to come (which we still think was a bluff to hide the rebels' weakness in France itself), precipitated the "legalisation" of de Gaulle without more than vocal resistance from the Left. The General from his reception in

the Assembly and in the Press, knew that he could sleep in peace (for the time being, at least) so far as metropolitan France was concerned. It was his sponsors, in Algeria, who now had to be told that *their* man was in power, and this meant that it was he, and not they, who henceforth would issue the orders!

It appears that de Gaulle has persuaded the army to toe the line (one no longer reads pronouncements by General Massu; he has presumably returned to his proper task of killing *Muslim* rebels—and with considerable success according to reports). But for politicians such as Soustelle and Delbeque, and the *ultras* among the French colonialists, de Gaulle's programme for Algeria stinks of liberalism and his almost sympathetic references to the courage of the F.L.N. (the Arab resistance movement) were heresies. Delbeque's cry from the heart "Have we crossed the Rubicon to go fishing" must have been echoed by many an Algerian *ultra* since last week's visitation!

On the other hand, the General's promises of integration, referendums and universal suffrage in Algeria are winning him few new friends in France. His critics declare that in

Continued on p. 3

**FREEDOM needs
Money & New
Readers?**

please !

REPORT ON THE CO-OPS - 5

(Continued from previous issue)

ALTHOUGH the Co-operative Independent Commission claim that their proposals for management, which I discussed last week, would not detract from democratic control but, on the contrary, enhance it, they made no attempt to analyse the meaning of democracy. Their whole argument, in fact, is based on an implicit theory of democracy which is by no means universally accepted, least of all in the Co-operative Movement.

If one examines critically the verbiage which passes as the literature on democracy, it is clear that there are two main theories of democracy competing to-day. The first, or 'classical' theory sees democracy as essentially a system of self-government—an institutional arrangement whereby men, either directly or indirectly, through representatives, govern themselves. The second and more fashionable theory sees democracy as essentially a system of responsible government. The protagonists of the latter theory accept, or more commonly assume, that self-government is impossible; all government is government by the few, whether in the name of the one, the few, or the many. The theory is really a theory of oligarchy but this term is avoided because of its emotive associations and also because it is believed that oligarchy is all right so long as the rulers act responsibly, i.e. in the interests of the ruled.

It is this second theory which the Commission employs when they argue that their management proposals are democratic. And the substance of my argument last week challenging this conclusion might be re-phrased by saying that their proposals would in practice result, not in responsible but in irresponsible oligarchy—the ruling few in this instance being the chief officials or managers of the Co-ops.

It is patently clear that whatever theorists have hitherto meant when they talked of 'Co-operative democracy' they have not meant 'Co-operative responsible oligarchy'. Co-operative government (in theory at least) is a blend of direct and indirect self-government: direct in that the members may participate in the government process by attending the sovereign assembly or business meeting; indirect in that the members elect an executive body—the management committee—to act on their behalf in between business meetings. No amount of talk about 'democratic control' can alter the fact that the management proposals of the Commission would involve a radical diminution of the element of self-government that still exists, however imperfectly, in most retail Co-ops. at the present time.

While the Commission clearly assumes in this part of its Report that democracy means responsible rather than self-government, it is not really aware of what it is doing. This becomes obvious when one looks at their proposals on amalgamation. On this question they accept the traditional Co-operative principle of the local autonomous society. They reject therefore the proposal in the Minority Report by Col. S. J. L. Hardie, ex-boss of the ex-Socialist Iron and Steel Corpora-

tion, which calls for two national societies—one for Scotland and one for England and Wales—and ultimately for just one national (or should it be international?) society. (Hardie's proposal, incidentally, is not novel. It was made as long ago as 1906 but it has not gained in attractiveness in the intervening 50-odd years. The Minority Report reads like a bureaucrat's paradise and an anarchist's nightmare). In rejecting the idea of a national society in favour of local societies, the majority of the Commission uses arguments which only make sense in terms of the classical theory of democracy. In short, the Commission assumes both competing theories of democracy, using in turn the theory which happens to suit their particular argument.

While the Commission accepts the principle of the local autonomous society, it proposes a wholesale plan of amalgamation by which the number of retail societies would be reduced from the present 950-odd to an 'ideal number' of 200-300, each society being based on a 'natural' shopping catchment area. It is at this point that the Commission's inconsistency or muddle about democracy really becomes evident. If the members of the Commission had been clearer in their own minds about the meaning of democracy, it

is possible that they would have faced squarely the fact that self-government works best—can indeed only work—in a small society. The smaller the society, the more chance of real self-government—the limiting case being the anarchist ideal of self-government or the sovereignty of the individual. (In this respect anarchism may be seen as a form of radical classical democracy.) As it is, the Commission touch the matter only obliquely when they discuss the possibility that amalgamation on the scale envisaged will lead to a decline in member participation in the government of their societies.

The possibility is a very real one. The decline over the last 30 years in the already abysmally low level of participation in Co-operatives, revealed in a recent study of Messrs. Banks and Ostergaard, is undoubtedly partly accounted for by such amalgamation as there has been during that period—roughly 10 societies per year. If the future Co-op. Movement envisaged in the Report has, say, 250 societies the average society (on current membership figures) will have a membership of 50,000. If present experience is any guide—which of course, in the changed circumstances it may not be—we may expect the proportion attending business meetings to be roughly halved. The Commission does not, to use its own language, take 'too serious' a view of this. The reasons it gives for this somewhat complacent attitude are: first, size is not the only factor accounting for low participation; secondly, amalgamation might be accompanied by an intensified effort to increase participation; and, thirdly, if a choice has to be made between amalgamation and participation, it should not 'automatically' be made in favour of the latter. Each of these reasons deserves an obvious retort: first, while size is not the only factor accounting for low participation, all the evidence points to it being the most important single factor; secondly, no one has yet found the way to halt the decline in, let alone to increase, participation; and, thirdly, 'Oh, yeah!' The last retort needs

to be expressed with the maximum of irony. Whenever the question of amalgamation has been discussed in the past, its effect on participation has not even been the last thing to be considered: it has not been considered at all: the discussion has invariably been exclusively in terms of business efficiency or in terms of effect on the 'vested interests' involved—the position of the displaced employees, officials and committeemen.

However, the Commission's point that the possibility of lower participation is not an insuperable objection to amalgamation may be accepted. The proportion participation may be halved, but, then, this only mean that 0.25% of the members will attend rather than 0.5%. One may well doubt whether this will make much difference. In any case, it is clear that the level of participation is only a crude index of the extent of democracy in an organisation. A low level of participation does not necessarily mean that a voluntary association is not democratic, just as a high level does not necessarily mean the opposite. We are all, in this day and age, familiar enough with polls of 99.9% in the case of the T.G.W.U., and polls of 105%. At the most, the level of participation is an index of democratic potential.

Apart from lowering participation, amalgamation is likely to have important consequential effects on the character of Co-op. democracy. If we extrapolate the results of the current investigation of the social composition of the Co-op. management committees and assume that the future large societies will be similar to the present large societies, we may expect the Commission's organised Movement to display the following characteristics. The average age of Co-op. directors will be reduced: a halt will be called to the 'gerontological revolution' which is so marked a feature of present-day Co-ops., especially the smaller ones. Proportionately more women directors will be elected and, perhaps as a consequence, the amount

Continued on p. 3

BOOK REVIEWS

Juvenile Delinquency

DELINQUENT BOYS by A. Cohen. The Free Press, Glencot, Illinois, \$3.50.

THE CIRCLE OF GUILT, by F. Wertham. Dobson, 18s.

SOME youths meet on a New York street. A gun goes off and one of them drops dead. Who is to blame?

According to Dr. Wertham, blood-thirsty comics are at the root of it all. Social workers who maintain that these macabre pulp magazines are a symptom of a sick society rather than a primary cause of delinquency are dismissed with contempt. If Dr. Wertham practises medicine along the same lines, all his patients presenting the symptom of a fever will one day be dug out of a deep freeze, very dead.

Dr. Wertham is understandably beside himself with anger, but his indiscriminate flailing at unidentified forces of darkness does his cause more harm than good. Of course there is something wrong with a social system that drives young people to crimes of violence, but in attacking social scientists for their attempt to analyse the problem Dr. Wertham waves his Achilles heel in the air—an undignified posture at the best of times. He is a humanitarian with a training in medicine that is of little use when it comes to understanding human behaviour in a social context.

★

THOSE who would prefer some real insight into the problems of delinquency to fulminating "agin sin" will find it in an excellent analysis of the culture of the gang by Dr. Cohen. No less of a humanitarian, Dr. Cohen is a well-informed social scientist who knows that unbridled sympathy clouds the sorrowful eye and leads to faulty judgments. If we are to help the delinquent in any radical sense we must understand what it is he is protesting against and why his protest takes such a destructive form. Only then can we hope to put a finger on the relevant faults in the social system. Unfortunately, the remedy proves to be more drastic and less simple-minded than suppressing *Dracula* and *Superman*.

To put matters in an over-polished nutshell, any highly competitive society which handicaps some of its most active members from the word go is asking for trouble. Gangs flourish in the working class areas of cities among adolescents, mainly boys, who are on the threshold of the economic struggle. Not only do they find themselves with a none too firm grip on the bottom rung of the ladder, but the guys above seem to make a point of treading on their bare knuckles with hobnailed boots. Goad someone into competing and deny him a chance to

win with the rules as they are, and you are inviting him to break the rules.

Cohen knows his sociology and his delinquents, having made a first-hand study of both. Given an excess of Cohens over Werthams there is hope for a rational solution. Given an excess of Werthams over Cohens and gang warfare should continue unabated, without the benefit of comics.

R.T.G.

'Brighter than a Thousand Suns'

WHY did the scientists produce atomic bombs? Why did they allow them to be used? What sort of people are the atomic scientists? These questions are answered by Dr. Robert Jungk's book *Brighter Than a Thousand Suns* (Gollancz, 21s.), which gives the moral and political history of the men who produced the atomic and hydrogen bombs. Of these scientists some were Jews and a number had come to America to escape Nazism. They were afraid that their counterparts in Germany would produce the atomic bomb first and Hitler would get a weapon with which to conquer the world. Einstein appealed to Roosevelt to speed the production of an American bomb. In fact the more eminent scientists in Germany showed great responsibility. They realised the destruction such a weapon could cause and deliberately held up its development there. In America Oppenheimer was given charge of the project at Los Alamos to harness atomic power for war purposes. His associates lost their scruples in the excitement of new invention and in the race to forestall the enemy.

They had put their trust in the 'democratic' state and handed over this terrifying new weapon to the military authorities. Many of them were horrified that the atomic bomb should be dropped on a city, killing men, women and children indiscriminately. They expected some warning to be given, some demonstration of the bomb's power or at least that it would be used only on purely military bases. Other atomic scientists could not escape a sense of elation at the success of their efforts. Robert Brode, an American physicist said: "We were naturally shocked by the effect our weapon had produced and in particular because the bomb had not been aimed, as we had assumed, specifically at the military establishments in Hiroshima, but dropped in the centre of the town. But if I am to tell the whole truth I must confess that our relief was really greater than our horror. For at last our families and friends . . . realised that we, too, had been doing our duty. Finally we

ourselves also learned that our work had not been in vain. Speaking for myself, I can say that I had no feelings of guilt."

On the contrary, Higginbotham, an electronics specialist, wrote to his mother: "I am not a bit proud of the job we have done . . . the only reason for doing it was to beat the rest of the world to a draw . . . perhaps this is so devastating that man will be forced to be peaceful. The alternative to peace is now unthinkable. But unfortunately there will always be some who don't think . . ." A third scientist who worked on the bomb wrote: "I looked forward with dread to the employment of this 'better' bomb. I hoped that it would not be used, and trembled at the mere thought of the devastation it would cause. And yet, to be quite frank, I was desperately anxious to find out whether this type of bomb would also do what was expected of it, in short, whether its intricate mechanism would work. These were dreadful thoughts, I know. But I could not get them out of my head."

With the dropping of the bomb Oppenheimer became a public hero. He became closely associated with the military and civil authorities and used his prestige to calm the worries of the young scientists, who wished to press for some public supervision and control of atomic energy. Their suspicions were aroused and only by extensive lobbying and agitation did they prevent atomic research development being handed over to direct military control.

But it was the situation of Pandora's Box. The knowledge of atomic power once let loose into the world was now out of the control of its discoverers. All the old dreams of patriotism and prejudice were brought to bear in quietening the consciences of the scientists. As early as 1946 a group of pacifist workers planned a demonstration at Oak Ridge against the use of atomic power for war purposes only to be stopped by the C.I.O. union organisers who wanted to protect the jobs of their members. Hans Bethe campaigned against the hydrogen bomb and with other leading physicists

sent a statement to Truman in 1950, containing these words: "We believe that no nation has the right to use such a bomb, no matter how righteous its cause. This bomb is no longer a weapon of war but a means of extermination of whole populations."

Other scientists formed the "Society for Social Responsibility in Science", whose members instead of hoping for government initiative in disarmament took personal decisions about their work and even if it meant giving up their jobs, agreed to take no part in the arms race. The Korean War and the fear of communism were used by the authorities to justify their actions. One victim of the witch-hunt was Oppenheimer himself, who had more than anyone served the State's interests.

Dr. Jungk's book gives a calm and factual account that is both fascinating and impressive. His scientists are neither the supermen nor the monsters of popular mythology. They are in fact men with human strengths and weaknesses, cut off by their absorption in their work very often from harsh political realities and from the consequences of their acts. They compare not unfavourably with the writers and the clergy, the accepted mouthpieces and consciences of our specialised modern community.

The author gives no solution to the problem of nuclear power but from his account there emerges clearly the fact that the H-Bomb is just one, though the most terrible, manifestation of modern social ills. It could not have been produced without the centralised State and the willingness of men to serve that State. It could not have been produced without fear of the external enemy, without tension, uneasiness, mental sickness and an unhealthy attitude to sex. The Bomb is one aspect of this vast social problem and the only answer is personal responsibility for all one's actions, concern and aid for one's fellow men irrespective of national frontiers and political divisions.

F.T.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

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

New Books . . .

From the Other Shore
Alexander Herzen 16/-
The Naked God Howard Fast 25/-
Private Life Alan Hackney 13/6
Brighter than a Thousand Suns
Robert Jungk 21/-

Second-Hand . . .

What the Negro Wants
W. E. Du Bois &c. 5/-
Trial of a Judge
Stephen Spender 5/-
Roads to Freedom
Bertrand Russell 4/6
TVA: Democracy on the March
David E. Lilienthal 3/6
The Fields at Evening
Ethel Mennin 4/-
The Man in the Thick Lead Suit
Daniel Lang 3/6
So the World Goes
J. W. Sullivan 3/-
Sailor on Horseback Irving Stone 3/6
Sasha A. Kuprin 2/6
Authority and the Individual
Bertrand Russell 3/6
The Healing of Nations
Edward Carpenter 3/6
The Fortune Douglas Goldring 4/-
Afterthoughts on the U.S.S.R.
André Gide 3/6
The Chinese Communists
Stuart Gelder 4/-
The Smaller Democracies
Sir E. D. Simon 2/6
Letters from an Outpost
Alex Comfort 3/-
England's Voice of Freedom
Henry W. Nevins 3/6
Quack! Quack! Leonard Woolf 3/-
Programme for Survival
Lewis Mumford 2/6
Back from the U.S.S.R.
André Gide 3/6

Periodicals . . .

Liberation May 1/9

We can supply ANY book required, including text-books. Please supply publisher's name if possible, but if not, we can find it. Scarce and out-of-print books searched for—and frequently found!

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

27, RED LION STREET,
LONDON, W.C.1

FINDING A WAY OUT

Vol. 19, No. 24. June 14, 1958.

And After de Gaulle

Continued from p. 1

Integration is a financial* and political impossibility. They apparently will not hinder his efforts, but have no faith in their succeeding. So as the F.L.N. are concerned all integration and equality the General can dispense is no substitute for their dreams of independence. They probably—and to our minds rightly—view the General's symbolic approach as a tactic to undermine their influence among the Muslim population, and that once the Muslim nationalists are isolated from the population the process of "cleaning them up" will have chances of success. For after all, what hope is there for Algeria if he cannot silence the resistance movement? And so far an army of 400,000 men armed with modern weapons has not succeeded; if anything it has strengthened the will to resist among the Muslim population.

★

It is clear that the French crisis remains, potentially as explosive as it was a month ago. The advent of de Gaulle has temporarily halted the purely vulgar struggle of men for positions of authority. But with his "authority" and "prestige" de Gaulle cannot offer solutions which will be acceptable to all sides. If he is sure of the army he may be able to impose a policy which all will have to accept but for how long would that last? Previous French governments have played the *colons'* game for the past three years (it is said that France has been governed from Algeria) without on the one hand satisfying them or on the other forcing the F.L.N. to capitulate. To attempt to reconcile the privileged status of the 1½ million French Algerians with the nationalistic aspirations of the under-privileged 8 million Muslims, is to ask the former to give up their privileges or the latter to accept that the future shall be as hopeless and miserable as the past.

Time is on the side of the Muslims in Algeria. The French Algerians can only maintain their privileged positions now with the aid of an army of occupation which is manned, armed and financed by the people of metropolitan France. How much longer will national pride override such considerations as that young Frenchmen are dying, or having to spend long years in the army, or that hundreds of millions of pounds are spent each year simply to prolong a situation which

*Last week's *Express* goes into the costs of providing the rapidly growing Muslim population (250,000 per annum) with the housing, education and living conditions which the "equality" which complete integration would demand, and shows that the necessary capitalisation in Algeria, which would have to come from France, would demand sacrifices in the accepted standards of living in France which would probably make the average Frenchman who dreams of Algeria as an integral part of France revise his ideas! The spending power of the 8 million Muslims in Algeria is at present 16,000 francs a year per head compared with 300,000 in France. To raise the standard of living in Algeria by only 2 per cent. would involve the investment of more than £100 million now and an ever-increasing amount each year to keep up with the present rate of increase in population.

Integration would mean that in the French Assembly within a foreseeable future a quarter of the Deputies would come from Algeria and, if the promises of integration and equality are kept, most of them would naturally be Muslims since they outnumber the French Algerians by 8 to 1!

I ONCE met Mr. Julius Braunthal at about the time of his retirement from being secretary of the Socialist International. "Congratulations," I said, "What for?" he asked. "On ceasing to be a politician," I was reminded of this when the time came for questions at a meeting addressed by Jayaprakash Narayan at the Mahatma Gandhi Hall in Fitzroy Square last week. JP, a tall, handsome, soft-spoken man in his fifties, had talked in very much the same terms as in his 'testament' summarised at length in last week's *FREEDOM*. But when members of the audience of Indian students and British socialists questioned him it became obvious that his retirement from political activity and his decision to work for a different kind of socialism, made his admirers disappointed or resentful, or just puzzled. They admired him for having been a political leader. We, on the other hand, are interested in him for having stopped being one.

Some, in the form of questions, were giving him elementary lessons on the necessity of political action (which is a rather comical way of addressing a man who was a party boss for twenty years), others were probing into the possibility of a political comeback. They felt, it was evident, that they had been let down by JP: I heard this feeling expressed very strongly a couple of years ago when Asoka Mehta, who succeeded Jayaprakash as leader of the Praja Socialist Party was in London. He was asked about the future of Indian socialism after the deviation of JP. In reply he listed the achievements of Vinoba Bhave's Bhoodan movement, the land gifts, the several thousand villages which had decided to pool their land: the erosion, as he put it, of the whole concept of ownership. "I wouldn't call this a deviation from socialism," said Asoka Mehta, "for this is what socialism is about."

JP for his part last week was anxious to emphasise that he had no quarrel with his former colleagues. "If they hope to build socialism by parliamentary action," he said, "Let them do so." And he spoke of his activities in attempting to change society at the village level as the 'third limb' of the socialist movement. "If it is the third limb," my neighbour in the hall whispered, "its function is to trip up the other two!" I think he was right, and JP wrong on this point. The socialism which seeks to build a stateless commonwealth from below is bound to come into conflict with the socialism which seeks to capture the machinery of the state in order to use it for its own purposes. This conflict is

is neither just nor even practicable?

Perhaps the insurrection in Algiers last month will prove to be not a new lease of life for French Algeria, but the last attempt by the *colons* to stave off the inevitable achievement of Algerian independence. (It is not without significance that already a number of the wealthiest French Algerians have left the country—with their fortunes of course!) We say "inevitably" because with all its faults the resistance movement of Algeria fights for a better cause than the *colons*, and not with conscript armies, but with its own forces and resources.

★

SURELY the millions of workers in France who are so well organised in their unions and their political parties that they have lost their individual initiative, would do well to ponder on the resistance offered by the Algerians to the cream of France's military power. It may well give them a clue to the humiliations they have suffered during the past month, and ideas for dealing with the crises that lie ahead.

"The people," declares Claude Bourdet in last week's *France Observateur*, "have lost a battle. They have not lost the war." Yes, but they lost the battle because they did not fight. They will surely lose the "war" too if they continue to rely on the police, the C.R.S. and their political leaders to fight their battles for them.

as old as the socialist movement itself. It was the conflict between the adherents of Marx and those of Bakunin in the First International and it is the difference between anarchism and political socialism to-day. JP must be perfectly aware of this conflict, and has made his choice. He declared several years ago that

"if our ultimate aim is to do without the State, we must here and now create the conditions in which the people will rely more and more on themselves and less and less on the State. No one can tell whether the State will ever completely disappear but if we accept the ideals of a non-violent democracy, we must begin to work for it. It need hardly be added that a people who want to do without the State or who wish to lean on it as little as possible would be a self-regulated people—self-disciplined, just and mutually co-operative . . . War is not likely to be abolished by governments. Only the people who have freed themselves from their governments can do it."

And in one of his village speeches, he made the opposition between his aims and those of parliamentary socialism even more clear:

"Bhoodan does not aim at capturing the State in order to use it for its ends. As a corollary, it does not wish to create or become a political party in order to capture the State. It aims rather at persuading the people, independently of what the State may or may not want, to carry out a revolution in their own lives, and through that a revolution in society. It aims further at creating those conditions in which the people may manage their affairs directly, without the intervention of parties and parliaments . . . In the present world the State not only in its totalitarian form but also in its

welfare variety is assuming larger and larger powers and responsibilities. The Welfare State, in the name of welfare threatens as much to enslave man to the State as does the totalitarian State. The people must cry a halt to this creeping paralysis . . ."

★

ANOTHER meeting in another city, and another one-time politico trying to explain how, to use Jayaprakash's words, "it became clear to me that politics could not deliver the goods". On March 1st, at the annual dinner of the League for Mutual Aid, in the Hotel Martinique, New York, Dwight Macdonald was explaining "Why I Am No Longer A Socialist". Like JP he described his evolution from the days when he was a revolutionary Marxist, and, after listing the defects of a great many isms, said: "To conclude on a somewhat more positive note, I want to say a few words in favour of anarchism, which is the only positive thing I can say now." He went on to discuss the disputes of the 1870's between Bakunin and Marx, concluding that in the light of subsequent history, Bakunin was right and Marx wrong, and contrasted his own definition of anarchism with that of the (American) Oxford dictionary:

"Now you all know what anarchism means—it means (to me at least) a lack of belief in all forms of authority imposed by force. And a belief in the right and the ability of the individual to decide anything that is important to him by his own free choice in voluntary co-operation with other people. The word *anarchist* comes from the Greek 'an' meaning 'without', 'archist' meaning 'leader', and the Oxford dictionary again

gives a wonderful definition of it: 'One who admits of no ruling power, one who upsets civil power, absence of government, a state of lawlessness due to the absence or inefficiency of the supreme power, political disorder.' Now this definition is absurd. This is the cartoonist's definition of anarchism, as being something which means disorder. It doesn't mean this at all!"

He then answered in advance the kind of objection he was likely to get from his audience:

"If you did have to-morrow, suddenly, anarchy in the sense of all laws and all policemen being abolished overnight, by a magic ray or something, of course you would have disorder. But obviously this isn't what is meant; these precesses take a long time; you gradually build up from groups of people who assert themselves against control, but in co-operation with other people who will carry on if it ever happens. I'm not so sure it's going to happen. Actually, a great many things right now are carried on independently of the State: one's family relations, trade unions, chambers of commerce, and all kinds of things are carried on without any State control or State power. Kropotkin says, 'Harmony is obtained not by submission to law, by obedience to authority, but by free agreement between the various groups, territorial and professional, freely constituted for the sake of production and consumption, and also for the satisfaction of the infinite variety of needs and aspirations of a civilised being.' In other words, anarchists believe that this is a higher kind of order, more creative, enjoyable and productive . . ."

★

ALL pretty elementary stuff for Dwight, even in an after-dinner speech. But he evidently found, just like Jayaprakash Narayan, how hard it is, in talking to people whose ways of thought are essentially political, to convince them that you really mean what you are saying. JP indeed writes: "Almost every day some one or another raises the question with me why at all should I have given up politics. The faith and hope that the people seem to repose in politics appear pitiable to me, but I find it difficult to explain to every one individually the rationale of my action . . . The hold of politics on the mind of the people is such, and its alternative is in such an incipient state yet, that I shall not probably be able to persuade many . . ."

This incipient state of the alternatives to political and authoritarian institutions is the stumbling block which prevents both their growth and their serious acceptance as a worth-while aim for people who are anxious to bring about social change. And this is the reason for the extraordinary importance of all the exploration of alternatives represented by the Bhoodan movement in India, the Spanish collectives of 1936, the Jewish Kibbutzim, the French communities of work, even the producer co-operative movement in this country. What lessons can they teach us? What are the factors leading to their growth or decline? What would happen if the effort that is directed into political power-chasing were put instead into this kind of activity? These are the kind of questions to which the political evolution of people like Jayaprakash or Dwight Macdonald give rise. And they are questions for which the anarchists should be providing answers.

C.W.

Report on the Co-ops

Continued from p. 2

expended on what passes as 'education' in the Co-op. Movement will be increased. Both these changes may be regarded as tending to make Co-op. leaders more representative of the membership as a whole. (The Commission would doubtless approve of this, since it apparently sets great store on leaders being representative and even naively assumes that the present active nucleus is generally representative of the membership—an assumption which could be exposed as a crass fallacy merely by attending one Co-op. meeting.) Other changes are likely to move in the opposite direction. Proportionately more employees will be elected as directors and, significantly enough, most of these will be employees of a managerial grade, not rank-and-file employees. Proportionately more directors active in politics, especially Labour politics, will be elected. And, finally, proportionately more directors will be

elected whose occupational status will stamp them as members of the middle, as opposed to the working, class.

No doubt the Commission would have argued if it had deigned to consider the matter, that none of these possible consequential changes presents an insuperable objection to amalgamation. But at least they would have been forced to admit that they are likely to result in a radical change in the character of Co-op. democracy.

So far I have discussed amalgamation in terms of its effects on the democratic basis of the Movement. Despite the lip-service it pays to the Co-op. tradition in this respect, the Commission, however, is not much concerned with democracy. Amalgamation, it thinks, will increase efficiency. In my next article I hope to show that it is as muddled about this as it is about democracy.

GASTON GERARD.

(To be continued)

Direct Action

Moroccan dockers won their fight to prevent 910 French troops from landing in Casablanca to-day.

For five days they refused to let French soldiers, back from leave in France, set foot ashore. They cheered to-day as they watched the liner *Koutoubia* sail off with them.

It is the second batch of troops the dockers have sent back to France. Last week they stopped 210 men from landing.

The Moroccan Government is pressing for immediate evacuation of all 40,000 French forces. France has agreed to regroup most of her outposts but wants to be able to control Algeria's western border to avoid rebel infiltrations.

Moroccan workers have already refused to refine 2,000 tons of French Sahara oil. The oil has been taken into custody.

News Chronicle 28/5/58.

FRANCO-MUSLIN "UNITY"

ALGIERS, JUNE 1.

French headquarters claimed to-day to have killed 132 rebels in a battle in the mountains west of Algiers yesterday. The French conceded that an Air France Dakota which crashed in the same area yesterday may have been hit by rebel fire. It suddenly dived to the ground and caught fire, killing the fourteen people on board.—Associated Press.

FREEDOM PRESS

SELECTIONS FROM 'FREEDOM'

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

each volume paper 7s. 6d.
cloth 10s. 6d.

The paper edition of the Selections is available to readers of *FREEDOM* at 5/- a copy

E. A. 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.

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

RUDOLF ROCKER:
Nationalism and Culture cloth 21s.

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

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.

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

TONY GIBSON:
Youth and Anarchy paper 2s.
Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.

★
Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications:
Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute cloth 3s.
Journey Through Utopia cloth 18s. (U.S.A. \$3)

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

THE PARTY SYSTEM

THE PARTY SYSTEM by Max Beloff. Background Books, 2s. 6d.

THIS is a very interestingly written pamphlet, and its author's political philosophy is given away in its first paragraph.

"All political societies except the most primitive present us with groupings to which the term 'political party' can be applied. For unless we imagine some Utopian state of affairs in which the interests of every citizen would be the same and his opinions identical with those of everyone else, it is inevitable that those whose interests or views most closely correspond should organise themselves in order to influence the decisions of the ruling authorities of the State."

It is more usual to attack Utopias roundly, on the grounds, amongst others, that people would be all identical in interests and opinions, rather than the concessive type of dismissal quoted above, but apart from that, we see that this essay sets out from the assumption that the most important matters in social life are to depend on "the decisions of the ruling authorities in the State", that such a governmental system is necessary and desirable and relatively fixed and stable in relation to social development. Add to these assumption the implicit subjective choice that democracy is the most desirable form for government to take, and then for 2s. 6d. and in 38 pages you get a nicely argued and well illustrated discussion of the rôle of party politics and the contrasting systems found within the democratic framework.

Beloff lets his knowledge, reasoning power, and ability to look at least some of the dishonesties of politics in the face take us as far as they can, without getting to the point of raising a serious doubt as to whether democratic government, or any form of government, really is the best possible way of organising social life. At the beginning of section II, which contrasts the political party systems in different European states, we find the reasonable comment "In discussing them, people naturally tend to regard what we have at home as the normal thing and what they find abroad as in some way odd or even undesirable". It is even more true, and far more important that people brought up on democracy "naturally tend to regard it as the normal thing, and the ideas of non-governmental organisation as in some way odd, or even undesirable".

Professor Beloff makes the points that

the traditional instability of French governments is not to any large degree a consequence of the electoral system, that the British system denies the Liberal party fair representation, and he admits that in France and Germany (and Italy is a further example) elected governments have altered the voting laws to increase their chances at subsequent elections. He accepts these facts without making any suggestions as to remedies for them.

That points to a weakness in his argument, which runs through that of all idealist advocates of democracy. They all realise that they are supporters of definite sectional interests, whose furtherance requires the sacrifice of the interests of large sections of the people, to be made in as little provocative way as possible, and although some of the politicians may have a little sincerity in them, and perhaps a few more of the sociologists who hang around them, their interests first and foremost are concerned with a strong and stable government, which will preserve respect for its instruments of authority. To present a façade in which it appears that the people have a legal control over the actions of the government is a secondary consideration.

I See No Ships!

"Probably not many people will set out along the road to conscientious objection in the present (Suez) crisis. We must hope, at any rate, that they may be few. . . ."

Manchester Guardian Editorial, 1/11/56.

"What has become of conscientious objectors to military service? . . . Perhaps the most surprising thing about them is that they are so few."

Manchester Guardian Reporter, 20/5/58.

* * *
Last week, in an Editorial headed "No room for religion", the Manchester Guardian deplored the intimidation of churchgoers in East Germany by the Communist rulers. The Communists, said the Guardian, invade Protestant Church Assemblies to dictate their "course of action".

In view of this display of feeling one might expect the Guardian editors to object more often and more strongly to the privileges we, in Britain, allow to the Roman Catholic Church which (in Spain for example) doesn't even allow Protestants to hold public Assemblies.

E.C.

The Bus Strike in Perspective

Continued from p. 1

the disputed point. In a Nationalisation Welfare State things are not so straightforward. The State is the employer of a large proportion of workers, and therefore their enemy in industrial disputes. At this point the theory of socialism breaks down, since all socialists regard the State as being somehow or other their saviour, whatever reservations they may have. But if the new enemy is more formidable, he does at least present a wider target. If the real concern of the bus strike organisers had been to win this particular dispute, they would have found out, by study and experiment, the best possible ways of hurting the government, avoiding hurt to the workers, and minimising the kind of inconvenience to ordinary people which does not contribute to the pressure on the government. Some of the ways of doing this were suggested in FREEDOM 17/5/58, one day strikes in a different area every day, refusal to collect fares, which could have caused dislocation in the City, upset the L.T.E. plans, besides showing to everyone that the bus workers were an essential part of the smooth organisation of travel in London. Guerrilla strikes would also have been far more effective in keeping away from work those timidly conscientious people who go to any inconvenience to themselves so as to get to work on time.

Instead of this, Cousins makes his pronouncement: "The workers are going to strike. Officially." But those words caused no chaos among employers and civil servants. They simply made arrangements to manage without the buses. Many bus workers must now be reflecting on the fact that there is no power behind the gesture of a strike, and without that, no power behind the threat. There can be nothing more demoralising than to be living on meagre strike pay

and to feel that the strike is having very little real effect.

The problem of sympathetic action is also tied up with the different points of view of workers and union leaders. The latter, while accepting the bus workers' strike, do not even at this stage want to jeopardise the negotiating machinery in their own fields. To put it briefly, political attitudes and industrial needs are clashing at every point, and the politicians are getting the upper hand, to the loss of the workers.

To those workers who are getting tired of this, and who see their differences with the union officials as being more than different opinions, but different interests, anarchism can offer the following points for consideration.

A permanent collaboration between State and workers is impossible, as their interests conflict. This is being made more and more obvious to-day.

To achieve its ends the State will use industrial action, for what else is the State but an organisation for forcing people to do work against their desires. Therefore the workers should be prepared to use it both in defence and attack.

The trade unions are so politically compromised that the only useful way of organising for industrial fights is on a local temporary level.

The union leaders are concerned with so many matters irrelevant to the workers' needs that it is futile to wait for them to arrange the sympathetic action which could win the present bus strike. It seems at the moment that the only good that can possibly come out of it will be if enough unofficial groups can exert influence to secure their ends—in defiance not only of the L.T.E. but of the transport union as well. P.H.

Much of the pamphlet is devoted to attacks on the one-party system of the Bolshevik-dominated States, and the arguments on this topic are the least satisfactory. Perhaps even the author cannot define the difference between the 'totalitarian' and 'democratic' versions of government as clearly as he would like to be able to. At the same time as attacking the tactics of Communists in the West he remarks that

"In a sense, all parties are in favour not of a two-party or multi-party system, but of a one-party system. Their activity is directed towards getting as large a share of power for themselves as possible. Ideally they would like to capture every seat in every election; and it is only the existence of competitors that prevents this happening."

Surely this is not a good way of expressing the situation in Britain. The politicians here, and in the stable democracies want a monopoly of power as much as any others, but they seek to keep it within a system, and not within a single party. All states exist as means by which a minority of the population can coerce the rest in pursuance of their interests, and it happens that in stable economic and political periods and situations, the multi-party system is the most effective way of doing this. It is more flexible, provides opportunities for those who want to rise within the system to improve it, and deviates the energies of potential revolutionaries. But it is just as difficult for individuals who are opposed to the system to do anything effective to change it as under a dictatorship. The existence of 'democratic' freedoms is something to accept with relief, but they are thanks to the economic situation, and not to the party system.

It would be interesting if all theorists of democracy were asked to state which of these they thought was the prime aim of democracy. (a) To express as closely as possible the opinion of the majority of people as to how they should be governed. (b) To provide strong, effective government. If Professor Beloff had chosen to discuss such a problem as that, it might have taken him out of the realms of "Background Books" into that of controversy, but it would have been a more interesting work. P.H.

New Law Reform Society

A Homosexual Law Reform Society has been formed. Its objective is to get the major recommendation of the Wolfenden Report on private acts between consenting adults made law. Among the committee members are Dr. J. Bronowski, Sir Basil Henriques, Miss Ethel Mannin, Lord Russell, Professor A. J. Ayer, Sir Robert Boothby, Mr. R. H. S. Crossman and Mr. Marcus Lipton. The society believes that "our present law is unjust and no longer acceptable to medical opinion, the leading spokesmen of the Christian Churches, or to humane good sense in general."

Manchester Guardian 30/5/58.

What a Deficit!

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 23

Deficit on Freedom	£460
Contributions received	£316
DEFICIT	£144

May 31 to June 5

Bakewell: D.M.* 5/-; London: S.B.* 1/9;
London: T.F. 5/-; Minneapolis: C.C. 7/-;
London: P.F. £1/0/0; Horwich: W.H.B. 4/6;
London: D.R.* 10/-; London: W.H.T. 2/6;
Glasgow: J.M. 2/6; London: D.O. 10/6.

Total	3 8 9
Previously acknowledged	313 2 10
1958 TOTAL TO DATE	£316 11 7

GIFT OF BOOKS: London: F.P.

*Indicates regular contributor.

•Have you found that new Reader for FREEDOM?
•Have you glanced at the State of the Deficit?

THE LIMITATIONS OF ANARCHISM

I THINK we already know some answers to the questions asked in "The Limitations of Anarchism" (FREEDOM 10/5/58). However these answers are only the first steps to some other questions.

Reich and Neill have taught what "self regulation" is (though this system of education was probably known before by a few people) and the importance of the behaviour of the mother to her child during the very first minutes of its existence (and even before, "if a woman with a rigid body bears a child, who can say what effect the maternal rigidity has on the new born baby?"—Neill, *The Free Child*). One of the main points is to let the child organize itself its own timetable, feeding little by little, and this point one shall never repeat too much, as a lot of libertarian-minded people don't practise it.

Of course, the answer to this is that, like anarchism, self regulation appeals to a minority of exceptional people.

Therefore, how can a grown-up be educated? I believe the answer is (and I do not know any other for the time being) through a therapy of a Reichian type—a psychoanalysis may not be enough for some people at least—Neill writes himself somewhere that his therapy with Reich did him much more good than two years of verbal psychoanalysis.

People who would have learned how

to suppress their bodily tension would naturally choose to educate their children in a "self regulated" way, and children themselves (if not the parents yet) could restore their lost unity with nature and build a free society.

Therefore the real problem is this: how can people understand they need therapy of a Reichian type? You answer, "Here we come back to the starting point." So many people have fact to recover contact with nature are imprisoned in the circle of hate.

But what do Reichian psychologists about it? How do they try to propagate their ideas? That I do not know. One hears of Reich very seldom in France.

I only think it would be a good idea if anarchists had more contacts with Reichians, and if all the libertarians want to went through a therapy of Reichian type. Then they could be rigid people they meet in the day-to-day life much more efficiently. They could even be therapists themselves without having a surgery-house and through paying another job at the same time.

By the way, let me add that I don't believe of course in the Freudian theory (related to the so-called "principles of reality") according to which it is paid the therapy to pay a lot of money. If the "anti-rigid" psychology could cure people for just as little money as possible, maybe it could help more people? Paris.

COLETTE GERMAIN

Function of Freedom

FREEDOM'S editorial reply to S.F. last week (7/6/59) was wise to point out that his views may not necessarily be shared by other readers. One example giving an entirely different opinion from his was quoted and I would like to give another.

S.F. seems to be primarily confused about the function of FREEDOM and, indeed, without an intellectual blush, after a column of word-spinning, asks what the function of FREEDOM really is. Surely a dispassionate reformer enthusing over a proposed jazz-up of the paper would establish this point first.

It has been suggested in FREEDOM on several occasions that in addition to providing a forum for discussing libertarian ideas the main function of an anarchist paper is to propagate anarchism. To some convinced anarchists who are equally convinced that they know all the answers, the presentation of news items with "an anarchist slant" may appear to be unnecessarily repetitive. But to the reader who has not yet reached this exalted position, or to the new reader who knows even less about anarchism and political plotting, national and international governmental policies, which are often made even more confusing by daily newspapers, are reduced to a proper level by anarchist analysis.

It seems essential to this writer that constant examples of governmental dishonesty and disregard of people should be given in any anarchist newspaper, and one of the best ways to do this is to utilise the rich daily supply of "meat" thrown out by politicians and tear it apart with anarchist teeth. Journalistically speaking this involves a presentation of the facts and their examination from an anarchist point of view.

For the poetry lovers (of which I am one) and the humourists (I am much too modest to give FREEDOM readers examples of my devastating wit), perhaps S.F. could form a group for the purpose of publishing a quarterly (or weekly?) magazine which could be entitled—A WEEKLY (or quarterly) PUBLICATION FOR THE DISSEMINATION OF ANARCHIST POETRY & WIT. An editorial note, which would ensure regular contributions, could be printed with each issue to the effect that all people who considered they could write poetry or witty prose should submit their manuscripts to the editors; this should ensure plenty of material to fill the wastepaper baskets. London.

A READER.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

Every Sunday at 7.30 at THE MALATESTA CLUB.

32 Percy Street, Tottenham Court Road, W.1.

LECTURE - DISCUSSIONS

JUNE 15.—Philip Holgate on WHAT CAN ANARCHISTS DO?

JUNE 22.—John Greig on FREEDOM & ITS APPLICATION

JUNE 29.—Tony Gibson on PARANOIA AS A SOCIAL FORCE

JULY 6.—Arthur W. Uloth on MAN AGAINST SOCIETY

JULY 13.—Donovan Pedely on ANARCHISM & DEMOCRACY

Questions, Discussion and Admission all free.

★ Malatesta Club ★

SWARAJ HOUSE, 32 PERCY STREET, TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD, LONDON, W.1.

ACTIVITIES

Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.
London Anarchist Group Meetings
(see Announcements Column)

Trad Jazz at the Malatesta

Every Friday and Saturday from 7.30

THE MALATESTA JAZZ BAND

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

32 Percy Street Tottenham Court Road W1

Jazz Men welcome Organised by IAC

Every Wednesday at 7.30 (prompt) BONAR THOMPSON speaks

FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

Postal Subscription Rates:

12 months 19/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)
6 months 9/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)
3 months 5/- (U.S.A. \$0.75)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies
12 months 29/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)
6 months 14/6 (U.S.A. \$2.25)

Cheques, P.O.'s and Money Orders should be made out to FREEDOM PRESS, crossed a/c Payee, and addressed to the publishers

FREEDOM PRESS

27 Red Lion Street

London, W.C.1. England

Tel.: Chancery 8364