

Freedom

AN ANARCHIST FORTNIGHTLY

Vol. 9 No. 27

December 24th, 1948

Threepence

"Let a man first give his supreme attention to making himself and all men free, and he will then begin to know the virtues of higher nature."

KROPOTKIN

Will Anglo-U.S. SELL OUT BERLIN?

FOR the anarchist, the situation of the people of Berlin has been particularly poignant in the recent elections. The elections themselves were more than usually farcical, for the Communists banned them in the Russian zone, did everything to intimidate the workers, and refused to put up candidates in the Western zones. The issue in fact became less one of particular votes but one of demonstrating against Russian domination. There is no doubt that the Western powers are right in saying that the high percentage of Berliners who went to the polls constitutes a severe rebuff for the Russians. For an anarchist, knowing the fundamental baseness of all governments whether subservient to either power group, or independent of either, the issue of this particular election with its demonstration-like character, and the special hazards involved, must have posed a very difficult question.

Threats of Reprisals

The Russians more or less openly threatened that those who voted would be victimized, and had these been a minority instead of an 88 per cent. majority, there is little doubt that reprisals would have followed. As it is there must be a very long black list of those Berliners who have worked and agitated against the extension of Russian influence. From a moral point of view these facts commit the Allies more than ever to the policy of the airlift and the prevention of the Russian aim of excluding the Western powers from Berlin. To justify the defiance of the Russian Administration shown by so large a section of the population, the anti-Russian German administrators have asked that the air-lift supplies be doubled so

as to make life in the Western sectors tolerable enough to the people who depend upon supplies from the air.

Airlift as Final Solution

Unfortunately, those who have political memories will have no great confidence that the Allies will honour their moral commitments to the people of Berlin. The airlift is a tremendous expense, and is open to attack under the plea of the burden it places upon the taxpayer. Realistic papers with small circulations among the ruling class, like the *Economist*, discuss the dilemma openly. How long, they ask, will "public opinion" continue to sanction "the very great diversion of resources which the airlift represents"? And the *Times* points out that the airlift

is not an indefinitely feasible means of supplying the Berlin population. Senator Connally, who will be chairman of the American Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has already questioned the expense and confidently predicted a settlement with Russia.

Probable Sell-out

Such an outcome would be merely a repetition of the fashionably condemned appeasements of the past, and would condemn many Germans who openly express their opposition to the Russian domination to the revenge of the Communists.

Yet it is difficult to believe that the Western powers will find it feasible to continue the air lift indefinitely, or that they will take any account (except for face-saving reasons) of their moral obligations towards the people they have urged into demonstrating against the Russians.

Once again we feel that the problem is apparently insoluble within the existent social framework and power alignments. The future of Berlin lies in the successful throwing off of all governmental yokes, whether Anglo-American or Russian.

The Unions and Workers' Control

ONCE again there is a lot of talk about Workers' Control going on, and it is very evident from the sources from which some of the contributions come, that the two words can mean very nearly all things to all men.

From some points of view, for example, the words "Workers' Control" seems to imply not control by the workers but control of the workers. To be just we must admit that those who betray this attitude nearly always now speak of workers' "participation" while in the next breath speaking of the need for discipline and so forth. This is the present line of most Trade Union leaders who see workers' participation as merely the introduction of men sprung from the working class into the managerial positions created by nationalisation.

This, of course, is the high spot of trade unionism from the officials' point of view, whatever it may be from the workers'. The coming to power of the Labour Government radically altered the position of the

trade union leaders, who in opposition could be fire-brands but when their political wing came to power became "responsible"—which, in this sense, means reactionary. And the present trend among the Labour politicians and T.U. leaders to speak of workers' participation in management is very obviously a move to canalise and destroy the growing demand from the rank and file for real workers' control.

We are not trying to pretend that the full implications of this growing demand are as yet fully realised by the rank and file. There are, after all, no half-measures in workers' control. Either the workers control industry or the workers are controlled by industrialists or some other authority. Similarly, there are no half-measures in freedom. Either we are free or we are controlled by some authority. So that the full implications of workers' control are revolutionary ones. They entail an uncompromising struggle with capitalism and all the variations on the theme of capitalism played by parliamentarians of all shades. The ideological working-out of the ideas of workers' control can only lead to a rejection of central organisation altogether—and much as we should like to think so, we see no real evidence that there is any large body of opinion among the workers going as far as that.

It is one of the contradictions of politics and one of the tactics of political parties to support decentralist ideas when they are popular although it is perfectly obvious that the theory on which the politicals' general policies are based are fundamentally centralist and authoritarian. Examples are the Communist parties—Stalinist or Trotskyist—which pay lip service to the idea of workers' control while knowing perfectly well what it would be worth if they ever took power. And the other left-wing parties are similar.

Similarly, with the trade union officials, who know perfectly well that the establishment of real workers' control would be the end of their cushy jobs at inflated salaries and so their interest lies in diverting what demand there is into the harmless channels of "participation". This finds its greatest success in such achievements as the establishment of Mr. George Gibson on the Board of Directors of the Bank of England.

(Continued on page 4)

The LYSENKO Controversy

ATTENTION has already been drawn in the columns of *Freedom* to the controversy in Russia between Lysenko and geneticists alleged to be "subservient to Western pseudo-science". We ventured to suggest that the suppression of certain scientists and the science of geneticists might well create more of a storm in this country than many a more extensive or far-reaching repression in the Soviet Union. It now looks as if this prophecy will be justified, for the Lysenko controversy has been discussed on the wireless in several programmes and also in the daily and weekly press, while the Royal Society has also had occasion to comment on the matter.

Protests by British Scientists

It appears that the Royal Society has addressed several enquiries to the Russian Academy of Sciences regarding the date and place of death of its former President, Vavilov. None of these enquiries has received an answer, though Vavilov was an honorary member of the Royal Society and a geneticist of such international repute that he was elected President of the International Congress on Genetics held in Edinburgh in 1939. Vavilov was attacked by Lysenko and discredited. He disappeared and is thought to have died in a forced labour camp, but so far no account of his death has been disclosed by the Russian government or the Academy of Sciences.

When at a recent Congress, Lysenko attacked the remaining few of Vavilov's colleagues among orthodox geneticists, and succeeded in getting their institutes closed down and themselves dismissed, he did so with the official approval of the government. And in addition he laid it down that science should be political, or, in *Pravda's* words, "the most important principle in science is the party principle." This was too much for the Royal Society, and Sir Henry Dale, its president, resigned from the Russian Academy of Sciences, of which he was an honorary member. He addressed a dignified letter of protest regarding Vavilov's death and the political element introduced with official approval by Lysenko, and his

very restraint provided the most scathing comment upon the subordination of scientists in Russia. Since then, several other foreign members of the Russian Academy have also resigned.

Internationalism of Serbia

It could be said that these eminent scientists could have made their protest earlier, and that by making it now they expose themselves to the suspicion of having succumbed to the current anti-Russianism of politicians who were lauding "our gallant ally" only a few years since. But in their defence it must be said that scientists have sought to make science an international brotherhood, and with considerable success. And that the intrusion of political partisanship into

their relationships would be exactly the fault of which they now accuse the Russian government. That they have raised this protest, and on such ground, is greatly to their credit.

Lysenko, an Ignoramus

Several points of interest have emerged in the course of the recent broadcasts. Dr. Darlington and others have witheringly attacked Lysenko's experimental premises—his refusal to submit his results to statistical analysis—which he denounces as bourgeois—and the inability of other experimenters to repeat his results. But it is especially interesting to hear Dr. S. C. Harland state that to discuss genetics with Lysenko was like trying to explain the differential calculus to a man who did not know his twelve times table. After several hours conversation with him fifteen years ago Dr. Harland regarded him as a man devoid of any grasp of genetical principles or plant physiology.

Stalinist Defence

Professor Haldane showed himself to be a typical Stalinist in his extraordinarily feeble defence of Lysenko and the recent decrees against the very genetics of which he, Haldane, is an exponent. He claimed that he could not decide the issue without reading the 500 page report of the proceedings of the Congress. But it does not seem necessary to have read the whole report to form some kind of opinion about the subordination of science to party needs, the dismissal of geneticists of international repute and the closing of their institutes, or the denunciation of the work of Mendel and Morgan, which as Haldane very well knows is fundamental to modern genetics, as "fascistic" and "bourgeois". He prudently did not speak of these things, and merely sought to draw red herrings across the trail—being witheringly rebuffed for his many attempts to mislead the uninformed general public in a letter from a leading New Zealand geneticist in the same issue of the *Listener* which published his contribution to the discussion.

Not the least amusing—and instructive—aspects of Haldane's squirming defence of the indefensible, was his citing of the

colchicine treatment of seeds in an implied defence of Lysenko's claims; amusing because Lysenko has himself denounced this treatment as "bourgeois".

Inheritance of Acquired Characters

In another broadcast, Professor C. H. Waddington (who in his *Pelican The Scientific Attitude* had shown himself rather uncritically laudatory of the position of science in the Soviet Union) discussed certain political aspects of the Lysenko ideology. Most interesting was his suggestion that the revival of Lamarck's long discredited idea that acquired characteristics could be handed on to offspring was due to the need to bolster up confidence in the Soviet Government's ability to "control nature". For, clearly, if by altering the environment of a plant one can affect its offspring which will then continue to breed true, one can overcome agricultural difficulties which have proved very considerable in the past, and which have only been begun to be solved by the most advanced geneticists of the school officially discredited in Russia.

The revival of the idea of the inheritance of acquired characters is most interesting in this connection. It has no real scientific basis, but yet its substance is embedded in the ideas of the ignorant, and it is often appealed to in support of anti-revolutionary arguments. Thus, when reformists say that anarchism could not possibly come in a short time because of centuries of capitalist conditioning, they are really implying the we inherit ideas which were conditioned in our forebears by the conditions of capitalism. And it is obvious that if the effects of environment are inherited by offspring then the "living down" of reactionary conceptions and habits of economic competition will be a much more formidable business than revolutionists expect.

Actually, the fact (established by orthodox biology) that the germ cells which bear the structure of inheritance are virtually uninfluenced by the environment of the individual parent, means that the future generations will be genetically, at least, untrammelled by the unsatisfactory environment of the past and present. Here, at all events orthodox science is on the side of revolutionary conceptions as Kropotkin insisted, and Lysenko and the reformists are ideologically in much the same boat.

JOHN HEWETSON.

POLICE OFFICIAL'S DOUBLE LIFE

Head of a Gang of Car Thieves

Pierre Houdart, formerly police commissioner for the elegant Paris suburb of St. Cloud, who combined his official duties with those of leader of a gang of car thieves, has been condemned to five years' imprisonment, a fine of 30,000 francs (£30), and the loss of civil rights for 10 years.

Houdart stole the cars and passed them on to friends, who camouflaged them before re-selling them. As commissioner of police it fell to him to collect from the victims the details of the missing cars and to assure them that everything would be done to recover them. Over 100 such thefts were reported to him before his own part in the proceedings came to light. *Times*, 9/12/48.

THE STANDARDS OF HUMANITY

By ALEX COMFORT

THE B.B.C. has recently broadcast a series of talks entitled "The Right Thing to Do." We reprint here Alex Comfort's contribution to the series because we think it an admirable statement of an ethical standard arrived at from a strictly scientific point of view. Discussion is invited from readers on the issues raised.

WHEN I was asked to give this talk, I said I would try to speak from the viewpoint of a scientific worker, and it is not easy to do that. If you want to know the way to prevent accidents to deep sea divers, or how to cure a disease of fruit trees, you can call on the appropriate branch of science to give you the answer: the scientist may be able to help you from what he already knows, or he may have to devise experiments to get you the information you want, but the benefit you derive from consulting him will depend on your giving him the right problem in the right terms. What you can get from science is not a rule of life, but information, and I want to tell you how I interpret the information available, and how I personally use it in deciding how to act.

What Light Can Be Thrown on the Moral Sense

When I have a decision to make on an issue of conduct, I use equipment which is part of myself as a human being. I have my reason, and I have my conscience, or moral sense, if you like. What most of us want to know, I think, is whether studies such as psychology and sociology can throw any light on this moral sense—whether it is reliable, what it is, and what it signifies. There is the religious view, that it is a spiritual force within us, pointing to God or to an absolute standard of goodness, rather as a magnetic needle points north; and there is the relativist view, that it is a gyro-compass which only holds to the bearing upon which it is set. You see the importance of the difference. If my moral sense is consistent, and if it does in fact respond to some external standard, whether that standard is the will of God or a property of the universe, then I can refer to God or the universe as I can refer to the National Physical Laboratory when I want to check the accuracy of a thermometer or a balance. That was what Kant must have had in mind when he said that nothing proved the existence of deity so clearly as the starry heaven and the conscience within us. To which Freud replied that conscience is certainly something within us, but it has not always been there. We owe its shape to the shape of the family, to the fact that for anything up to fifteen years our parents are, for most purposes, our conscience, and to the kind of society in which we are brought up.

If absolute standards of moral behaviour were a part of the fabric of things, I should expect to find signs of them in the physical universe. But I cannot see any such signs apart from man and his attempts to find goodness and justice. The Victorian agnostics were very careful indeed to make it plain that in rejecting religious revelation they were not rejecting absolute standards of behaviour, because they feared, and many people still fear, that unless there is some objective standard of goodness, one cannot say that any action is better than any other. I think that is a fallacy, and I think it arose because of the tendency which we all exhibit, when we are dealing with something unfamiliar, to make a model in terms of what we know.

I believe that there are standards of conduct, but that they have been evolved by man—and do not exist in nature apart from man. We can go further, I think, and say that right and wrong, like the appreciation of beauty, are something confined to man—a private joke of the human species. Outside man, in the natural order, I can see some signs of consistency

and relationship but no signs of moral purpose. And following from that, I believe that if there were only one human being left, the terms right and wrong would not have any intelligible meaning so far as he was concerned. The Christian would say that such a sole survivor could still choose between right and wrong, because he could accept or reject a moral relationship with God. I believe that right conduct depends on the fact that men live in societies: the sole survivor I mention could not do wrong, because he could harm nobody, and could not do right, because he could help nobody.

I think you will agree if man is really the only part of the natural order for which goodness or beauty have meaning, moral decisions become not less but more important. These human standards will exist only so long as we uphold them. And we are bound together by the fact that we have two struggles—one against the environment which threatens our existence and one against the threat to the values which we have discovered, whether it comes from the physical order or from other human beings who endanger it by concentrating upon themselves and their own comfort and power.

If I am going to apply these conclusions, I must use my moral sense. How much can I find out about it from experimental science? In the last twenty years, we have learned a great deal about our moral sense, and we can begin to gauge its reliability. Let us begin with the individual. If I look at modern work in psychology, I find the conscience is a part of a far larger mechanism of censorship, which determines not only what I think right, but also which impulses and ideas I am able to think about tranquilly, and which make me so uncomfortable that I dodge them and push them out of consciousness. This censorship is only partly concerned with rational morals: much of it works at an entirely irrational, nursery level. I find I have to recognise aggressive impulses in myself—and even the part of my system of standards which is directly concerned with conduct can make me so uncomfortable if I disobey it that am very likely to do one thing from an unconscious motive and then pretend to my moral conscience that it is really something different. Nevertheless I also find that I can determine my own standards by reason. And before I can get a true picture of the reliability of moral sense I must look not only at the data for the single individual, but also at those for human beings living in groups.

It has often been denied that man is really a moral animal at all—people have said that he is too selfish, cruel and unreliable to qualify for such a title: you remember—the heart of man is corrupt and desperately wicked. Is it true? I do not think a sociologist would say that it is. What do we believe about the individual? Freud's discoveries frightened some people: they revealed forces outside our conscious control, but still a part of ourselves, about which we knew very little. They showed us that anti-social impulses are there and they showed us how easily we can be deceived over our own motives. But they did not reveal original sin in the religious sense—and there seems to be nothing in our knowledge of the individual which suggests a basic flaw in our moral nature such as is implied by the doctrine of the Fall. Primitive societies

are many of them far more able to reach sound judgments of conduct than we are to-day.

Stuffed Substitute for Responsibility

Analytical psychology teaches me to distrust my own motives. Sociology teaches me that provided I act as a human being, my human nature is not a trap, and I can reasonably trust my social impulses. And it points to another important principle. Human beings are social as long as they recognise one another as human beings. At the personal level we have certain common ground for our social actions. Once that relationship breaks down in any society, and particularly if we begin to treat institutions and conceptions as if they were human individuals, to individualise a group to which we belong, and transfer our responsibility from our neighbour to it, then our social sense shows increasing signs of breakdown, and we are left with a moral deficiency covering our whole public conduct, however

well we may behave in our home or our street. And when I have to decide how far I can accept the directions and the laws of a centralised state as guides to my conduct, I have to remember that a centralised state is one of these stuffed substitutes for responsibility. Power in society is a product, not of responsibility crystallised, but of group aggression. And however just and honourable the members of a government may be in their private lives, their social sense is bearing a weight which it was never designed to carry. One man can carry one pack. It is inviting failure to attempt to carry the packs of an entire army. The greater the concentration of authority, the greater the strain on those who accept it, the greater the likelihood that psychopaths will come to the top, and that those who do come to the top will be psychopathic.

Our moral sense only functions reliably in the type of relationship which exists between individuals: if I allow myself to swallow my conscience in deference to a graven image, however laudable, or if I allow myself to exercise a position of coercive power, my social sense will fail me exactly as it has failed every generation of rulers, whatever their standards and whatever their intentions. So I look upon it as my duty, in view of what I have learned about the mechanism of human relationships, not only to resist bad laws, but also to refuse to exercise power, either in politics, in personal affairs, or by adopting a dictatorial attitude toward my family, because if I accept power I remove my actions out of the field of human moral sense into the field where Hitler's intuitions, 'my country right or

wrong', and 'Father knows best' all find common ground.

In everyday life I have to apply these beliefs to the choices I make. How do they help me to decide what I should do and what I should refuse to do? I can put it best by quoting the last novel of Albert Camus, *The Plague*:

"I know that in this world there are pestilences and there are victims, and it is up to us not to ally ourselves with the pestilences."

Power is one of these pestilences, war is another. There are physical pestilences, the diseases and the discomforts and the accidents—my reasons for undertaking scientific work at all is that it is part of the business of abolishing them. But in everyday life, the rule which I use is a reasonably concise one. I am responsible for seeing that I do nothing which harms any other human being, and I leave nothing undone which can reduce the amount of preventable suffering and failure. And I find that in making quick judgments in complicated cases—and almost all the cases are complicated in modern society—conscience is a reliable instrument. If I stop to argue the benefit to humanity in abstract terms, I am much more likely to find myself acquiescing in something like Belsen than if I follow my human sense.

And the second rule I can recommend you is this: in your public conduct, when you are asked to choose between a personal action which causes suffering and a hypothetical evil which will result if you refuse, choose the hypothetical evil. Anything I agree to do will be done. I am responsible for it. If I drop this atom bomb, I shall obliterate Hiroshima. If I refuse the inhabitants of Hiroshima may set up a tyranny. I choose the tyranny, not because I am prepared to compromise with it but because its creation will depend on other people's judgments, not mine, and I may be being deceived. Man is adjusted to function in a social society; in such a society, our consciences would have a direct check from the social group. To-day, in contemporary society, we have nothing to guide us but the state, and the state is not a human being, or even a socially responsible group of human beings. You might be willing to drop the atomic bomb, or to agree to its being dropped in a good cause, but you would not deal with the population of Hiroshima singly with a sword, whatever benefits to humanity were promised you. Faced with a decision in private life or in public duty, the Jew will refer to the Law of God, and the Catholic to the teaching of the church, and the Protestant Christian to his interpretations of what God would wish, or what Christ would have done. I would try to refer to the standard I have given you, the standard of humanity which is the foundation of scientific humanism.

This responsibility is twofold—a positive duty to remember that you are a human being, and a negative duty of disobedience to irrational and anti-human instructions. Josef Kramer, of Belsen, has been described as a respectable man who thought he was doing his duty. That may be true or false, but as often as we allow the standards of a group which is based on power to supersede our personal responsibility as an individual to individuals, we become like him. And the choice rests with us.

Reprinted by courtesy of the B.B.C. and The Listener

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

- El Terror Bolchevique en Bulgaria. Prologo de Eugen Relgis, Ediciones F.O.R.A., Buenos Aires.
- La Contre-révolution Etatiste, Ernesta, Editions Pensée et Action, Bruxelles—Paris.
- Il Movimento Operaio e la Tattica Elettorale, Errico Malatesta, Edizioni Aurora, Italy.
- Le Syndicalisme et le Problème Paysan, Paul Camus, Editions S.L.I.M., Paris.
- Inside Red Russia, J. J. Maloney, M.L.C., Angus and Robertson, Sydney.
- Sleepless Spain, Victor Alba, Cobbett Press, London.
- L'Ere de l'Impérialisme, Robert Louzon, Ed. Spartacus, Paris.
- Saverio Merlino, Max Nettlau, Traduzione e Introduzione di I. Edizioni Studi Sociali, Montevideo.
- Questions for Communists, Stephen Naft, New Leader Association, New York.
- Rex v. Aldred, London Trial, 1909, Indian Sedition, Glasgow Sedition Trial 1921, Edited and Compiled with Commentary and Appendices by Guy A. Aldred, Strickland Press, Glasgow.
- Défense de l'homme, Revue Mensuelle, rédacteur: Louis Lecoin, Paris.
- L'Indispensable Révolution—l'Emancipation de l'homme par le Socialisme.
- Libertaire, Gaston Level, Editions du Libertaire, Paris.
- Libertà e Rivoluzione, Michele Bakunin, Scelta delle opere a cura di Carlo Doglio, Istituto Editoriale Italiano, Milano.

George Woodcock's LITERARY NOTES

THE illogicality of men of science outside the realm of their own subjects is notorious. We have all met the acute mathematician or clever biologist who is knocked sideways in childish reverence for the most patently mendacious statements of Comrade Stalin, or the first-rate physician whose social attitude is of the purest Blimp. It is the kind of penalty which seems to come from over-specialisation, an over-stimulation of one mental faculty leading to atrophy of the rest.

Perhaps more distressing, because less easy to understand, are the cases of those men who do gain a certain universality of outlook and then turn it to the wrong end. A book which illustrates this is Alexis Carrel's extremely interesting and equally exasperating *Man, The Unknown*, which has just been reprinted as a Pelican.

Carrel was a French surgeon who did important work in his own field, but whose activities gave him the opportunity to observe, with a very inquiring mind, what was being found in other branches of science relating to human life.

The result of these inquiries led him to the conclusion that any scientific approach to man must regard him as an organic whole, must seek to establish the unity of the personality, and to end the fatal dualism which has ridden science and plagued the rationalists as well as the religionists since Descartes made his celebrated distinction between mind and matter.

On this basis Carrel gives a very fascinating description of the functioning of the human body, and some astute comments on the influence of the environment. But his psychology is weak—for which defect he makes up by saying that the science is still in a primitive stage—and he makes atrocious generalisations of a quite reactionary nature.

For instance, he goes to great lengths to discuss the difference of human personality which fit men and women for different types of activity. Nobody in his senses will deny the manifold diversity of human types, but it is completely illogical to jump from this to saying, as Carrel does, that, because men are different, they are unequal, and have unequal rights.

As I said, it is a book from which you will gain quite a number of interesting facts and stimulating thoughts. But, if you have any sense of human realities, you will be exasperated beyond measure by the persistent perverseness of the author's thought.

Byron is one of the few really good social poets which English literature has produced, and for this reason it has always been a somewhat frustrating thing to find his really lively passages buried in a great mass of romantic poetry which to-day has little interest. Byron was as poor an example of the romantic poet as he was a great satirist.

Those who experience these difficulties have now had their task done for them, for Roy Fuller, himself a contemporary social poet of some distinction, has made a sound and handy selection of *Byron for To-day* (Porcupine Press, 5/-). Besides copious selections of the satirical poems, it contains a stimulating introduction on Byron's contemporary significance.

Two new magazines of interest to libertarians are *Défense de l'Homme* and *Contemporary Issues*. The former is edited by the veteran French anarchist, Louis Decoin, and the first issue contains interesting articles and notes on almost every aspect of social and cultural thought, from Modern Pedagogy to Charlie Chaplin. The latter is brought out by the group who edit *Dinge der Zeit*, and contains, among other items, an analysis of the Yugoslav situation by Paul Ecker, a criticism of T. S. Eliot as critic, and a study of Pragmatism.

A contribution to documentation of the atrocities committed, not this time by the Nazis, but by the Allied air forces, is given in *Out of the Ruins* by Gerhard Mackenroth (Peace News, 3d.), an unpretentious account by a German soldier of the search which he made for his dead wife and child among the ruins of bombed Dresden. It is written with a level and unemotional style which makes it one of the most telling accounts of its kind that I have read.

The Intellectuals Must be Taught!

The Vatican, while putting Sartre on the Index for his squalor, must be careful not to condemn the English Greene and Waugh (though the Eire censorship has fewer inhibitions). The Communists, while exalting Russian culture, cannot afford to alienate the Western intellectuals who have little use for Lysenko and Gerassimov, but, so long as they keep in step with the party, act as good advertisement for Marxism. All sides find them useful but most unreliable. "Left... left... left, right, left!" shout the party sergeant-majors as the intellectuals shamble along, dreaming of other things and falling out now and again for a drink. Gone are the days, writes M. Casanova, of the French Communist party's Political Bureau, in the current Cominform

journal, when the intellectuals could be allowed out in groups of their own; the professional societies into which they were formed after the Liberation "tended to develop into independent bodies, which took upon themselves the right to pass decisions without applying to the usual party organisations," and so, of course, had to be abolished. This, suggests M. Casanova, explains why the Zhdanov line on artistic and intellectual questions was so hard to sell in France. But there is still hope. A Central Commission on Work Among Intellectuals has been formed to do some ideological slumming. Perhaps this is the one point on which colonels, cardinals, and commissars agree: the intellectuals must be taught to respect authority.

Manchester Guardian, 22/11/48.

... from our stock ...

- On the Edge of the Primeval Forest
Albert Schweitzer 10/6
- Modern Love
George Meredith 5/-
- Man's Estate
André Malraux 8/6
- The Art of the Theatre
Frank O'Connor 2/6
- ★
- For Children
- Three Gay Tales from Grimm 5/-
- PUFFIN BOOKS:
- Children of the New Forest 2/-
- Through the Looking Glass 1/6
- Paper Birds (for cutting out) 2/1d
- Printing: Locomotives; Dogs; Zoo Animals;
- Animals of Australia; About a Motor Car;
- Music Time—a book of tunes; Horses; 1/6 each

- King Penquin Books 2/6 each
- Unknown Westminster Abbey
- Poisonous Fungi
- Highland Dress
- Woodcuts by Albrecht Durer
- ★
- The World's Masters—
- New Series 3/- each
- William Blake
- Sandro Botticelli
- Jan Vermeer of Delft
- Hans Holbein the Younger

- ★
- Resistance (New York) Nov.-Dec., 1948 3d.
- Journal of Sex Education, No. 3 Dec., 1948 2/-

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.

'HELPING AFRICANS'

ANTI-IMPERIALISM for many years and particularly in the years between the world wars, was a touchstone of sincerity on the part of all bodies claiming to be "progressive" in this country, and most particularly was this the case as regards its international relations, because it was never considered by working-class bodies abroad that any British socialist movement could claim to be socialist if it

THROUGH THE PRESS

THE WONDERFUL AVERAGE MAN AGAIN

The New Yorker cannot be in touch in the same way as is the Londoner with the men who run his country. The Londoner in his casual routine can meet in the same day, a Member of Parliament, a Treasury official, a film star, an officer in the Brigade of Guards.

He can confirm or modify his own opinions by direct contact with the people who effect events. He does not need to rely solely on the newspapers and on the radio for his information.

—Alec Waugh in the

Evening Standard, 13/12/48.

Of course, being a Londoner has its drawbacks, as when Stewart Granger and Stafford Cripps turn up for tea on a wet Monday with your room full of washing...

BLACK DOGS

A cemetery for dogs in Washington has refused to bury dogs belonging to coloured people. This is one example of racial discrimination alleged by 87 civil leaders, representing all parts of the United States, in an outspoken report of conditions in the district of Columbia, which the report describes as a "blot on our nation", and alleges that the Government itself is a chief offender. "Its practice of systematically denying Negroes equal employment opportunities set a bad example," the report says.

Sharing the blame, says the report, are Congressmen who champion "white supremacy" and real estate, commercial, and financial interests which consider segregation is a "matter of good business". Discrimination against Negroes in Washington, the report says, is now more widespread than it was five years ago. Segregation is practised not only in hotels, theatres, restaurants, and housing developments, but in Government posts and even in churches, schools and hospitals.

The largest churches, Protestant and Catholic alike, followed a policy of discouraging attendance by Negroes. "The exclusion of Negro Catholics from white-Catholic churches is one of the most disturbing aspects of segregation," the report said. It also claimed the Negro doctors could attend patients in only one local hospital, and the schools for coloured children were inferior to those for the whites.

It said that 260,000 Negroes—about one-third of the population of Washington—were crowded together in "black belts" which had become some of the ugliest slums in the country. Because of these conditions, a Negro living in Washington had an expectation of life 12 years less than that of a white person.

Manchester Guardian, 11/12/48.

COMMUNIST KINGDOM?

"Eventually we will all arrive at Communism," was the forecast ventured by Dr. Johnson, the Dean of Canterbury, in New York yesterday.

He further opined: "It is possible for Communism to exist in England without doing away with the rule of the King. It might very well be that Princess Elizabeth's son will become King of Communist England."

Sunday Dispatch, 12/12/48.

DIRECT ACTION BY HOUSEWIVES

For the first time in Swiss economic history, a boycott of Swiss products by Swiss consumers was successfully organised and maintained when housewives went on strike a few days ago, and refused to buy any fresh meat in the butcher shops as a protest against the increase in price.

National councillor Gottlieb Duttweiler headed the angry meat consumers and rallied all the women's organisations in support of the boycott.

For several days Swiss butcher shops were full of meat but empty of customers, who ate corned beef and imported frozen meat or didn't eat any meat at all.

N.Y. Herald Tribune, 4/12/48.

were not anti-imperialist. By accepting imperialism, British socialists would also accept the necessity for imperial war, identity of interests with their own ruling-class, oppression of the workers abroad, and the general nationalist ideas as against internationalist.

The Labour Party as such threw anti-imperialism overboard in the first minority governments and has always accepted the need for the Empire, rather fancying itself in the rôle of junior partner with capitalism for the share-out of the Empire. The Communists were of course tied to Russian Imperialism but the conflict of this with their professed support for colonial workers did not become so apparent until 1941, when they became the most enthusiastic wavers of the flag and the patriotic chorus-leaders, causing the practical fold-up of their organisation in Eire, their complete identification with the ruling-class in India and Africa, while a curious anomaly existed in the Japanese-held countries until 1945, the C.P. supporting the Japanese militarists more or less, with some effort at independence from them, until the end of the Russo-Japanese peace and commercial treaties that preceded the fall of the atomic bomb.

Nevertheless, apart from these obvious phoney anti-imperialists there was considerable sympathy in working-class circles here for colonial independence and aims, and only the intangible and half-and-half policies of the various groups standing for anti-imperialist activities caused the lack of real support. It was never particularly clear what sort of action the Indian and African and other bodies—mostly composed of students and not, therefore, wholly conscious of proletarian possibilities—considered could be extended to the struggle in those countries by organised workers here. In any case, too, the feelings of sympathy held by organised workers here were seldom translated into action—Spain being such a terrible example—owing to the illusion and dope of political action. But to-day it must frankly be admitted that little even of the desire remains, partly owing to the widespread belief that "the Labour Government has emancipated the Empire", and partly owing to the betrayals by their own politicians of India and Pakistan. This latter, indeed, does at least show that we were not so sectarian as we were sometimes accused of being, when we nagged about the limitations of nationalist politics and how betrayal could be expected in the event of war and also in the event of home rule.

It must be said, however, that home rule in the Indian continent (even if this has been more occasioned by the run-down of the British Army than the anti-imperialism of the Labour leaders) is most overwhelmingly superior to imperialism in spite of the transformation of disciples of Gandhi to disciples of Caesar, and primarily the reason for this is not because the Indian masses have gained liberty—they have lost only one illusion, the nationalist one (in itself a gain)—but because the British workers have ceased to be oppressors there and can no longer be identified with the capitalist class in the rule of India. But this still remains the case in Africa; and the British Junkers are planning to make Africa a second India—to build out of the Central African colonies a new empire to replace the financially outworn old one. This would undoubtedly have initial support, even from some Africans, as an alternative to the menace of "White" South Africa. There is no doubt whatever that under the progressive veneer of talk about helping the Africans by such plans as the "groundnuts" scheme, the Labour Government means to re-create an Empire in Africa. The "emancipation" of the Empire boils down to an acceptance of the fact that they cannot continue to hold down India against its millions; and have switched their plans to Africa. The scheme for economic development, even more the switching of the Army Middle Eastern base to Kenya, give evidence of their preparedness to build a new colonial empire, and this must be seen in light of the fact that Africans have—since the impetus given them by the impudent Dr. Malan's plan to deport Indians and segregate

WE apologise to those readers who notice a certain lack of topicality in this issue of *Freedom*. Owing to the date of publication this fortnight, all material had to go to press some days earlier than usual.

THE POLITICAL CESSPOOL

THE recent debates at the National Assembly have exposed once more the corruption which prevails in parliamentary circles and which characterises the great majority of social activities in France. In the past, one had to deal merely with individual corruption but nowadays whole groups and parties are rotten from top to bottom.

The Minister of Interior, the Socialist Jules Moch, in a speech which lasted two hours, has defined his accusations against the Communist Party. He has revealed how Soviet subsidies reached the Stalinist propaganda machine in France through the Banque du Nord whose shares are mostly in the hands of the Russian state and which happen to be the bank used by the French Communist Party. Funds are also dispatched in Rumanian, Polish and Czech diplomatic bags and important sums have been sent under the cover of "workers' solidarity" by organisations mostly in Eastern Europe.

It is the first time that such accusations have been made officially. They are not new in themselves, for years the anti-Communist Press has been publishing them and people who have the courage to keep their eyes open have had their minds made up for a long time.

During the miners' strike the French Communist Party has published, on the average, two posters a week and has distributed them all over the country; furthermore, it has issued hundreds of

thousands of handbills. These expenses were above those incurred normally, i.e., paid officials, upkeep of propaganda headquarters, and an extensive Press which is run at a loss. One must also reckon that important sums were used to keep the movement going; without them it would have soon died out owing to the weariness of the miners.

The lists of subscriptions which were sent to all the branches of the C.G.T., the collections organised all over the country have no doubt gathered considerable amounts. But they can only be considered as representing a fraction of the money spent and they often offered a convenient façade to money received from elsewhere. If one looks at all closely at

LETTER FROM FRANCE

the subscription lists published in the Communist Press one soon realises that the sums contributed must have been considerably inflated. Only people who wish to go on being fooled because it suits their personal interests or because they are afraid of losing their faith believe such figures.

However the Communist deputy, Jacques Duclos, who answered the Minister of Interior, has been able to quote figures and totals to disprove his charges. More effectively still he has attacked the other political parties on the same ground. He wanted to know, for example, how the Socialist daily *Le Populaire* managed to continue publication in spite of its deficit. He himself supplied the answer: the Socialist receive money from the Government, from abroad, in particular from Italy, England and Belgium, and from secret capitalist sources.

The spokesman of the Cominform in France went on to expose the occult resources of the Christian Democrats and the mysterious funds at the disposal of

the Gaullist Party. He ended by asking (certain that there was no risk that his demand would be granted) that an enquiry be immediately started in the resources of all political parties.

★ The moral disintegration of democracy which is a direct result of the invading imperialist powers is an open secret for everyone. Not only governments, and Party machines, but also working-class movements are rotting.

In well-informed circles in Paris and among lucid observers it is known that the various trade union organisations receive subsidies either from services connected with the Foreign Affairs Services of certain countries, from agents employed by various embassies or else by associations of industrialists. The Christian Trade Unions, the reformist Trade Unions calling themselves *Force Ouvrière*, the Gaullist production committees, the "independent" trade unions and organised minorities, even modest trade union officials, all and sundry, are in the pay...

The great difference between the Stalinists and the non-Stalinists is that the money sent to the former is sent with the knowledge that it will be used by a well-disciplined army, while that sent to the latter is often supplied without any pre-conceived plan, mainly to strengthen the anti-Communist forces—but it achieves little results because it is absorbed by a costly and inefficient machinery.

If one were to count the number of workers' publications and organisations which have remained absolutely pure the fingers of one's hand would be sufficient.

One can be justly proud to know that the Anarchist weekly *Le Libertaire* maintains itself only thanks to its subscribers, its readers and subscription lists. But this also explains why it has to meet continuous difficulties in order to continue publication.

S. PARANE.

SOME ADMISSIONS ABOUT BRITISH AGRICULTURE

THE possibility of expanding food production in this country has often been discussed in these columns, and it forms an important section of George Woodcock's pamphlet *New Life to the Land* (Freedom Press, 6d.). But it is a possibility which has been neglected by the political groups of the Right and Left, the opinion being frequently expressed that British agriculture has reached its limit, and that these "overpopulated" islands have no option but to secure food supplies from abroad,

for it is "impossible" to grow it here.

This attitude has, of course, well suited the interests of the exporters of machine products who expect to be paid in agricultural imports, and the government has followed their lead. Now, however, the loss of overseas markets and the shortage of dollars have changed all that and a new policy of expanding the home farming industry has been introduced. The following table shows the expansion of food growing acreage during the war, and also the targets for further expansion which the new agricultural plans have set.

CROP ACREAGES IN THOUSAND TONS				
Average	1936-39	1948-9	1949-50	1952-53
Bread Grains	1850	2300	2600	2800
Other Grains	3400	6000	6200	6500
Potatoes	750	1500	1300	1100

This shows a considerable increase on pre-war production and the expectation of further increases. Livestock, which during the war years fell considerably because of the difficulty of securing feeding stuffs has now recovered. Cattle stock is 110 per cent. of the 1939 level, poultry 115 per cent., sheep (badly affected by the hard winter two years ago) 68 per cent., and pigs 49 per cent. It is expected that livestock production could be increased to

an extent which would make total agricultural output two-thirds as large again as before the war.

These figures are interesting in themselves, in that they show that despite the export interests, British agriculture can be considerably expanded. But it is also interesting to find that the methods for promoting such an increase are solely those of monetary incentives which provide many difficulties quite outside the technical problems of increased farming production. At present many farmers are only able to engage in mixed arable farming because of the price controls and guaranteed and often subsidised price they receive from the government buying organisations. If these ceased, these farmers would turn over their whole land to grazing and rely on dairy produce to keep them going. Whether they would in fact be able to do so is another matter, but it is clear that mixed farming is completely dependent on some kind of guaranteed price to the farmer—that is to economic conditions which have nothing inherently to do with the problem of food production itself. Without the complications introduced by industrial capitalism, the problem of increasing Britain's food output would be very much simpler, and the full application of modern technical advances (We do not mean simply mechanisation) would be widely possible.

Alex Comfort:	
BARBARISM AND SEXUAL FREEDOM	
Boards 3/6. Paper 2/6	
Alexander Berkman:	
A.B.C. OF ANARCHISM	1/-
George Woodcock:	
ANARCHY OR 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/-

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 Leval:	
COLLECTIVES IN SPAIN	1d.
Charles Duff:	
A HANDBOOK ON HANGING	2/-

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

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	

John Olday:	
THE MARCH TO DEATH	1/6
THE LIFE WE LIVE, THE DEATH WE DIE	2/6
A. Ciliga:	
THE KRONSTADT 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.
ON LAW	1d.
P. J. Proudhon:	
GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE 19th CENTURY	Cloth 5/-

GANDHIANS (like Dr. J. C. Kumarappa), socialists, communists, capitalists and Governments of every variety say that production is what will solve the consuming problem. As if production has anything to do with the system under which consuming is "arranged". Whether it is the state—of whatever form—which produces (states never produce but may organise production!), whether individual or group (company) capitalists produce, whether the socialist or communist parties think that they can produce and distribute, consumption is a thing which they cannot arrange.

Varieties of Nonsense

All these groups, ideologies, parties or organisations accept certain methods of organising production as necessary. In fact, they have all something in common. On that point they do not want to change anything. The state, individual or group capitalists, or socialist and communist parties as well as Gandhians want production to be carried on as now by buying things required for production and paying for labour in the same manner as now. But if they produce whatever they can, the people who have to pay all the expenses and organisation (offices and government) cannot pay for them, for they will not have received the amount of money which they are required to pay to maintain the offices or government, and even for the material required for production, for they earn only salaries and wages. The prices being labour costs, material costs and organisation charges, those who receive salaries and wages cannot pay for all these and therefore cannot buy up the goods at prices which will include all these expenses. For we know that hand work cannot be purchased by those who produce it. The same applies to machine goods. It is only when those outside production buy up the goods, that expenses can be met. For wages and salaries are only part of the prices and the total expenses cannot be recovered out of wages and salaries. But all these so-called economists think that the part can pay for the whole, an absurdity which is common to all. It is with this absurdity that they are all approaching the so-called economic problem. It can be said safely that they will not solve the problem of distribution and consumption whatever and however much they may produce, even however little

Money & Moral Values

An examination of the Gandhian economic theory of replacing the factory system by a return to handicraft with an introduction of "moral values" into the money system.

they may produce. For distribution cannot take place at all on this production basis, for before the distribution can take place the producers and their organisation must be paid their full price. These so-called producers control production for their own benefit and cannot permit of any other result. So it is waste of time and energy because it is talking in the air, without consideration of the conditions. And this neglect of conditions, fundamental conditions, is common to all of them. The whole civilisation and mankind may go down, but there can be no distribution and consumption under these conditions which they have all accepted and want to maintain. But they have platform and paper and can shout without thinking in the least. They are even able to live for shouting or by shouting like that. No other voice can be raised or heard in the midst of their din which is called "economics". They are all trying to square the circle and they promise they can do so. They quarrel only on non-essentials and drag others who are starving into their quarrels.

Recently, Dr. J. C. Kumarappa, the great exponent of Gandhian economics said that "Gandhism aimed at eschewing violence and dishonesty from daily life and at making people self-sufficient in regard to the primary needs". Dr. Kumarappa explained "the present day money economy made them lose sight of the real value of things as distinguished from their commercial value. Money was not a safe method of valuing articles".

Moral Value of Goods

He said that Mahatma's self-sufficiency programme founded upon moral values would, if implemented, raise the moral consciousness and lower money considerations and material values. Now, we must ask, apart from questioning moral values and raising moral consciousness, whether Dr. Kumarappa wants no money to be used in production process? No, he does not say so definitely. He simply wants to lower money considerations. Does he mean that whatever may be the

money price of goods, he would let those in need have the goods? That he does not say either. In fact, goods are not material value but moral value! Does he mean goods are not to be produced for material needs and satisfaction but only for the moral values and satisfaction obtained in producing them? That would mean "production for production's sake". I suppose, Dr. Kumarappa does not mean to go on piling up goods without distribution just for the sake of moral values contained in them. Even an absurd man cannot say that. Surely he would want to distribute the goods. How will he do it? Just give it away! That would be nice. But then the goods will have no money value but only use value. Is it what Dr. Kumarappa wants? But since he does not say so, we must have a clear answer from him. Alright, supposing for the moment that Dr. Kumarappa wants goods to be produced for use and not for sale—shall all, whether those who live only by preaching something for production get the goods alike—free? Then

there would be no difference between producers and parasites. Is that moral consciousness? That also would require elucidation from Dr. Kumarappa.

No Money but Payment

How would Dr. Kumarappa organise producing goods? He would not simply confiscate the materials and equipment needed for producing goods. Does he want only labour to be confiscated? Make work compulsory without any payment? I do not suppose so. Therefore, Dr. Kumarappa, supposing he organises production and not merely preach about the moral beauties of production, will pay some kind of money for raw materials and equipment, land, houses and transport and also some wages to those who work and organise production. Or can he do this without any of these requirements? Those who sell raw materials must also live and therefore must earn, and so Dr. Kumarappa must pay more than what the raw materials cost them to produce, must pay them profits. Those who supply equipment must also live, must earn more than they paid for them and have profits. Dr. Kumarappa will not deny them these. Then he will either have to purchase or rent house and land or he must buy them outright without loss to their owners and even with some profit or he must pay rent continually. All these must be paid in some kind of money. Then he will have to pay the technicians, employees and labourers with some money at least. Thus there will be money payment throughout. Having put in the money, he cannot distribute the products without consideration of any money. Rather he will have to recover the whole cost or expense during the distribution—with something to pay himself. Now, the total cost of all the goods produced will amount to X—money and this must be recovered with something more than X. Otherwise, Dr. Kumarappa cannot buy anything and must go without food. Unless someone makes charity out of their earnings to feed, clothe and house him and provide for all other necessities out of their portion of earnings.

M. P. T. ACHARYA.
(To be concluded.)

ANARCHIST ACTIVITIES in BIRMINGHAM

THE season's meetings commenced with an inaugural meeting on September 26th. Eric Woodward read a paper on "Art and Revolution". He criticised the anarchists' reliance upon industrial action as the chief means of revolution. Anarchy, he thought, could only be realised by each individual becoming a special kind of artist, thus integrating his own personality and by that means bringing about a transformation of society. This viewpoint was hotly challenged and accused of being one-sided and ineffectual. An extremely interesting discussion followed.

The relationship between anarchism and pacifism was discussed on Oct. 10th. Our old and respected comrade Mat Kavanagh addressed the group on Oct. 24th. His subject was "Anarchism—Past and Present". He gave us an interesting account of some of the personalities involved in the early anarchist movement and reminded us that the events of the past fifty years had fully confirmed Bakunin's contention that a revolution must negate its point of departure or it will inevitably return to it.

The non-arrival of our lecturer on November 7th resulted in the meeting being cancelled. On November 21st, S. E. Parker gave a talk on the "Chicago Martyrs". After outlining the tragic occurrences of this famous but half-forgotten incident, he drew an analogy between 1886 and to-day and stated that if reaction was not to consolidate its triumph, the spirit of the Chicago Martyrs must be recaptured and their memory perpetuated in our actions.

Other Activities

"Freedom" has been sold at all important political meetings.

Public Meetings. Public meetings have been held on Aug. 1st and Oct. 24th, in the Bull Ring. Mat Kavanagh addressed an attentive crowd on both occasions. It is hoped that more public meetings of this nature could be held, the only difficulty being a lack of capable speakers.

S. E. PARKER,
Secretary, B.A.G.

and BRISTOL

THE Bristol Anarchist Group held their Monthly Meeting on Tuesday, 7th December, as usual in Room 4 of the Kingsley Hall, Old Market Street. Desmond Medhurst gave a talk on "Selfishness and Anarchism", developing an interesting theory that what is normally known as "unselfishness" should really be called "moral selfishness", since satisfaction is derived from it, as much as from material selfishness.

The speaker considered that life exists solely for self-interest and gratification, either bodily or mental. From the instinctive gratification of bodily pleasures, we were said to turn, when intellect had developed, to the gratification of the mind or inner ego, by denying our instinctive desires. Material selfishness sprang from wishes or desires, and moral selfishness from duty or reason.

The conclusions reached by Frankel and Weisskopf, two women Viennese psychologists, were mentioned, showing that wishes are more attractive to the unconscious than are duties.

Nevertheless, the development of reasoned moral selfishness was seen to be the only true progress, and a possible help to anarchists in life and teaching.

A lively discussion followed, ranging through Free Will, Heredity, Environment and the Lysenko controversy, returning to the subject at issue, and a general agreement that the speaker had provided plenty of material for thought.

A BRISTOL COMRADE.

Industrial Notes

AN INSULT

A MATTER of tremendous importance is being considered by the Civil Service Union on behalf of its members. And its members are considering the matter rather ruefully for themselves.

After spending months in trying to negotiate with the Treasury for increased pay for messengers and office cleaners, delay which resulted in considerable unrest and agitation among the Whitehall workers, the union is now faced with a munificent offer from the Treasury. The minimum rate for messengers has been

£4 10s. 0d. per week. The Treasury are offering £5. The hourly rate for cleaners was 1s. 8½d. The Treasury are offering 1s. 8½d. An increase of one farthing per hour—on a 48-hour week—one shilling!

This was announced some days ago, and we have been waiting to see the union decision before commenting on it. At the time of going to press, however, no decision has been announced—which means that the union is really considering the matter! Surely there is only one answer to such an insulting offer by the Treasury—unhesitating refusal, followed by immediate direct action.

We have seen the effect of strike action in Government buildings when earlier in the year electricians, lift-men and maintenance engineers came out. If the bureaucrats had to deliver their own messages and clean their own offices, the Treasury might be induced to see the thing in rather a different light.

One of the arguments by which the Treasury had managed to delay things for so long was reference to the Government White Paper on wages—the "Freeze Wages" paper. The union argued that the White Paper contained provision for wage claims by those earning below a reasonable standard of subsistence. Such government publications are, of course, completely irrelevant. What matters is the need of the workers. The Treasury offer can hardly be said to have affected that one bit.

TIME TO STOP

AS a post-script to our note in last issue referring to the new watch industry in Wales, the following cutting from the *News Chronicle* (14/12/48) draws attention to a very old aspect of any industry:

"A new type of wrist-watch offered as a Christmas present, has been fitted by a well-known maker with a double case. This keeps out the dust all right, but is causing a dust-up among the watch repairers.

"It stops the owner-wearer looking inside to 'see the wheels going round' or counting the jewels and what-not. But it also makes it impossible, if it stops, to poke around the works with a pin.

"The *Horological Journal*—watch shopkeepers' trade magazine—contains a tearful letter on the subject.

"Pin-poking usually breaks the 'balance staff' or other vital mechanism, and is the repairer's best friend. As replacement spare parts are now more plentiful, this repairer begs the manufacturers: 'Live and let live!'"

In an article elsewhere in this issue, Acharya shows how the money system encourages the production of shoddy goods. In fact it demands shoddy goods of short life since following on the heels of the manufacturers who live from the production of such goods come the hordes of patchers-up and menders who live from the repairing necessary to poor quality products.

And some talk about the efficiency of capitalism!

Meetings and Announcements

UNION OF ANARCHIST GROUPS: CENTRAL LONDON

Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.
At 8, Endsleigh Gardens, W.C.1.
JAN. 2 Various Speakers
JAN. 9 "Questions and Answers" R. Rhees
"Evils of Social Reform"

HAMPSTEAD

Informal meetings for discussion, so far without Chairman or any predetermined subject, are held every TUESDAY, at 7.30 p.m., at:

5, Villas-on-the-Heath,
Vale of Health,
Hampstead, N.W.3.
All comrades are welcome.

MERSEYSIDE LIBERTARIAN GROUPS

PUBLIC MEETINGS
in COOPER'S HALL, Shaw Street,
Liverpool
on Sundays at 7.30 p.m.
JAN. 16 David Pude, Les Griffiths,
Harold Sculthorpe
"Why Vote?"

GLASGOW ANARCHIST GROUP

Indoor Meetings,
CENTRAL HALLS, Bath Street,
every Sunday at 7 p.m.,
Frank Leech, Willy Carlyle, John Gaffney,
Eddie Shaw.
No Meeting Jan. 2

BIRMINGHAM

Discussion-Lectures are held on alternate
Sundays in Dick Sheppard House, 36,
Holloway Head, at 7 p.m.
JAN. 2 S E Parker
Can we Affirm the Real Thing?

CHORLEY

PUBLIC LECTURES
The Situation in Germany To-day,
A. Hargreaves (Recently returned from
Germany). Sunday, Jan. 9th at 7.15 p.m.
Oddfellows Rooms, 9, Cunliffe Street,
Chorley, Lancs.

ONE-THIRD OF THE WAY!

FOUR months have passed since we launched our SPECIAL APPEAL and during that period our readers have responded to the tune of £300. Though this amount is still far from our target of £900, nevertheless we feel that it is an achievement which, in these days of political apathy, is far from insignificant. To all those friends and comrades who have shown their solidarity, the Freedom Press extend their thanks.

The present issue completes our 12th year of continuous publication with the exception of a few months in 1939. During that period we have published 260 issues of "Freedom" and its predecessors "War Commentary" and "Spain and the World". We enter our 13th year of publication in a better financial position than that in which we entered the current year, but we are still a long way from being out of the wood. For this reason we ask those comrades and friends who have supported "Freedom Press" during this difficult year to continue their support and actions during the coming year. We also appeal to those comrades who have so far ignored our call for solidarity and activity on behalf of the paper and the anarchist ideal, to FIND during the coming year the time and the money to contribute to the task of forwarding our movement in this country.

Special Appeal 10th LIST

December 3rd to December 15th:

Ilford: S.E. 1/6; Glasgow: A.M.C.D. 3/4;
Anon: £10/0/0; Glasgow: F.L. £5/0/0;
Anon 2/6; London: I.A. 5/-; Broughton-
in-Furness: E.M.W. 5/-; Castle Douglas:
J. & M.A. 5/-; London: P.S. 10/-; Stirling:
R.A.B. 10/-; Kenya, Colony: E.G.L. 6/6;
London: G.O. 5/-; London: S.G. 5/-;
Anlaby: D.R. 1/6; Long Eaton: C.W.R.
2/-; Coleman Hatch: D.M. 4/-; Llanelli:
L.W. 2/6; London: V.R. 5/-; Wadebridge:
F.E.R. 7/6; Glasgow: per J.W. 10/-.

Previously acknowledged ... £19 11 0
£280 10 11

SPECIAL APPEAL
TOTAL TO DATE ... £300 1 11

The Unions and Workers' Control

(Continued from page 1)

And the trend is being encouraged by those politicians who, more astute than the rest, are also determined to keep one jump ahead of popular demand by advocating greater union representation on National Boards. Sir Stafford Cripps is one such clever boy, and said in Manchester on November 20th:

"Trade unionists with wide knowledge and experience are in such demand for national and area boards, for regional boards, working parties, and for a hundred and one committees and commissions that there are just not enough to go round.

"We are asking the workers to play a new part, to advise and to take an active interest in the technique and organisation of production and management. The old idea that trade unionists and their officials are interested only in wages and conditions of work and in compensation is as dead as the dodo—or ought to be.

"In the completely altered circumstances of to-day it would be ridiculous to take the old view that a trade unionist who entered upon management functions had 'gone over to the enemy'.

Very clever talk—from the enemy. Cripps very neatly puts across the old confusion between trade union officials and workers, making them appear one and the same, and when enough officials have been appointed to managerial positions, trade unionists will do doubt be satisfied that workers' control is established.

On such a showing, the wind is taken out of the sails of the trade unionists by action taken by employers on the unionists' own line of endeavour. For instance:

"Mr. J. E. V. Jobson, chairman and managing director of Qualcast, Limited, of Derby, announces in a letter to his workers—whom he addresses as colleagues—a go-ahead business promotion scheme.

"From his staff he has selected six employees, with an aggregate of 103 years' service, to serve as 'trainee-directors'.

"They will attend board meetings and give advice but will not vote.

"If they prove satisfactory they will, in time, qualify as full directors."

What more could a good trade-unionist want?

But all this has nothing to do with workers' control as we mean it—con-

trol by the workers of the means of production through their own autonomous organisations, which are themselves controlled by the workers and not by paid permanent officials. Workers' control begins with the producer and ends with consumer. Its business is solely the organisation of production and distribution for the benefit of society as a whole and according to the needs of society as expressed through communal organisations which are themselves autonomous and controlled by the people.

We are opposed to the paid permanent official because his office inevitably develops influence and power and because his interests as an official will sooner or later become divorced from those of the workers he is supposed to represent. The development of the ideas of workers' control led us to the rejection of the money and wages systems—the means by which workers are divided against each other and exploited. Workers' control inevitably leads to a conflict with authority, with the State which exists for the protection of the existing order and with the trade unionists whose function is the organisation and control of the workers in a State. And the rational form of organisation for workers' control must be industrial and not by craft.

All this has been worked out fully in the ideas of Anarcho-Syndicalism, which has itself been worked out by hard experience of workers in the struggle against Capitalism.

But it is obvious that Workers' Control as we know it, can only be achieved, not through the unions, but in spite of them.

P.S.

FREEDOM Anarchist Fortnightly Price 3d.

Postal Subscription Rates
6 months 4/6 (U.S.A. \$11).
12 months 8/6 (U.S.A. \$21).

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies
6 months 7/6 (\$15.00).
12 months 15/- (\$31).

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.