

# Freedom

AN ANARCHIST FORTNIGHTLY

Vol. 9 No. 22

October 30th, 1948

Price Threepence

Under a Government which  
imprisons any unjustly, the  
true place for a just man is  
also prison.

THOREAU.

## WHO SHALL CONTROL THE UNIONS?

### SIGNIFICANCE OF THE HORNER-LAWTHER CLASH

THE struggle between Will Lawther and Arthur Horner is not an isolated affair, much less a merely personal quarrel; it represents a fundamental clash between the Labour Party and the Communists which extends to all unions and even into the international sphere. Lawther and Horner are personally friendly to each other; what is more, their industrial policy has been almost indistinguishable in the past, so much so that Lawther has often been regarded as a fellow traveller. The issue that divides them now may seem to be one of policy, but it is actually a question of who is to be boss—not Lawther or Horner in the miners' union, but Labour Party or Communists in the Trade Union movement.

It would be very interesting to know which side initiated the showdown; Horner's and Lawther's statements shed no real light on this question, and are to be taken as seriously as any other political polemical gambits. At the time of writing this, the General Council of the T.U.C. is about to meet (Wednesday, 27/10/48), and the Executive of the Mineworkers' Union the following day—after this issue of *Freedom* will have gone to press. This article, therefore, will have to confine itself to generalities, to surveying the position as a whole. Actually the perspective thus gained will probably prove more useful than the details of the controversy which will only be available after the union meetings.

### Political Control of the Unions

The substance of the Mineworkers' Union Executive's complaint against Horner is that he has used his position as secretary to further the views of the Communist Party rather than those of the Mineworkers' Union as a whole. For what it is worth there seems to be undoubted substance in this charge. But what about the Labour Party Trade Union leaders? Do they not use their union positions to advance the political ends of the social democrats? Of course, since the Labour Party have a majority of posts in trade union officialdom, the policy they carry out has an air of democracy about it because it is endorsed by the various executives involved. But they no more carry out the views of the rank and file than the Communists do. Instances are the acceptance of such measures as the Essential Works Order during the war, the No-Strike agreement (with the bosses, not the men), the endorsement of the government's wage pegging proposals, and so on. If Horner is found formally guilty, he will be judged by his fellow offenders.

For, of course, the truth is that the whole of the structure of the unions is designed for their use in political ends. If they were controlled from below by the workers themselves this would be impossible, but their strongly centralized structure, with the hierarchy of officials makes them far more a weapon in the hands of political parties

than one to be wielded by the workers.

Whatever the apparent grounds for the present showdown, the real issue is that the Labour Party members do not object to political control of the unions in itself, they only dislike it when other parties acquire partial control. The whole position is implicit in the remark of W. J. Brown, himself a union official of long standing, in an article on the Lawther-Horner dispute in the *Evening Standard* (21/10/48). Mr. Brown writes: "Long ago the Communists saw clearly that their hope of success lay not in converting the masses to Communism, but in penetrating, capturing and subverting the existing organs of society. And of all those organs the trade unions were easily the most important." The antithesis between the masses and the institutions of society, not excepting their own alleged organs of struggle, the unions, is here taken for granted. And of course W. J. Brown is right to recognise the gulf that exists.

### The Miners' Strike in France

There seems no doubt that the miners' strike in France will also be directed to serve the ends of the French Communist Party—which is as much as to say the ends of Russian foreign policy—though its apparent justification lies in the grievances of the French miners. The Communists in the C.G.T. having cheerfully led the French miners into positions of extreme danger involving severe clashes with the police will be guided in their conduct of the struggle not by the needs of the miners, though of course they will have to take these into account for the sake of their own prestige, but by the present policy of Russia. Indeed it is amusing to hear Horner talking of the obligations of international solidarity in the workers' struggle, when, during the war the Communists not merely opposed strikes, but actually ordered their party members to go to work as blacklegs. International solidarity, and not even solidarity with neighbouring places of work, or even their fellow workers in their own trade could then make them disobey the dictates of the Kremlin. So we are not greatly impressed by Horner's new-found international feelings of solidarity.

### Social Democrats and Russia

The social democrats themselves have adopted such an equivocal attitude towards Russia that they are now harvesting the results of their attitude in the past. Labour Party officials know well enough what the general situation in Russia is, how the trade unions are run and so on. But because they think that Russia was held in esteem by the workers, and that they would lose support by speaking the truth about it, they have kept quiet about Russian affairs in the past, or have even joined in the lip service which the wartime alliance with the Soviet Union made expedient. In politics it is not the truth

(Continued on page 4)

## Politics Behind French Strikes

THE situation in France offers a tragic illustration of the results of political infiltration in the working-class struggle. To the privations which necessarily result from a strike which has already lasted four weeks has been added the more dramatic sufferings caused by the clashes between the strikers and the Government's armed forces. Workers have been killed and wounded, mines have been flooded and put out of action for months to come. And yet as the struggle is amplified the aims of the strikers instead of becoming bolder, appear more and more insignificant. The demands for wage increases are already too small to cover the rapid rise in the cost of living and the other demands seem ridiculously small compared with the strength displayed by the strikers.

It is obvious that the miners have genuine grievances and that they command the sympathy, and to a great extent the solidarity, of a large section of the French working-class as has been shown by strikes which have taken place in other industries. How is it then that the miners have been unable to obtain satisfaction for

the modest demands they put forward a few weeks ago?

The explanation is to be found in the unwillingness of the Communist controlled C.G.T. (General Confederation of Labour) to press the struggle with sufficient energy to secure victory. We are witnessing what may appear at first sight a paradoxical situation. We see that, on the one hand, the French C.P. seems to give complete support to the strikers and welcome an open clash between the forces of repression of the government and the miners, but on the other hand we see that it refuses to take a line of action which would ensure a swift and complete victory for the miners. As the French Anarchist Federation pointed out from the beginning only an unlimited general strike for aims worthy of the sacrifices which the strike would cause would have secured them victory.

The C.G.T. and the Communist Party are, however, less interested in the aims to be achieved by the strike than in the political capital it can make out of it. As its record shows, the C.P. has always been liberal with workers' lives; since the liberation it has boastfully adopted the title of "le parti des fusillés" because of the great number of Communists shot during the German occupation. A few dozen workers shot by the Ministry of the Interior's forces will justify the title of murderers which the C.P. has been hurling at the government during the past few weeks and will also give trade union leaders an opportunity to bathe in the glory of their martyrdom (T.U. leaders never get killed, however). In fact, the wounded and the dead will not give the measure of Communist militancy but rather of their betrayal.

### Rolling Strikes

If the Communist Party had wished to secure a rapid victory for the miners it would not have discouraged a general strike. The C.G.T. at its Congress recently held in Paris voted resolutely against a general strike and favoured instead the *grèves tournantes* (revolving or rolling strikes) which would hit one industry after another. The aim of these rolling strikes is to paralyse one sector of industry after another, for a short period of time, thus creating chaos in the whole economic life of the country while avoiding an immediate breakdown. Benoit Franchon, the Communist general secretary of the C.G.T., explained to the delegates the advantages of the rolling strike. "We have received a number of letters calling for a general strike," he said, "but one does not create a general strike as easily as partial strikes, and often the partial strikes, if they are well directed, permit us to obtain better results than action *en masse*." One may note in

passing the use of the words "create" and "well directed" which betray the Communist leaders' desire to launch workers into strikes like Generals throw an army into battle. It is for the higher tacticians of the Party and not the workers to decide which type of strike is better (the leaders of the Italian C.P. have also adopted now the rolling strike in preference to the general strike).

### Failure of New Tactic

What interests us most, however, is to discover what Mr. Franchon means by "better results". The rolling strike is obviously an excellent arm to disorganise economy and keep the government in constant fear of being overthrown but it is of little use to improve workers' conditions. Instead of throwing their whole weight in a swift struggle against the government the workers are being asked to exhaust themselves in a series of skirmishes which are almost always bound to end in defeat.

This new tactic is a further proof that the Communist Party does not want an improvement in workers' conditions. Workers' unrest is necessary to the C.P. for it provides it with a bargaining weapon with which it hopes to obtain entry into the government. Because, though the C.P. is now calling the ministers of the present government murderers, they would not be opposed to sitting in the Cabinet if these murderers made some room for them, and if they could obtain such important posts as the Ministry of Defence and the Ministry of the Interior. A number of Socialist, M.R.P. and radical deputies, led by the President of the Assembly, Edouard Herriot, would welcome the entry of the C.P. into the government as a means of stopping industrial unrest but the Government must be more than a little worried by de Gaulle's threat that he would seize power if the Communists were put in charge of the Army or the Police.

One cannot rule out however, the possibility of a compromise being reached and of the C.P. entering the government once again. The C.P. keeps this eventuality in mind too and this is another reason for not wishing to obtain certain rights for the workers which they may regret once they are in power. When the C.P. was in the government it was opposed to a sliding scale of wages, and to the 40 hours' week and they would no doubt oppose them again if they were to enter the government.

The events in France are too closely linked up with the international situation to allow for prognostics. Whether a compromise will be reached or unrest develop into civil war is more likely to be decided in Washington and Moscow than on the coalfields of France. And much workers' sacrifices and heroism will have been wasted once again.

## MORE POLITICAL TRIALS IN SPAIN

WE are informed that next month seven members of the C.N.T. are coming up for trial in Spain. Among them are several members of the National Committee of the C.N.T. They were arrested in December 1947. Among the accused are comrades Manuel Villar, Luis Morales and Eustaquio Rodriguez. The authorities are trying to establish a connection between the above accused and the arrest of a number of comrades during which our comrade Burgos was killed and a policeman wounded. Though in fact these comrades were not involved in that incident, the authorities are trying to use it in order to obtain the death sentence for comrade Villar and another of the accused and thirty years' imprisonment for the other five C.N.T. mem-

bers. Manuel Villar is well-known in the international anarcho-sindicalist movement. Many years ago he was one of the editors of *La Protesta* of Buenos Aires and was later expelled from Argentina. In Spain, he became the editor of *Solidaridad Obrera*, of Barcelona, and *Fragua Social*, of Valencia before Franco's victory.

We appeal to comrades all over the world to initiate a campaign of protest against this new attempt to destroy the Spanish anti-fascist movement by means of assassinations and executions. We must defend the libertarian cause and its struggle for the liberation of Spain.

THE SECRETARIAT  
OF THE I.W.M.A.  
Stockholm, October, 1948.

### MORE WORLD CITIZENS

A group of ten Berliners held a meeting in the British sector yesterday to discuss the possibility of emulating the example of the American Garry Davis and becoming "world citizens". They included four journalists, several authors, and the proprietor of a dress shop. They had received information that three Germans from Bad Nauheim, in the American zone, had already written to Mr. Davis for "world passports". The ten have therefore drafted a similar letter of application and are in high hopes of exchanging their German nationality for a loftier ideal of universal citizenship. *Manchester Guardian*, 12/10/48.



# A HUNDRED YEARS OF REVOLUTION

George Woodcock (Editor): **A HUNDRED YEARS OF REVOLUTION, 1848 AND AFTER.** (Porcupine Press, 15s.)

ONE of the last non-Stalinist documents to come from Czechoslovakia before the Communist coup d'état was made absolute, was the Prague *Critical Monthly* in its first issue for 1948, which contained a long article on "The Socialist Year 1848 and its Heritage" by Dr. Václav Cerný, who emphasised the significance of the Paris February Revolution of 1848 as "the first attempt by reformist and revolutionary socialism to make itself responsible for the administration of State and society", and as "the starting point of the two-fold development of European socialism; anarchistic and Marxist". Cerný saw the Paris Commune in 1871 as the fruit of the theories of Blanqui and Proudhon rather than of Marx and dates the melancholy history of modern socialism from the victory of Marx's followers over those of Bakunin in the first international. This concern with the question "What has gone wrong?" with the revolutionary movements is asked in different ways in several of the essays in this book.

George Woodcock gives an account of the sequence of events in that year and shows that "we still live under the influence of the happenings of that time, and still in our own day, are witnessing the fulfilment, usually in an ironically perverted form, of the ideals for which the men of 1848 fought, often futilely, and never more than half-realising the significance of their acts." Max Beloff studies those events in a broad historical perspective concluding that "In 1848, the year of revolutions seemed in retrospect less a springtide of hope than a warning of the wrath to come."

Christopher Hollis contributes an urbane and amusing discussion of "The Merits and Defects of Marx," with, however, a note of superior disparagement which ill behoves a Tory M.P. Raymond Postgate's essay on "The Principles of 1848" which, with its searching attack on political expediency and its concern with ethics comes a little strangely from a Labour Party man, and it seems that after all his years in the Labour movement, Mr. Postgate is tentatively reaching towards an attitude which goes further than that of orthodox socialism. "It is for us," he says, "to bring into objective life what is already alive in our hearts and in those of very many people all over Europe. Whether it will be at first expressed in a purely political organisation, I do not know. I am inclined to think not: it may not indeed for some time be expressed in organisation at all."

T. A. Jackson gives a Marxist view of "1848 and the Birth of Marxian Communism" which begins as an interpretation of the Communist Manifesto and ends as a tirade against the bourgeois opponents of Stalinism. John Hewetson's essay on the "Dormant Seeds of 1848" is of a very different order. Starting from the events in France, he analyses the nature of revolutions in general and with some most interesting quotations entirely vindicates the attitude of the anarchists.

"A radical view of the economic problem of the social revolution, and internationalism: Proudhon and Bakunin had understood these questions in 1848 and revolutionary theorists have conceded the correctness of their views. But more important still, because almost unrecognised even today, were certain views about the motive force and directing power behind revolutionary events. Once again the anarchists Proudhon and Bakunin had reached conclusions far in advance of contemporary social thinkers..." Hewetson concludes:

## Book Reviews

"There is no need to idealise or to idolise the 'masses': it is enough to reflect that in this, as in preceding and succeeding revolutions, the revolutionary achievements derived from the spontaneous uprisings of the mass. The leadership conception is the antithesis of this, and its corollary, the emergence of the political party as the would-be controlling force, signifies the end of the revolution, the beginning of the counter-revolution."

The concluding essay, Hugh Ross Williamson on 1848 in England is witty, forthright and entirely unexpected in its conclusion. For him, the two events in England of that year which have the greatest significance for us to-day were the meeting of F. D. Maurice, Charles Kingsley and J. M. Ludlow, when they first enunciated the idea of Christian Socialism, and the Irish potato famine which drove hundreds of starving peasants to Britain and America. These events, he thinks gave rise to the phenomenal growth of the Catholic Church in this country in the last hundred years until it is "in fact, the strongest effective religious body in England"—with obvious political implications. He thinks that the emigration to America of Europe's dispossessed explains the fact that America's "deepest psychic need (often unconscious) is to take its revenge. It is this need which manifests itself in such widely differing actions as shelling Monte Cassino, bombing Dresden, making a slum of Grosvenor Square, or entangling a hungry Continent in a net of usury."

The second half of this book consists of a selection of impressions and docu-

# Sex Education

Second Number of a new Journal

TWO months ago a new *Journal of Sex Education*, with Norman Haire as editor, was reviewed in these columns. It is pleasant to see the second issue coming out with 48 pages instead of 32, and with its quality maintained at a high level. It may be a matter of surprise for some that there should be a need for such a magazine, since there is no lack of books on sexual matters—as the review sections show, with 10 pages in the first issue and 14 in the second. Actually it is this very state of published matter on sex that makes this journal so necessary.

### Opposition from the Churches

Norman Haire has no difficulty in showing that the chief opposition to enlightenment in sexual matters comes from the Churches (this is very evident in the obscurantist opposition to artificial insemination advanced by people of religious views at a Conference two years ago which is reported in detail in this issue. Their views contrasted sharply with the courageous evidence of Dr. Mary Barton and Mr. Kenneth Walker, both of them

doctors with a lifetime of experience in grappling with the problem of childlessness in marriage). But having failed to stop the spread of sexual enlightenment, the Churches have changed their tactics and now seek to control that enlightenment so that it does not conflict with the aims of orthodoxy. This means that a great deal of current literature of sex is written by churchmen, many of them sincere enough, no doubt; but their writings are inevitably coloured with the ascetic fear of the flesh, that settled conviction that sexual activity is wrong which is implicit in the Genesis story, and runs through the whole of Christianity.

And not only has the Church sought to infiltrate the literature, but churchmen are also to be found claiming places on such bodies as marriage guidance councils. Now churchmen have as much right as anybody else to express views on sexual matters; but bodies which claim to offer advice to those in difficulties ought to be responsible in their attitude and base their advice on the results of known facts as revealed by unbiased and scientific investigations. How much the results of such enquiries may be at variance with the impressions of current opinion is shown by the Kinsey report of 12 years' research into the sexual behaviour of over 5,000 American men. Churchmen, however, do not adopt a scientific standpoint except so far as it suits them to give a "realistic" colour to their views; for the rest they choose the facts which suit them, often out of context, and, as many contributors to this journal are able to show, do not scruple to write flat lies in support of their moralistic viewpoint. Thus (to take one example from many), one medical writer with a strong moralistic and religious bias is quoted as stating that sexual intercourse in unmarried women may lead to mental disturbance and lesbianism. The reviewer remarks pertinently that he says nothing about the much greater likelihood of such disturbances and abnormalities arising from sexual starvation.

### The Moralistic and the Scientific Approach

Enough has been said to indicate the need for a magazine which maintains a scientific, and eschews a moralistic approach. It is to be recommended to all readers of *Freedom*, both as an admirable digest of advancing work in sexology, and as a clear exposition of the forces which seek to obstruct sexual enlightenment. Particularly welcome is its attitude to the question of sexuality in children and to the general problem of the sexual enlightenment of the young.

### Revolutionary and Reformist Attitudes to Sex

It may not be out of place to make some comments on the larger social problems arising out of sexual reform. Readers of *Freedom* will have noticed a number of articles which relate the sexual attitudes of society to the structure of our society—articles which show that there is a certain connection between sexual suppression and authoritarian forms of administration. To some extent therefore the path of the sexual reformer is tied up with the revolutionary struggle for a free society without coercive institutions of government. The editor of the *Journal of Sex Education*, Norman Haire, has not been identified with this point of view. He is by no means a reactionary, but rather an advanced liberal in his social attitude as it appears in the comments, articles and reviews which appear

(Continued on page 3)

## Notes in the Margins of Several Books

### 1. Human Nature and Science.

POSITIVE science, analysing social existence in order to isolate statistical laws, robs man of his concrete individuality and thus deprives itself of all individual insight. Of man's nature it only grasps an abstraction, an anatomical scheme in mechanistic terms. Its "objective man" is a theoretical man, whose "behaviour"—if it is possible to use this term for an automaton—is described in terms of rigid subjection to cause. The historical type, considered in this way as *mean or normal*, is in reality a more than extreme type; it corresponds in no way to the vast number of complex concrete cases, but results from the hypothetical reduction of life to a single function. The elimination of all that intervenes practically to complicate real life, so as to fake the results according to a biased determinism: this is the working hypothesis on which the "science of man" is based. That biological abstraction is a dream of the vivisector; a degree of impoverishment which is not even realised in the physiological laboratories where operations are made in *anima vili*. In fact, the most atrocious experiments of mental manipulators and psychiatrists on the maddened cattle of the extermination camps, or on the incurable idiots of asylums, have never reduced the human being into the state of perfect degradation envisaged by scientific schematisation.

His gods have never maddened man to this point; his masters have never reduced him to the core of simplification which is presupposed in the man who is the theoretical object of positive science. Neither "mass observation", nor crowd psychology, nor the rough and summary investigation of the "psycho-technicians" of the Gallup Institutes, nor the pitiless clinical study of idiocy or monomania, allows one to assume such mental poverty. Nothing reveals to us in the facts the rigid simplicity of functioning which positive science attributes to the sociological entities imagined by it. Rational man, religious man, economic man, sensual man, egoistic man, social man—all these remain myths. From this it results that positive science, in whatever concerns the human facts which compose history, should limit itself to *ascertaining and illuminating* to its best ability collective phenomena, with a full consciousness of its relative infirmity. Science should remain infinitely modest. It cannot pretend to institute, by its own authority, experiments on individuals and peoples; it cannot validly erect a government or an arbitrary theory of the "necessities of history"; it should limit itself in general to a consultative and explanatory function, with regard to the voluntary efforts and spontaneous errors of human individuals. Science institutes no "sacred truth" to which and by which can be "sacrificed" a single human victim.

### 2. Of "scientific" Anarchism.

CONCRETE and individual human nature is not the object but the subject of science. Consequently there exists no political imperative which can be

validly based on the judgments of a social doctrine that pretends to be scientific. In fact, no authority can be imposed on individual wills and destinies without returning to a religious absolute of which scientific thought is the permanent negation. There is no legitimate dictatorship of men of knowledge, because there are no men of knowledge, but only students and seekers. It is impossible to reconcile scientific relativism and the human subjectivity of all knowledge with a dictatorship exercised in the name of knowledge over the human being taken as an object. There is no admissible compatibility between methodical doubt and the power of the State, between free examination and the exercise of authority. Thus, the myth of a "scientific policy"—assumed in our day by almost all Parties and States—could only be an object of scandal for scientific thought. The arbitrary meaning and the fanatical character of the violence or constraints exercised in the name of any social theory whatever—biological, economic or otherwise—do not here depend on the fact that this theory would be "refuted by science in the present state of acquired knowledge"; they result from the principle that all scientific theory is provisional, and consequently refutable.

Inversely, the provisional and partial agreement of positive science (towards 1880) and a militant theory, such as Kropotkinian anarchism, does not confer on that theory the right to impose itself by force. As Malatesta has pointed out, it is futile to give as the foundation for anarchism certain scientific hypotheses provisionally admitted in "competent" circles; it is ridiculous to pretend that the historic rights of anarchism can result from the fact that anarchism may be presented as the "truly scientific socialism". To affirm that anarchism is anticipated in history as a "scientifically recognised" necessity, and that from this there results a political imperative in its favour, is to ruin, in the domain of reasoning, the very premises on which we pretend to build: that is to say, science as a method and liberty as a principle. The basis of anarchism, as a social effort of voluntary experimentation and as a practically conscious apprehension of reality, is not the identification of any particular doctrine presented by anarchism with a contemporary hypothesis of learned ideology (for instance, the "role of mutual aid in evolution"); but it is on the contrary the basic identity of social anarchism with free scientific research.

### 3. Our Method and Theirs.

IN our eyes, the principal superiority of anarchism does not result from an agreement between the positive content of the books written in its name and the positive content of sociological or other studies realised by the "learned". However encouraging and inspiring may be the realisation of that agreement, it cannot

be the basis of our conviction. The latter results from the fact that anarchism poses as its sole historical claim the liberty of autonomous experiment, error and self-criticism. Anarchism affirms the right to err and to correct oneself; it denies the right for anyone to "chastise" the error of another. Contrary to anarchism, all possible politics are based on precisely contrary demand. They deny the right of autonomous experiment, error and self-criticism. They deny the right of experiment in the name of the *indivisibility of society*, represented by its consecrated institutions; they deny the right of error, in the name of *socially accepted truths*; they deny the right of self-criticism, in the name of *socially monopolised repression*. But there is more to it than this.

If the institutional society makes a mistake, each of its members must participate in the error, "from solidarity". Then, as in the last analysis the responsibility for the error is always brought back to individuals, it is still for the so-called infallible institutional society to choose its scapegoats, in order to *chastise in them the social sin*—always "by solidarity".

The fact that this system of error and correction (or more exactly of *fault and redemption*) is incapable of realising the least development in society—in whatever concerns the consciousness of social facts—would appear clear enough to whoever endeavours to pose the valid conditions of all scientific experiment. No rational knowledge is possible in a world where social monopoly of action and responsibility imposes a global notion of society and of the universe (so far as one can speak, in such a case, of "thought", of "action", of "responsibility" or even of "society"). No rational knowledge is possible in the total world and the totalitarian society.

### 4. Socialist Democracy or Anarchy?

THERE are those who oppose totalitarianism and democracy to each other: "Democracy, in its principle, authorises the minority to think and propose what it will, provided it acts as the majority wishes". But what is a thought that possesses no field of autonomous verification, and a will to which action is forbidden? And how can the responsibility and nature of the error be discerned in a collectivity acting *en bloc*, willy-nilly?

"Socialist" democracy is differentiated from liberal democracy in so far as it pretends to extend its principle to all the domains of social existence: socialist democracy is, in a manner, the totalitarian application of the democratic principle.

The rights of minorities is still res-

pected, we are told. How is that? The very existence of a "minority" presupposes a secession. All heterodoxy should find its concrete formation in a domain of open experiment, which assumes liberty to lie not within the framework of the laws, but on the margin of the laws. There can be no organised minority without a preliminary field for dissident action. To admit a regime where the law of the majorities would reign in all domains would be to admit absolute social immobility.

Do you want to know what is the result of the universalisation of the majority principle? For example, let us apply "democracy" to medicine, and let us suppose that a medical parliament had power to forbid, by the plurality of voices, all new therapeutic methods—until the day when, going back on its first decision, it might authorise them, or rather impose their employment universally, by a new majority decision. Would you like to tell me on what proofs the majority of the doctors could base their change of view and break with their own routine, if it is not on clandestine and illegal experiment by a few dissidents? It will be said that the medical minority—and even the majority—would, as a last resort, experiment on guinea pigs. But when it is a question of *socialist democracy* and of human institutions, it is no longer possible to experiment on animals in the laboratory; and there remains finally only one means of forming thought and orienting opinion: the organised indiscipline of the "anarchists".

Anarchism has no need to seek its justification in the future, in "scientific" prevision. Insofar as it is the social—and cosmic—secession of man, anarchism has been the only laboratory from which human thought has emerged. Either I am very much mistaken, or our thought is, of itself, rebellion against unthinking unity, our intelligence insurrection against the unintelligible continuity of the universe. Our thought stands in rivalry to the world. It hungers for creation and liberty. To the cosmic continuum it opposes articulated structures. It would appear polemical, anarchic, promethean. In these conditions, Anarchy remains the real way of human development. Anarchy is the human tendency in man. All the rest is only the aggressive return of night and chaos, the temptation of the great Nirvana, the cosmic and social slumber of animality. It is the renunciation of individuation: it is an abdication before the instinct of death.

If the name of "socialism" is given to this religious and mystical sentiment, this domination of historic fatality and gregarious solidarity—we must acknowledge that conscious life is a vast and always uncertain duel between socialism and anarchy.

JEAN CELLO.

## Freedom Bookshop

We have just received the latest publication of the Resistance Press, a reprint of the famous pamphlet: **An Appeal to the Young**, by Peter Kropotkin. 6d.

A Hundred Years of Revolution, edited by George Woodcock 15/-  
The Novel in our Time Alex Comfort 5/-  
The Twilight of the Gods Richard Garnett 1/6  
Penguin Island Anatole France 2/-  
Ulysses James Joyce 25/-  
Journal of Sex Education No. 1, 2 2/- each

We are accepting orders for the KINSEY REPORT ON SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR IN THE HUMAN MALE (800 pages, 32/6, copies of which will be available in limited numbers early in December. Reserve your copy NOW!

Postage is not included in above prices, and should be added.

Please send all orders to  
**FREEDOM BOOKSHOP**  
27 RED LION STREET  
LONDON - W.C.1.



# Freedom Press

- Alex Comfort:  
BARBARISM AND SEXUAL FREEDOM  
Boards 3/6. Paper 2/6
- Alexander Berkman:  
A.B.C. OF ANARCHISM 1/-
- George Woodcock:  
ANARCHISM OF CHAOS 2/6, Cloth 4/6  
NEW LIFE TO THE LAND 6d.  
RAILWAYS AND SOCIETY 3d.  
HOMES OR HOVELS? 6d.  
ANARCHISM AND MORALITY 2d.  
WHAT IS ANARCHISM? 1d.  
THE BASIS OF COMMUNAL LIVING 1/-
- Rudolf Rocker:  
NATIONALISM & CULTURE 21/-
- Herbert Read:  
POETRY AND ANARCHISM Cloth 5/-  
Paper 2/6
- THE PHILOSOPHY OF ANARCHISM  
Boards 2/6, Paper 1/-
- THE EDUCATION OF FREE MEN 1/-
- John Hewison:  
ITALY AFTER MUSSOLINI 6d.  
ILL-HEALTH, POVERTY AND THE STATE Cloth 2/6, Paper 1/-
- MUTUAL AID & SOCIAL EVOLUTION 1/-
- Peter Kropotkin:  
THE STATE: ITS HISTORIC ROLE 1/-  
THE WAGE SYSTEM 3d.  
REVOLUTIONARY GOVERNMENT 3d.  
SELECTIONS FROM HIS WRITINGS (Chosen by Herbert Read) Cloth 8/6
- C. Berneri:  
KROPOTKIN—HIS FEDERALIST IDEAS 2d.
- Errico Malatesta:  
ANARCHY 3d.  
VOTE WHAT FOR? 1d.
- M. L. Berneri:  
WORKERS IN STALIN'S RUSSIA 1/-
- F. A. Ridley:  
THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE MODERN AGE 2d.
- Gaston Level:  
COLLECTIVES IN SPAIN 1d.
- Charles Duff:  
A HANDBOOK ON HANGING 2/-
- John Olday:  
THE MARCH TO DEATH THE LIFE WE LIVE, THE DEATH WE DIE 2/6
- A. Ciliga:  
THE KRONDSTAT REVOLT 2d.
- Icarus:  
THE WILHELMSHAVEN REVOLT 6d.
- "Equity":  
THE STRUGGLE IN THE FACTORY 3d.
- McCartney:  
THE FRENCH COOKS SYNDICATE 3d.
- William Godwin:  
SELECTIONS FROM POLITICAL JUSTICE 3d.
- P. J. Proudhon:  
ON LAW 1d.
- GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE 19th CENTURY Cloth 5/-

27 Red Lion Street  
Holborn, W.C.1

## SEX EDUCATION

(Continued from page 2)

over his initials in these two issues. But his general position became plain in the early thirties when the World League for Sexual Reform dissolved after an insoluble difference of opinion between the two presidents, Norman Haire and Leunbach. Leunbach took the view that the struggle for sexual reform could only be tied up with the revolutionary struggle. (Leunbach was at the time tied up with the Communists, but there seems no doubt that his was a genuinely revolutionary point of view, for they later denounced him and even threatened him with physical violence unless he stopped expressing his "filthy views on sex". Compare the path of Reich.) Haire on the other hand held that the cause of sexual enlightenment must keep itself separate from revolutionary struggles in the social sphere. The statements of the two exponents are to be found reprinted in Wilhelm Reich's *Sexual Revolution* (obtainable through Freedom Press).

The present journal adheres to Haire's point of view in this matter. But although *Freedom* takes up the position defended by Leunbach, it must be admitted that the controversy does not really touch the purpose of the *Journal of Sex Education*. In it the editor is concerned with sexual education, and his approach and that of most of his contributors is strictly practical. No doubt he looks forward to a day when obscurantism will not roughen the path of enlightenment; but here and now we have to deal with individual problems in their actual setting. And this will appeal to readers with problems of their own, for those with pressing and anxious sexual difficulties are not greatly helped by considerations of what will happen after the revolution is accomplished. They want help now. This journal is to be warmly supported in that it seeks, with honesty and courage, to help in the solution of such problems.

J.H.

WITH some flag-waving and speech-making U.N.O. has celebrated its third birthday. But behind the myth of unity among nations and the desire to preserve the peace is the reality of war which has become a permanent feature of our society. While politicians meet and talk, war goes on. It takes the form of open warfare in China, of war training in Germany or of war preparation with the signing of treaties. Taken at random, here are a few aspects of this "permanent war" as they appeared in the Press during the past few days:

● During the past six months the U.S. have handed over 88 million dollars as military aid to the Chinese central government in its fight against Communist forces. This was used to buy explosives, trucks, oil, arms and ammunition.

● Closer co-ordination in defence in case of future war has been discussed by the meeting of Commonwealth ministers held in London. The ministers agreed "that the danger of war must be met by building up armed forces in order to deter any would-be aggressor". They agreed also, said the official communiqué, "that freedom must be safeguarded, not only by military defensive measures, but also by advancing social and economic welfare". India, Ceylon and Pakistan have joined in this agreement. Thanks to their newly-won independence the Indian people are now committed to a future war by the same leaders who opposed the last one.

## STALIN TEACHING THE FACTS OF LIFE

THE Russians are celebrating the tenth birthday of their standard History of the Communist party of the Soviet Union.

It was prepared by a "Commission of the Central Committee", and consists, as might be expected, of a highly simplified account of Russian history since 1862. It is remarkable mainly for one thing: it contains the first reasonably clear exposition of the Communist philosophy of dialectical materialism, and shortly after the book first appeared it was revealed that Stalin himself had written the chapter concerned. Now, however, it seems that he was responsible for the whole book and his subordinates are tumbling over one another to congratulate him. Not only Mrs. Pauker and Mr. Gallacher paid tributes but the "activists and intelligentsia" of the Mongolian Peoples' Republic have passed a vote of thanks, while Lyssenko, the biologist, has called the book "an irreplaceable textbook teaching the facts of life". Certainly Stalin is an extremely intelligent man; in his long interview with H. G. Wells, for example, he had rather the better of the argument. But this best-seller, with its distortion of fact in order to point fool-proof revolutionary lessons, hardly does him credit. And, entertaining as it is to think of Stalin himself writing that "Comrade Stalin's speech made a profound impression" or "Comrade Stalin's article was of the utmost political moment", too much smugness becomes irritating. The final moral reads:

"A party perishes if it conceals its mistakes, if it glosses over sore problems . . . if it is intolerant of criticism and self-criticism, if it gives way to self-complacency and vainglory and if it rests on its laurels."

Only the most practised dialectician can square this with the whole sense and spirit of the book.

Manchester Guardian, 9/10/48.

## Legalizing Terror in Czecho

AFTER a seizure of power, the new rulers invariably seek to fortify their new-own positions through legal means. Respect for the law inevitably becomes quite illogical in such circumstances, yet it serves to hamstring the opposition of all except those prepared to adopt a revolutionary position—with all the increased hazards which such legal manoeuvres invest it with.

Two new laws have recently been signed by the Communist President of Czechoslovakia, Gottwald. The first—termed the law for the defence of the Republic—makes it a serious offence to make adverse criticisms of the President and government of Czechoslovakia, but also of any country with which Czechoslovakia has signed an alliance. In a word, the Soviet Union. Here we have in a thinly-disguised form the law which Stalin desired in his famous and revealing slip of the tongue—when he said that he wished to see all anti-Soviet propaganda illegal, hastily explaining afterwards that what he had meant was anti-Semitic propaganda!

● Strategists look upon the Berlin airlift as good preparation for the next war. Says Major-General William H. Turner: "We look upon the airlift not as an end in itself. It is an exercise in the technique of using big airplanes in a manner hitherto unknown". Reporting this statement *Time Magazine* comments: "The triumph of organisation and improvisation that made the airlift possible is what Turner means by 'using the airplanes in a manner hitherto unknown'. For strategists the airlift has a meaning far beyond its

immediate goal of feeding blockaded Berlin. The U.S. Army has never fought a major foreign campaign more than 300 miles from salt water. Suppose it had to fight in the heart of a continent? An airlift like Berlin's might be the answer.

"U.S. airmen have considered this possibility since the China Hump operation and the airborne Burma jungle campaign. Perhaps Russian strategists who have consistently underestimated air power, are beginning to get the point."

## THROUGH THE PRESS

### AMERICAN T.U. BOSS

At the United Mine Workers' Convention some delegates had the temerity to demand the right to choose their district officials by a vote of the membership. John L. Lewis swiftly squelched that move (21 of his union's 31 districts are ruled by Lewis appointees). It was just a waste of time, said the Great Man, to talk about such things; he could be relied upon to choose competent officials and, if any of them "failed to do the right thing," he would send them back to digging coal.

From there on, the delegates tried to outdo each other in expressions of fealty. They decided that his birthday, Feb. 12, should be a holiday in the soft-coal fields. They learned that John L. had not paid his \$30,000 contempt fines out of his own pocket but out of the union's till, and voted retroactive approval of that. John had merely to suggest that the U.M.W.'s \$13 million bankroll ought to be bolstered so that he could have more "available funds in a crisis". With audible grumbles, the delegates voted to boost their dues from an average of \$2 to \$4 a month. But gratefully, they raised John Lewis's from \$25,000 to \$50,000 a year. *Time*, 18/10/48.

Translated into English money, Mr. John L. Lewis will now be getting £12,500 a year. The vice-president and secretary-treasurer are paid £10,000, and the thirty members of the executive £3,000 a year. Thus T.U. leaders have incomes which may well be regarded with envy by smaller mineowners.

### AMERICAN MRS. GRUNDY

Following hundreds of complaints, mostly from women, that too much dressing is going on in store windows in Atlanta, the police told department stores that shades must be drawn on shop windows when models are being dressed or undressed.

N.Y. Herald Tribune, 11/10/48.

### SICKNESS DUE TO OVERWORK

Mrs. Barbara Castle told the delegates at the National Council of Women Conference at Hastings that women's higher sickness rate was due to their having two jobs and being constantly overworked.

"I have been impressed with the toughness of women in the industrial areas," she said.

"I lived in a weaver's family where the wife got up at six in the dark Lancashire mill, made breakfast for the children, plaited the girls' hair for school, left something to eat for her husband when

he woke up, ran round the corner to the mill to clock-on at 7.30.

"She ran home at mid-day to cook dinner, clocked-on again from 1 to 5.30. "Then she rushed home to housework." *News Chronicle*, 14/10/48.

### HOLLYWOOD MONEY MAY KILL ITALIAN FILM INDUSTRY

Italy's moviemakers, who have turned out some of the world's best post-war pictures on a shoestring (*Open City*, *To Live in Peace*, *Paiza*, *Shoeshine*), had reason to feel bitter last week about their American competitors. Hollywood was pressing its advantage in the one department in which it invariably excels: money.

The Italians knew very well that more money would not necessarily make better pictures. What they feared was that American money could keep them from making any pictures at all. For Italy had become a popular Hollywood "location", and the visiting moguls were tossing money around freely enough to drive local costs right out of the Italian's reach. Items:

A cameraman's weekly salary had jumped from 40,000 lire (\$69) to 175,000 lire (\$304).

The wardrobe cost alone for 20th Century-Fox's *Prince of Foxes* hit \$275,000—or about nine times what it took to produce both *Open City* and *Shoeshine*.

Producer Darryl Zanuck said he would not "stoop to sweatshop practices . . . We are not in Italy . . . to cash in on another country's depressed condition." Would Italy's best directors surrender to the invaders? Vittorio de Sica (*Shoeshine*) was negotiating with David O. Selznick. Roberto Rossellini (*Open City*, *Paiza*) was reported flirting with representatives of Sam Goldwyn.

*Time*, 18/10/48.

### WAR HORSE TO BISON

Mr. Churchill seems to have come down in the ranks of the animal world. During the war he was described by Stalin as an "old war horse" but last week *Pravda* called him a "bison of British reaction who has outlived his day".

## WHO SHALL CONTROL THE UNIONS?

(Continued from page 1)  
that matters but what tale the needs of the moment makes expedient. By leaving the attacks on Russian conditions to be made mainly by conservatives, they have actually served the Communists' turn.

Of course, the expediency of the moment is not the only factor which has made social democracy adopt such a feeble position towards Russia. Despite vilifying attacks ("social fascists", "renegades", "lackeys of capitalism", etc., etc.) they have made no adequate reply. The reason surely is that the Russian government has put into effect the programme of the social democracy everywhere, for after all the Bolsheviks were the Russian party of the social democratic international. The Labour party believes in government in coercion, in bureaucratic control, and the subordination of workers' institutions to the State. The Welsh chief theoreticians of the British Social Democracy were candid enough to recognise that the Soviet Union had cancelled out the programme of the Fabians. The Socialists are left with only trivial matters to attack, and even now their main appeal is to patriotism, never an emotion favoured by the theorists of socialism, though practised often enough by its party propagandists.

### The Communists' Opportunity

The State worship of the social democracy, their preference for discussions with the employers rather than militant struggle, has created a tremendous apathy in the unions, and branch meetings are very poorly attended. In such circumstances it has not been difficult for the Communists,

## DE VALERA'S ANTI-PARTITION CAMPAIGN

HERALDED by a deluge of ballyhoos in the kept-press of Dublin, the great Mr. Eamon de Valera has arrived in Britain. According to the party hacks of Fianna Fail, the leader has come to see—and conquer.

By the use of his much-vaunted statesmanship and his Gaelic charm, he hopes to beguile the powers-that-be into the repeal of the Government of Ireland Act (1920). What does he offer in return? Can it be adhesion to Western Union, or a lease of bases to the Anglo-Americans?

It is noteworthy that Mr. de Valera's first call in Liverpool, was to an establishment of the Catholic Church. This is not surprising in a politician who has never under-rated the value of an efficient Church machine in the delicate task of repressing a people who, by nature, are not amenable to Authority in its more obvious forms. At first glance it may seem strange that the die-hard Republican of 1916 and 1922 should be on such amiable terms with the Church of Rome. It was a Bishop of this very Church who said of the Fenian Brotherhood (a revolutionary society of the 1870's) that Hell was not enough, nor Eternity long enough, for them. It was the Hierarchy of this Church who (in the Pastoral Letter of 1922) excommunicated all members of the Republican forces who fought in the Civil War.

But in those days, de Valera had yet to become Taoiseach of Ireland. He was still very much "on the outside, looking in", and he had not yet tasted the intoxicating and corrupting elixir of Power.

In those days, "Up the Republic" was synonymous with "Up Dev." Since then he has reddened his hands in the orgy of political executions from 1939 to 1944 and he has become more and more content as a result of adulation of his followers. Calling themselves *Fianna Fail* (Gaelic: Soldiers of Destiny) they're a motley mixture of domesticated retired Republicans, Tammany style politicians, and deluded youths.

And now this man de Valera descends on Britain in an attempt to repair his political fortunes, shattered by the February Elections. He is trying to buy with promises of bases for Western Union, that which can only be obtained by the efforts of the plain people of Ireland.

When he is no more, and his "philosophy" of "frugal comfort" is relegated to the same corner as Salazar's Corporatism and Mussolini's Fascist Republicanism, future generations may remember those who died facing his firing squads, but whether his victims are remembered or not, de Valera will not go unmentioned—he has made his mark on Irish History, by the firing squads and gallows of the early 1940's.

SEAN GANNON.

by disciplined attendance at union meetings to capture a degree of control quite disproportionate to their numerical strength. The Labour Party union officials can do little enough about it because their position depends on the apathy of the rank and file, and they are therefore reluctant to try and mobilise the active feeling for union activity which would frustrate the Communists' infiltration tactics. Such union activity by the rank and file would frustrate the stonewallers of the T.U.C. hierarchy also.

Thus the undemocratic nature of the unions serves the ends, though for different reasons, both of the Labour Party socialists and the Communists. Inevitably it creates the problem for both of them as to how power is to be distributed between them. Hence such quarrels as Horner versus Lawther.

The larger issues—for the official union movement—is indicated by the question of the T.U.C.'s relation to the Communist-controlled World Federation of Trade Unions which will probably have come up for discussion on 27th October. But behind all these issues, superficial ones and fundamental ones alike, lies the question that is never asked: Why are the unions controlled by political groupings at all? Why are millions of "organised" workers pushed around by henchmen like Lawther and Horner at all, when the control of the unions should lie with the men on the job?

To the question "Who is to control the Unions, Labour or Communist?" we unhesitatingly answer, *Neither*. The workers will only cease to be pawns in political manoeuvrings when they themselves decide the activities of their industry without the intervention of the increasingly dictatorial union leaders.



# RAILMEN'S MISGIVINGS

IT is not often that a trade union paper—an official organ of a union that is—will criticise the workings of nationalisation. The unions have had nationalisation as their goal for so long now that they can hardly be expected to do or say anything critical of the system for which they have agitated so ardently. For union officials have jobs to look after, and jobs to aspire to, and nationalisation offers the best protection and provision for both.

In view of this, therefore, it was all the more surprising to discover that the *Railway Review*, official organ of the N.U.R., had featured on its front page an article severely critical of the workings of State ownership in the railways. But, of course, we must remember that supporters of nationalisation are particularly anxious to see it working successfully—that is obvious—and the editors of the *Railway Review* have very astutely seen that it is in their interest to provide a safety-valve for the grievances and misgivings of the railway workers. Especially so if there is the possibility of the criticisms being noted in high places and acted upon—and in view of the respectable nature of the R.R. there is that chance. Not that we think any action taken in high places can iron out the faults of nationalisation, but it can pretend to.

The writer of the article is a railway worker, James Jory, and such remarks as these have been seized upon by the Tory press with glee: "It is no secret that the organisational structure of British Railways reveals many weaknesses, and that there is a most uncomfortable atmosphere prevailing in the services." More interesting to us, however, is the specific case he deals with in cartage, where instructions have been issued from above without any knowledge of what they entail for the workers who have to carry them out: "The workers engaged in cartage are being badgered with instructions which radically alter existing methods of collection. Let us be quite clear on this point. We do not oppose any method which will give a more efficient service to the public. But we do object to instructions being issued at short notice, without giving any opportunity to show how ridiculous some of the new proposals are."

Now, we are not going to follow in Tory footsteps when we comment on this; our opposition to nationalisation springs from a diametrically opposite point of view. Ever since there have been bosses in offices giving orders to workers on the job, there have been examples of stupidity and lack of understanding of what is involved in the carrying out of work. One step away

from actual, direct contact with the work involved can result in a lessening of understanding and a growth of intolerant authority—that is why foremen are so unpopular! It is true that, for want of the organisation or the opportunity, workers at the point of production can often not get a clear overall picture of the industry in which they are concerned—cannot see the wood for the trees in fact—but it is equally true that the foreman, manager, supervisor or whatever he is called, from his position outside the wood as it were, cannot see his way through the trees.

## CONTROL, NOT CONSULTATION.

The solution does not lie, however, as the unions desire, simply in putting union officials on management boards. Nor does it lie, as James Jory suggests, in consultation with the workers on the spot. Both these measures will make a pretence of solving the problem, but in fact will only confuse it more. It must be clearly understood that, whatever the superficial appearances, in a capitalist society industry can only be run in a capitalist way. As such, there cannot be avoided a difference of interest between management and workers, since the profit motive still

operates, and all attempts and pretences at "democratising" industry are just so much window-dressing which leaves the real relationship between managers and men, authority and the exploited, completely unaltered. All that they can do is to give the workers a say in their own exploitation!

No, we say that the workers on the spot should control. That in every station, yard or depot, workers' councils should be elected among the workers themselves without taking any member away from his workplace permanently and without paying him any more than his wages at his job. These councils could co-ordinate throughout the industry and with similar councils from other industries and communal councils representing the consumers. Thus control over productions and distribution could be effected without centralised and autocratic control, nobody could be exploited by anybody else, every improvement practical and desirable could be put into operation by the workers concerned and there would be no need for government, union bosses, money or railway police.

Anarchy, did you say? That's right! P.S.

# A Strike we don't Support

WE are often accused of supporting any and every strike that takes place irrespective of whether it has any social significance or not. We are also often accused of supporting the workers whatever they do—simply because they are the workers.

It is not true, as a matter of fact, that we do this. After all, it is the workers who make wars possible and who keep capitalism going—not, in either case, because they particularly want either, but simply because they will not take the trouble to do anything about it. True, all the scales are weighed against the workers: the means of production are controlled by others, the means of expression are owned by others, tradition, education and authority make the workers believe the system is permanent and unshakably right. But working-class history shows clearly that if workers are determined enough, courageous enough and clear-thinking enough, they can achieve results be-

yond the wildest dreams of the weak, timid or muddle-headed. If...

Nevertheless, we do admit that we support the strike in principle. When workers go on strike they are acting directly and at the point of production in a manner which means that they are taking the initiative themselves, or at least are not taking the boss's initiative lying down. And even if the purpose—the immediate cause—of the strike bears no significance at all from the revolutionary point of view, still we are glad to see that the hypnotism worked by the ideas of legality and constitutionalism is not quite so spell-binding as it seems.

Another reason why we in *Freedom* appear to support every strike may be that we have not the space to report on or discuss every strike which takes place and therefore are rather liable to write only about those which appear to us particularly interesting and praiseworthy. But in the past we have criticised workers for striking for such reasons as their opposition to foreign workers coming into their industry; strikes in support of the colour bar, or the closed shop have also been criticised in *Freedom*.

And now we have learned about a strike which we find nothing but laughable. Fifteen hundred Belfast dockers are on strike at the moment of writing because they want to pay income tax on the Pay-as-you-Earn system! At the moment, they are paying under the old system by which they pay a lump sum every six months. This, they claim, and quite rightly, is a hardship. Some of them have been before the courts for not paying and a court order has been made for them to pay weekly. But the local tax collectors will not accept payment on that basis—so the silly asses come out on strike to get their income tax deducted from their wages before they get them!

Now it is true that if you are going to pay income tax it is better to pay it in small weekly doses instead of having to find an amount equal to several weeks' wages in one lump sum. But to put yourself out of work and suffer the financial stress of an unofficial strike in order to gain that very doubtful privilege is surely a very back-handed way of going to work.

Look at it like this; there is obviously enough solidarity and determination among these Belfast dockers to carry through successfully any action they decided upon—so why can they not simply refuse to pay the tax collectively? They could not all be sent to jail and in any case the courts are making orders for them to pay weekly and the tax officials are then refusing to accept—so what better alibi could they have?

A strike against paying income tax is something we could all approve of—something which would ring an immediate bell of sympathy among workers everywhere. But to strike in favour of P.A.Y.E.—well, really!

# Democracy or Anarchy?

THERE is a story told about a Catholic missionary who imagined he was making progress in teaching the Gospel to a cannibal tribe when they gave up eating human flesh on Fridays. At one time this might have been thought a humorous exaggeration, but the modern ideas of Democracy make one realise that it need not have been.

We have seen in the modern world, since 1918, such a growth of totalitarian doctrines, whether fascist or communist, that the slightest alleviations of dictatorship—no matter how outrageous it might have appeared to an earlier generation—are hailed as great advances. At one time social reformers denounced the iniquities associated with all forms of power—today they hug themselves in the belief that this is a slight improvement on what happens elsewhere.

We noticed in the *Sunday Pictorial* a paean of praise for British democracy because of something which they said "could only happen here". An elderly gentleman was shown leaving an aeroplane and being greeted by a R.A.F. guard of honour. The newspaper pointed out gleefully that in any other country the leader of the Opposition would be met by an armed guard but only here could it have been a guard of honour—and in a short period he would be back attacking the King's Ministers.

This is an advance on the other practice of suppressing the Leader of the Opposition, just as desisting from human flesh on one day of the week may be claimed as a step forward, but it is only a very minor point unconcerned with the main issue. It is better to greet a pompous old gentleman with honour than to shut him up in the Tower, but to associate this with liberty could only occur to complete strangers to the idea of Freedom—such as abound in the newspaper world, whose sole criterion of freedom of speech is permission to get as much paper as they can in order to pry into everybody's domestic affairs. For it does not occur to the journal concerned to have asked itself whether the R.A.F. guard of honour was doing the duty voluntarily or not. All sorts of comical people get into the Services and it may well have been that it was composed of ardent admirers of Mr. Churchill, but it is extremely unlikely that this was inquired into when they were detailed for the parade. It may equally have been the case that many of them may have strongly disliked the idea and used the sort of language usually associated with turn-outs for V.I.P.'s, which goes far beyond any of Mr. Bevan's descriptions of the Tories.

Again, the other week an odd item crept into the *News Chronicle* (8/10/48) which said, "Persecuted peoples all over the world will have made a mental note of the reactions yesterday of Arthur Fadden, Australian M.P. Button-holed by a couple of alleged Security Police who

wanted to ask him about the release of British Cabinet secrets, what did he do? Put up his fists... dial 999? No; he sent for the Press, and as soon as the reporters arrived with their notebooks the Security Police faded away."

Yes, doubtless an improvement on accidental drops out of the window, but supposing it had not been the honourable Mr. Fadden, M.P.? Supposing—for instance it had been some dishonourable person writing in *Freedom*—not letting out any military secrets but uttering a few unpalatable statements at an inconvenient moment? Well, as was discovered in 1944, there would be no possibility of phoning the Press because the person concerned would not be let near the telephone, which anyhow would be at such a period about as private as a special wire to M.I.5, and the Press would not be able to stop an Old Bailey sentence anyway.

If we are asked to judge Democracy as a creed which allows liberty not only to the Government Party, but also to the Opposition Party, as has been more or less stated in certain political speeches in which statesmen have said they believe in "our two-party system"—then we are prepared to agree with the definition, but we would point out it is not much of an advance on Dictatorship, which allows one party that liberty. It has nothing whatever in common with Freedom, which inevitably supposes the right of anyone to say anything they wished. But, to quote the famous words of the social-democratic statesman, Leon Blum, in 1940, when he defended the French suppression of anti-war minorities to the British Labour Conference, Democracy is not the right to do as one wishes. "That is not Democracy, that is Anarchy."

Under Democracy a party that is elected to power has no need whatever

to consult the people who are supposedly sovereign. Its representatives act according to their policy decided by themselves. The Government elected in 1935 on the basis of keeping us out of war with Italy, not only led us through the Second World War but modified its basis as to be completely unrecognisable to the original Government at the finish. The present Government, elected primarily on the basis of the necessity for social reforms following years of Tory rule, may yet lead us through the Third World War with Russia, which was certainly never brought up in 1945. Indeed, there may to-day be a number of people in this country who want war, but they don't all want it with the same country, and while some may want war with Russia, doubtless an intensive survey would reveal that of this pro-war minority there are a number of other countries that might be accepted as an alternative. However, it does not really matter whether they want war with America, Russia, Spain, Transjordan, Poland, the Argentine, Germany, Egypt, Israel, China or Yugoslavia, to quote a few of the suggestions of the total militarists. Nobody will ask them anyway. That will be decided by Whitehall. The campaign of persuasion and building up of public opinion comes after. It is considered "academic" to suggest that they ask the people if they really want war. That is not Democracy, that is Anarchy.

ANARCHO-SYNDICALIST.

# WHAT MAKES A MAN DIG HIS GARDEN?

AT the recent British Association conference at Brighton, when "incentives" were being discussed, Nigel Balchin, the writer and psychologist, declared that:

"Industrial psychologists must stop messing about with tricky and ingenious bonus schemes and find out why a man, after a hard day's work, went home and enjoyed digging in his garden."

The *News Chronicle* headed its report "Why do you like digging? B.A. must find out, says writer." But is it such a mystery? If Mr. Balchin really doesn't know the answer, he will find it in George Woodcock's *Anarchy or Chaos*, where the identical illustration is used. A man enjoys going home and working hard in his garden, if he's lucky enough to have one, because there he is freed from the petty tyranny of bosses, managers, foremen and his own master; is freed from subordination to industrial or commercial processes and is responsible to himself alone for the disposal of his labour; is freed from the irrational organisation of his daily work and participates in the logic of nature; is working because he *wants* to and not because he *has* to.

Tolstoy said that the rich man will do anything for the poor man except get off his back. In the same way, the production pundits and morale merchants will give the worker anything (or not quite anything) except control of the means of production. But only workers' control will reproduce in a wider field the feeling of satisfaction and enjoyment in his work which makes a man want to dig his garden. The consultants, experts and specialists will, as Mr. Balchin says,

think up all sorts of "tricky and ingenious bonus schemes", they will prattle about joint consultation, co-partnership, and industrial democracy, but they will never voluntarily let go the reins of industry. Why should they? They'd be out of work themselves if they did.

The only people who can solve the problem of industry, who can make work enjoyable, are the workers themselves. While they are content to be, as Eric Gill said, "reduced to a sub-human condition of intellectual irresponsibility," they needn't expect to get any fun out of their working lives, nor need they expect production to be harnessed to the real needs of the people instead of to export drives and re-armament programmes. While they are willing to be the pawns of an obsolete, inefficient and inhuman factory system, they needn't expect the factory system to alter.

## FREEDOM

Anarchist Fortnightly  
Price 3d.

Postal Subscription Rates  
6 months 4/6 (U.S.A. \$1).  
12 months 8/6 (U.S.A. \$2).  
Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies  
6 months 7/6 (\$1.50).  
12 months 15/- (\$3).

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.

## Meetings and Announcements

### UNION OF ANARCHIST GROUPS: CENTRAL LONDON

Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.  
At 8, Endsleigh Gardens, W.C.1.  
OCTOBER 31st John Turner  
"Synthesis"  
NOVEMBER 7th John Hewitson  
"World Politics and Food Supplies"  
NOVEMBER 14th Philip Sansom  
"The State"  
NOVEMBER 21st Alex Comfort  
"Can We Modify Human Conduct?"  
NOVEMBER 28th F. A. Ridley  
"The Conflict of European Ideologies"

### NORTH EAST LONDON

NOVEMBER 2nd Alan Smith  
"The Prospect Before Us"  
Comrades interested should ring WAN 2396

### GLASGOW ANARCHIST GROUP

Indoor Meetings,  
CENTRAL HALLS, Bath Street,  
every Sunday at 7 p.m.,  
Frank Leech, Willy Carlyle, John Gaffney,  
Eddie Shaw.

### BRISTOL

Public Meeting  
Kingsley Hall, Old Market Street, 7p.m.,  
NOVEMBER 2nd  
Questions and Discussion

### BIRMINGHAM

Discussion-Lectures are held on alternate Sundays in Dick Sheppard House, 36, Holloway Head, at 7 p.m.  
NOV. 7th. Conroy Maddox

"Myth and History"  
(Postponed from October 10th)

### LIVERPOOL

Public Meeting at Cooper's Hall, Shaw Street, 7.30 p.m., Sunday, November 14th and November 28th. Questions and Answers.

## INHUMAN PLANNERS

Planners by the score were busy re-planning New York into a marvel of cold perfection. But Lewis Mumford, an author, stopped them cold. He asked: "In all your planning how many hiding places for lovers have you planned, how many nooks and crannies where children may throw stones?" Shamefacedly the planners replied: "None. We didn't think of that."

Daily Express, 13/10/48.

## Special Appeal

### 6th LIST

October 8th—22nd:

London: G.G. 2/6; Paisley: A.F. 2/-;  
London: A.M. 4/6; Stamford: F.P.H. 2/6;  
Withernsea: J.D. 5/-; Anlaby: D.R.\* 5/6;  
Bristol: B. & E.S. £1/0/0; Bristol Group 5/-;  
Glasgow: A.M.C.D. 2/6; New York: N.E. 15/-;  
London: M.W. 11/6; Taunton: A.P. 3/8;  
Long Eaton: A.B.S. 2/6; Bridgnorth: D.S.B. 5/-;  
Hounslow: W.M.E. 5/-; London: A.E.H. 5/-;  
Anon\* 2/6; Glasgow: F.J.D. 10/-; Glasgow:  
M.D.T. 1/-; London: H.M. 2/6; Johannes-  
burg: B.R. -/9; London: D.C.M. 1/-;  
Sidmouth: J.S. 1/8; Phila, Pa.: Circolo di  
Emancipazione Sociale (per O.M.) £3/15/0;  
S. Francisco: Part proceeds picnic at Pleasanton (per O.M.) £12/10/0; London: P.W. 5/-;  
Birmingham: F.D. 5/-; W. Wickham: H.A.D. 1/6; Denver, Col.: R.B. £1/3/9;  
London: T.G. £2/0/0; London: (Lotus Fund cards) J.H. & L.G.W. 9/-; J.E. 10/-.

Previously acknowledged ... £26 15 10

£230 0 4

SPECIAL APPEAL FUND

TOTAL TO DATE ... £256 16 2

## GIFTS OF BOOKS

Inverness: J.E.M.; Nottingham: K.N.;  
Enfield: D.H.; Glasgow: A.M.; Shanghai: L.P.K.

\*After initials indicates contributors to the 5/- a month scheme proposed by a London reader.