

Freedom

ANARCHIST FORTNIGHTLY

Vol. 10, No. 12

June, 11th, 1949

Threepence

THE STATE OR LIBERTY?

IS SOCIALISM COMPATIBLE WITH INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM?

THE CENTRAL TENET of anarchism has always been opposition to the whole idea of government, of the political control of the people as a whole by a few of their fellows. It follows logically from this that anarchists are far less concerned than those who believe in the necessity for government with the question of who compose this ruling minority. Socialists are apt to find our attitude incomprehensible and to describe it as "irresponsible", for to them it is axiomatic that the Labour Party is better than the Conservatives. If one's vision is limited to matters of mere reforms, it is not difficult to point to some advances for the workers after almost any political party has been in power for an effective number of years. Even fascists can point to reduction in unemployment or to this or that public works. And these questions of relative merit form the endless stock-in-trade of election battles.

In times of a boom in trade a government can often claim the credit for an apparent advance in the economic status of some of the workers; if such a claim cannot be expected to take in the electorate a slump in trade or the "sabotage" of the political opposition is brought up to explain or excuse the situation. The plain fact, however, is that the general condition of the workers has for centuries been such as utterly to preclude the possibility of full human stature or the realisation of the immense and untapped potentialities of the peoples as a whole. If this fact is faced, doubts arise as to the validity of the reformists' arguments, and the suspicion grows that the anarchist contention may have more in it than a superficial glance suggests. When that suspicion has taken seed, the horizon opens up, and the possibility of a society freed from the pettifogging vision of all the political sections, together with the inequality, the regimentation, and the squalor that go with their administrations, is seen to be more than an impracticable dream.

Bevan Dots the I's

In his speech before the opening of the Labour Party conference, Aneurin Bevan lent considerable point to anarchist criticisms of governmentalism, albeit in a speech intended to boost Labour socialism. In a democracy it should be apparent that government serves the interests of the people as a whole, even though minorities are from time to time discontented. Yet all governments are forced to attack large sections of their subjects, seeking to attach to them the blame for their own failures to serve the general interest. The Labour Party is no exception. Speaking of the trade unions, he declared that it was "necessary to tell some of their people in industry that they were beginning to lose faith, and that some of them appeared to have achieved prosperity in excess of their moral stature, and that some of them had got what they had got too easily, and that if they had had to struggle more for it, they would value it more now." It seems he was not speaking of the J. H. Thomas's or the George Gibsons, not even of Labour M.P.'s who voted themselves a £400 a year rise in pay at a stroke—nor again of working class cabinet ministers at—£5,000 a year? It

seems he was speaking strictly of workers in industry who go on strike, for he went on to say that "they were in danger of throwing away, by a few months of dissipating anarchy, what they had spent a life-time to build up."

We will pass over the absurdity of the suggestion that industrial workers have secured their far from adequate wages without a struggle; nor will we dwell on Mr. Bevan's use of the term anarchy, though as an intelligent socialist he cannot be ignorant of its meaning. What is interesting is the attitude of the ruler hectoring the ruled, the men who take the

(Continued on page 4)

EISLER AGAIN

THE reaction of certain sections of American opinion to the refusal of the Bow Street magistrate to order Eisler's extradition shed interesting lights upon the conceptions of justice which are held in America. The complaint that the decision was a poor return for all the economic aid America has sent to Britain, with its clear implication that justice can be bought makes it easier to understand why Sacco and Vanzetti were done to their slow deaths. It is probably fair to say that not even the lowest sections of the capitalist press in Britain would dare to voice such a suggestion—though they might indubitably feel the same way. And that says a good deal for public opinion in this country.

The U.S. government is now making itself look viciously ridiculous by its harrying of the crew of the Polish ship *Batory*, in which Eisler made his escape. It is difficult to see what possible advantage it hopes to reap from this petty vindictiveness.

Eisler himself made some grateful remarks about traditional British love of fair play and justice. He has indeed something to be thankful for here, but his remarks were scarcely following the line of *Pravda*. We do not doubt that he will be hearing from headquarters about this!

The Railmen Fight Back

IT is undoubtedly very inconvenient not to be able to take the family to the coast, or get home to see the old folks on a Whitsun week-end. It is even more inconvenient to work permanently under conditions which are disruptive of one's own home life and frustrating in many other ways. The railwaymen are to be congratulated on not having fallen for the emotional appeals directed at them by press and union "not to spoil the holiday", and for having shown their determination not to weaken in their resistance against the new lodging-out schedules.

Several weeks ago we prophesied that there was real trouble brewing up on the railways. It did not take great powers of prophesy to foretell that. For all the supposed benefits of nationalisation, the railwaymen remain among the lowest paid of workers, and the railways badly understaffed.

We have no intention here of cataloguing the grievances of the railmen—they are many and deep-seated. The present flare-up in the North-east, spreading further South each strike-bound Sunday, was sparked by the introduction of new schedules entailing more nights away from home. The go-slow being practised in most London depots is a protest against the Rail Board's refusal to grant a wage increase.

We wish to state simply and briefly our solidarity with the railmen. The degree of responsibility which falls upon these workers is too often underestimated. Only when something goes wrong and an accident occurs, is it brought home to us that every day many of us put our lives in the hands of these working men, that a handful of workers somewhere, every minute of the day and night, are responsible for the safe journey of thousands of the travelling public.

Is it too much for these men to be granted the modest demands they are now compelled to strike for? The Oaksey Report on pay and conditions for the police has been granted without demur by the Government, pledged to peg wages. The ordinary unproductive flatfoot is to get one guinea a week more at the start of his useless career. The railway workers who maintain and run the lifelines of an industrial society are denied an increase which they have already modified from 12/6 per week to 10/-. Why this difference? Because the police are paid from taxation, whereas transport costs are added to production costs in the selling prices of our goods abroad, and railwaymen and all other workers must be sacrificed on the altar of the export drive.

All support to the railmen in the fight for their claims. But let us also look ahead. The struggle for to-day's conditions must be fought to-day—but also must be fought the struggle for tomorrow's free society. Let the means be direct action such as the railmen are effectively using now—but let the goal be Workers' Control!

HARRY JONES

WITH great regret we announce the death last month, at the age of 33, of our comrade Harry Jones. From a very early age he was active in the propaganda work of the movement and possessed a very comprehensive library of anarchist books and pamphlets. In 1942 he put these at the disposal of the London movement through the library of *Freedom Press*. Comrade Jones was active during the Spanish War and the early part of the recent European War and on several occasions lectured at Frith Street and Belsize Road. He took an anti-militarist stand and, in 1942, was sentenced to 12 months' imprisonment.

In recent years, ill-health had prevented active participation in our work but he always retained his interest in it and his faith in the anarchist ideals.

GASTON B.

THOUGHTS ON THE ANNIVERSARY OF

THE PARIS COMMUNE

THE anniversary of the Paris Commune is generally misused by the so-called Socialists and Communists, mostly for imposing celebrations of State Socialist thought. However, the Paris Commune was actually the proof of the importance of the spontaneous mass movement, even before the Russian and Spanish Revolutions, and proved the danger of every pre-ordination.

Even Marx, in the face of the Paris Commune, felt obliged to revise the State Socialist principles set out in his Communist Manifesto, and to recognise the perniciousness of State establishment. But this recognition did not last long. All too many sections of the working people have forgotten the original principles of libertarian socialism. This forgetfulness coincides with a whole epoch of the heaviest defeats of the movement for social liberation.

The worst of all these defeats is that which presents to the working people of the world the loss of every proletarian self-determination at the hands of the so-called dictatorship of the proletariat, as if it were a revolutionary triumph, and portrays the most reactionary regime in the world as socialism. This is worse than a lie; it means that the ideas of socialism

and freedom are shamed and compromised.

The "Versaillese" of the Russian Revolution have not torn or burnt the banners of socialism; they have usurped them. The Paris Communards were beaten by the white counter-revolution in open battle, and the undoubted victory of Capital and the State was understood by the workers in all countries. How many sacrifices must the Russian counter-revolution demand before the workers in all countries realise that the new ideology of counter-revolution operates with communist and socialist slogans?

Previous social revolutions have been wrecked; they have not succeeded in the removal of every means of exploitation or oppression of man by man, but either they have been defeated by the ruling class and caste or they have brought forward a new ruling class or caste, whereby the slavery of man by man has been established in a new form.

What interests us in these lines is this second form of defeat of the social revolution, namely the form in which the revolutionary defeat is put forward as a sham victory but whereby in reality this apparent victory of a revolutionary party or élite is one

over the mass movement on behalf of a new ruling class.

The Great French Revolution supplies us with a classical example of such an evolution. All subsequent revolutions, while they have supplied us with more or less examples towards social liberation, have also been brought forward to the same tragic result. This applies also to the Russian Revolution of 1917 and the Spanish Revolution of 1936.

One could conclude from that, that the masses have not yet proved themselves ready for total social self-liberation. This is correct insofar as the working masses, while they have at times and places in the Russian and Spanish Revolutions carried through total self-liberation and a form of the free Commune, have always trusted their lot eventually to a minority (vanguard, leadership, etc.) and therefore have left the path of self-determination.

Marxism and its offspring Bolshevism are theories and ideologies which have come out of these repeated tragic courses. Marxist theory teaches the inevitability of a transitory stage to socialism, in which power is delegated to a workers' state and a certain amount of exploitation and oppression of man by man remains. (That this is not just a certain amount, however,

but the greatest conceivable, has been shown in practice.) Bolshevism has realised these Marxist theories with iron consequences, and has based its ideology first on a proletarian dictatorship over the peasants (Lenin in *What to do?* 1903) and in 1917 on party dictatorship.

While Anarchism rejects the Marxist teaching of an inevitable transitory stage to socialism and the ideas of the workers' state, it has lent its impress to the principles of every social revolution.

This basic difference between classical Marxism (as well as every other State Socialist theory) and classical Anarchism, leads to the division between the statist and fascist (bolshevist) tendencies of Marxism and all State Socialist workers' movements, and the spirit of anarchism in the social revolution.

This evolutionary possibility must be insisted upon as we profit from new experiences and are inflicted by sham-revolutionary experiments and theories and consider the various problems of social mass movements in the twentieth century. It is the most important contribution we can make in order to avoid new and bloody defeats of the movement for social liberation.

Seen in a Crooked Mirror

NINETEEN EIGHTY-FOUR.

By George Orwell (Secker & Warburg, 10/-).

IF it is true that satire admits an element of hope, then this novel is not satirical: it is a grim and convincing attack on the centralised State and on modern warfare, and its power is due to the complete pessimism with which every page is stamped. It is certainly Orwell's most considerable book to date, and is the most powerful novel of its kind to appear since *Brave New World*.

The story is set in a future when the world is divided between three totalitarian powers which are perpetually at war with one another. It would not be possible for any of the three to win the war, and in fact the

authorities have no intention of ever bringing it to an end; its real purpose is to hold in being the existing hierarchy in each State. Since few men can remember what peace was like, the idea of peace has disappeared: *war is peace*, as the Party slogan proclaims. In London, a city of Airstrip One, part of Oceania, the Party rules through four ministries. The central character, Winston Smith, works in the Ministry of Truth. Here, among other things, novels and songs are composed by machinery for the *proles* (a large submerged class of illiterates, quite powerless), and Winston in the Records Department is occupied in the continual falsification of history. "Who controls the past controls the future: who controls the present controls the past," says the Party, and its rule is based mainly on

its complete destruction of all historical records. Every day yesterday's truth is altered so that it will conform with to-day's events. It is true in a way that the past still exists in memory, but this way is distorted by the technique of *doublethink*, which is a kind of superficial schizophrenia by means of which one can remember a thing and simultaneously forget it, believe a statement and at the same time disbelieve. Thus there is no past and no future, but only a continuous present in which the Party is all-powerful; there is no more history. The Party is timeless, its leader, Big Brother, is eternal. Within this eternity Winston Smith is the only living man who believes that there is an objective standard of truth and that political freedom and equality are desirable. The story is about his meeting with a girl called Julia, their love-affair, and their attempt to join a revolutionary organisation. It would be a pity to give away Orwell's plot, which is worked out with terrifying completeness. Sufficient to say that he discovers that the ultimate aim of the Party is simply to increase its power over men: that is, to increase human suffering: that is, to produce an eternity of pain. "If you want a picture of the future, imagine a boot stamping on a human face—for ever."

The novel has the complete credibility of a nightmare; it is this quality of dream which lifts it above the level of the political horror-story. As a piece of craftsmanship it is subtle and almost perfect. Orwell does not begin by presenting a future world of whose plausibility the reader has

first to be convinced; he begins with the world as it was until recently: a drab, exhausted, broken London, dusty under desultory rocket-bombs. Because one knows that this world really existed, one accepts its truth, and Orwell then proceeds to introduce a gradual heightening of the truth. One grants the premises; the poetic logic is perfect; and so one accepts the conclusions. (Possibly this foundation in present truth will eventually weaken the novel; in the future the reader may not be able to assent to the premises; otherwise the book bears all the marks of permanence). If one takes the story to pieces, few of the parts seem original. Much has been learned from *Darkness at Noon*; there are many reminders of Dickens; there are even touches of horror from the Gothic novel and the Yank terror-magazine—no doubt derived from Orwell's researches into boys' fiction. Orwell's astonishing success lies in his imaginative grasp of all these elements, and his moulding of them so that each seems perfectly placed and genuinely recreated. Perhaps the best example is his handling of the love affair. From the first this is slightly repellent, and there is a moment when Julia actually seems—hearty, sweating, bashing you in the back with her hockey-bag—to become a kind of Girl Guide Leader on Victoria Station. Yet in a world of fear and ugliness in which a strict military chastity is enforced by the Party, love would degenerate into this kind of physical scramble, and even the lovers would be unaware that any degeneration had taken place. This is probably Orwell's deepest insight; his treatment of the sexual problem is

always acute.

Only an honest man could have written this book, and it is desolating that in our world such honesty should lead to such despair. Out of his despair, Orwell has made a protest more complete and more sustained than any other writer of his generation, and for this he deserves our praise and gratitude. I don't think any sensitive reader could ever completely forget *Nineteen Eighty-Four*—a crooked mirror held up before us with terrible determination—unless the book fails in its purpose and we ourselves enter the mirror-world of doublethink and forgetfulness. It is our task to ensure that that does not occur, to oppose the world presented by Orwell's novel, to alleviate human despair and restore the honesty and faith of free men.

L.A.

... from our stock ...

JANKEL ADLER, 38 reproductions

(int. by Stanley William Hayter) 21/-

JANKEL ADLER—an artist seen from one of many possible angles by Stefan Themerson 30/-

★

1984 George Orwell 10/-

Coming Up for Air

George Orwell 9/6

Talks to Parents and Teachers

Homer Lane 6/-

Ethics

Existentialism

The Common People

Dead Souls

1946-1946

Cole and Postgate

Gogol

Peter Kropotkin

Paul Foulquie

1746-1946

12/6

6/-

Journal of Sex Education, June

Poetry London, May

2/-

2/6

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

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

MILITARISM

MILITARY life in general depraves men. It places them in complete idleness, that is, absence of all rational and useful work; frees them from their common human duties, which it replaces by merely conventional duties, to the honour of the regiment, the uniform, the flag; and, while giving them on the one hand absolute power over other men, also puts them into conditions of servile obedience, to those of higher rank than themselves.

TOLSTOY.

CHILDHOOD AND SOCIAL REVOLUTION-2

IV. The Roots of Cruelty.

One of the most revolting aspects of childhood is the amount of pleasure which children appear to get from cruelty. The adult who believes in letting children alone, is sometimes shocked into interference by the sordid spectacle of the bullying of timid children by their fellows. The ruthless brutality of which children are capable make adults decide that really children are horrid little devils if left to themselves—and so they are all the better for a firm training from adults in adult standards of humanity and justice! Yet the problem is more complex than this; if the aggressive and tough children are the normal, why do they appear to hate the timid child? Some of the most inoffensive children appear to arouse hatred and persecution wherever they go, but some other timid children evoke a spontaneous protectiveness from their tougher contemporaries. The reason for this subtle difference is not apparent to adults.

It would seem that the quality of the timidity which evokes hatred is that of the unfortunate child who has succumbed to the force of the adult counter-revolution in an unusual way. It is no longer a normal child-rebel, but a neurotic individual living as far as it can by adult standards and loathing its own natural instincts. Normal children hate the police mark and class-traitor—and the hatred of children does not seek to justify itself so carefully as does the hatred of adults.

On the other hand, the type of timid child that evokes protection and championship among its contemporaries, is one who, though badly scared by the adult counter-revolution, has not given into it. This is intuitively apparent to its fellows.

The cure for bullying therefore, would appear to be less and not more adult influence in children's affairs. Those who have the care of a bullied child have a sure indication that they have been all too successful in imposing their adult standards on the child.

V. Avoidance of Conflict.

If we accept the hypothesis that human children have fundamentally different instincts from adults, and are naturally in a state of real revolt against the adult class, we are faced with two problems: first, how to control these aggressive animals so that they do not render adult life acutely uncomfortable, and second, how to educate them so that they become tolerable social beings when they grow up.

The first problem is easily resolved, as intelligent adults find out for themselves. If adults establish some sort of peace terms which grant the children certain inalienable rights, the children will keep their side of the bargain in respecting the adult rights—keep it at least as well as the adults will. I think that punishment is always a grossly foolish mistake. I particularly condemn those punitive acts which adults inflict on children under a guise which is supposed to make them seem like 'natural retribution'; children see through the sham.

If such a treaty of mutual respect is established in a family, school or other institution where adults and children have to rub along together, the children will still be in revolt against the adult class, but the situation will not loom so large in their lives.

The second problem is more difficult—the problem of education for later life. There is no complete answer for the case for a certain amount of actual coercion so that children will develop the skills and abilities which will be essential for them in adult life. Other species of the higher animals have to use coercion in the education of their young. Otters have to drag their cubs into the water to teach them to swim.

We conclude this article in this issue. As we wrote last time, comments are invited from all our readers.

For others have evolved from non-aquatic ancestors and they have to overcome their children's land-loving instincts by force. Seals have to terrorise their young to teach them the meaning of fear when danger is about, for the young seals have no appreciation of danger. Many predatory creatures play savagely with their young in order to rouse them to the requisite state of automatic ferocity.

What we humans have to consider is what degree of interference with the natural instincts of our young is wise. I maintain that we have gone too far with interfering in the natural instinctive life of children—gone so far in fact, that we now no longer recognise how basically different they are from our adult selves. The danger is that if we try to make the child live in a manner too much at variance with its natural instincts, it will never live a proper instinctive life in childhood, and therefore it will retain in its adult life a certain amount of the a-social and ferocious instincts of childhood. The world is full of beings adult by age, but partly child by instincts. The nice young men who light-heartedly fly bombers and devastate towns are simply neurotic beings who have had to wait until their twenties to give proper expression to the instincts of infancy. The well-meaning social moralists who bring up children according to an idealised adult code of behaviour have to bear their full share of the blame for the supreme immorality of adult behaviour.

Much surprise has been aroused by the fact that children from the so-called 'progressive' schools generally join the armed forces like kids from more conventional schools. Anyone who knows something of the progressive schools will realise that there is no lack of earnest social moralists on the staffs who would be only too pleased if their pupils would become war-resisters. But propaganda by deed and example has little effect on children when it is directed against their own innate instincts. Pacifist propaganda directed against the war games and the self-glorification of the child can only succeed in making it somewhat shamefaced, and may delay and warp its natural expression. If adults are revolted by the spectacle of children behaving as children, they should avoid contact with the young animal; true, they can interfere and suppress the manifestation of childhood instincts, but they cannot eradicate them. The children who grow up with a satisfactory gratification of their instinctual life in the various phases of their development, are more likely to have sound adult instincts at a comparatively early age, and therefore resist the fantastic demands of the State in the matter of military service.

I am not suggesting that there is any easy solution to the problem of education. Whatever we do there is no possibility of breaking the vicious circle of environment in one generation. What I am chiefly concerned to demonstrate is that the moral training of children has direct results quite other than is intended, because the child must live out its life as a natural animal, and too great an interference with its natural propensities leads to it never undergoing the mental and emotional metamorphosis into a natural adult.

VI. Adolescence.

Adolescence is a time of metamorphosis from child to adult, a time when loyalties fluctuate between the two classes. In our society the period of adolescence is artificially lengthened by a number of factors.

The adult counter-revolution has made a great deal of use of this latter period of the child's life; older children are made the upholders of adult morality by the same means by which the oppressed classes of every country are made to produce the man-power for the police force to uphold the privileges of the oppressors. The prefect or monitor in school, the patrol leader in the Boy Scouts, the bossy elder child who gladly enforces parental authority in the home—all are recruited from the ranks of childhood and moved by the same motives as the policeman who is recruited from the labouring classes to enforce their servitude.

Younger children are far more clear-sighted and independent than adolescents, for the latter are rendered unstable by the shock of the new emotional drives that they can neither understand nor control. Sexual potency comes in the early teens, and the frustration which adult society imposes on it, upsets the personality of the child. The adolescent hates its own youngness, it desperately strives to be mature; maturity (it thinks) will bring relief to the awful problems of sex and power. So the adolescent despises childhood, despises its own nature, and worships the adult way of life.

In our civilisation we utterly reject the idea of a sexually potent child enjoying a full sex-life—we insist that copulation is the prerogative of adults. Yet it is not possible that full sex experience should naturally be achieved before the child-adult metamorphosis takes place in the psyche?

VII. The Adult Anarchist.

The individual achieves maturity. All the abuses of power, the unfair privilege, the humbug, the senseless repression of joy, that he experienced from adults as a child, he now sees going on around him in adult society in exactly the same manner. The Many are being repressed, cheated, humbugged and emotionally starved by the action of the Few—just as if the masses were children and their rulers adults. The parallel is strikingly exact. The State in its drive towards totalitarian dominion, assumes more and more the aspect of a hypocritical and repressive adult controlling a lot of children. In all the aspects of State interference with individual liberty we see the nasty schoolmarm, the pompous father.

If the individual has retained something of his childhood independence of spirit, it will serve him in good stead in adult life. He will not become the stooge of the exploiters, he will react *childishly*, that is he will revolt as and when he can. But now that his childhood instincts have given place to adult instincts, he will think and act along social lines. He will act in the consciousness that his personal freedom is bound up with the freedom of his fellows. Thus the drive to social revolution is logically founded on childhood revolt. There is nothing derogatory to the revolutionary urge in the fact that it has its roots in childhood. Experience teaches us that those people whose anarchism is entirely a matter of intellectual conviction often do not stay the course. If they have been beaten down by the adult counter-revolution in childhood—beaten down so that they no longer own themselves, but submit to the 'rightness' of being owned by some person, institution or abstract idea, they will fear freedom in adult life. The prospect of freedom means giving them back the ownership of themselves. Such people, however convinced they may be in their conscious minds by the hard logic of anarchism, will reject freedom in their innermost being, and dread the advent of social revolution.

G.

TWO VIEWS OF THE CANADIAN SEAMENS' STRIKE

JUST now we are on strike for renewal of our 1948 contract. The shipping companies have refused to renew it. Although the C.S.U. (Canadian Seamen's Union) is affiliated to the T.L.C., which is the Canadian section of the A.F.L., the American S.I.U. (Seafarers' International Union) which is affiliated to the A.F.L. is trying to break our strike because the C.S.U. is "communist" dominated. Another confusing point is that the N.M.U. (National Maritime Union), which is affiliated to the C.I.O., is supporting us. There is no Canadian C.I.O. marine affiliate by the way.

As you realise, the term "communism" is a very elastic one and can be used to discredit anything or anybody, including anarchists. Personally, I feel that the political opinions of our executive have nothing to do with the issues of this strike. Although the

Canadian Communists are supporting us, certain ideological contradictions against Marxist economics are apparent. Here is an example:

The Canadian National Steamships is a government company or utility and represents socialism in the Marxist sense. It operates for profits as is natural in to-day's money system. Therefore it signed a contract with the S.I.U. scabs as did the private shipowners. This provides us anarchists with an example of how State enterprise deals no better with its employees than private enterprise. It is small wonder, therefore, that the C.S.U. no longer demands "nationalisation" of the ships to solve the deep sea strike like they did in the Lakes strike.

Montreal is just like Spain. No May Day parade was allowed, although priests and nuns can parade all over the place. I am sorry to confess that U.S.A. and Canada are getting more Fascist all the time. However, I feel that there is some disgust with Imperialist rivalry among the common people which is not yet expressed. This disgust is much more apparent in Western Europe where the Marshall Plan and the Atlantic Pact, as well as the "liberated" People's Republics in the Balkans, don't arouse much enthusiasm.

When I was in Leghorn, Italy, I met Giovanna Berneri, who gave me an encouraging picture of anarchism in Italy. We have certainly regained lost ground there. On board the Monte Gaspé, my last ship, I was able to interest a number of my shipmates in anarchism. Maybe you have heard from some of them already?

In Leghorn, the Errico Malatesta group gave me some of their Italian publications which, however, I cannot translate: but they seem to be well written. I would like to start a group here in Montreal if you could give me some information on how to start and carry on. Just now I would have to work quietly, but the present gives the people an opportunity to appreciate our opposition to authority.

Many people that I have talked to find the idea of "worker-owned" enterprise quite original. It is surprising how the idea is spreading here and there. In

Garranogne, Ontario, is a plant which was bought by the employees in 1946 and successfully operated by them. In New Zealand, there is a small coastal freighter jointly owned by the officers and crew. These instances are only a few and could be multiplied. However, they are only a beginning. I believe it is the task of anarchists to publicise and stimulate these projects and so develop them to their logical conclusions. I also believe that it is our best bet to encourage all strikes. However, the workers are still deluded by the false values of money. They don't seem to appreciate the difference between money and goods. In Europe, however, the situation is different in view of the severe post-war inflation.

There is much else I would like to discuss, but I won't take any more of your attention now. Please accept my sympathy for the death of M. L. Berneri. Although our numbers are small, I can see our principles reaching many through the impact of events, trends and independent writers such as Arthur Koestler. Let us remember the poem of A. H. Clough—
"Say not the struggle naught availeth."
Montreal, Canada. M.A.P.

Editor's Comment . . .

We welcome letters from comrades abroad. It is often impossible for us to give balanced reports, or to comment fairly, on events in other countries owing to our limited sources of information, and it would be very helpful to us in our task of presenting information on the workers' struggles in all countries, if comrades in other countries would take up their pens now and again and send us informative letters.

As our Canadian comrade has shown above, the situation in the seamen's strike is a very confused one, which is why we have refrained from dealing with it ourselves, but we do feel compelled to say that the present struggle seems to be based more on inter-union rivalry than anything which is of any basic interest to the workers concerned. Our comrade refers to "the S.I.U. scabs" and probably the workers in the S.I.U. refer to C.S.U.-organised seamen as scabs, too. Both these unions are reformist; one has a Communist executive, the other a Labour crowd in control. At the moment, the C.P. are militant again—but for what ends?

Anarchists have no interest in taking sides in inter-union squabbles or struggles for power, but naturally, as workers, are bound to take part in activity carried on by their fellows. Their job is to combat the reformists and endeavour to direct the activity along more revolutionary lines, if at all possible.

MANY strikes in Canada take on forms which are quite rare these days. Several years back the policemen of the city of Montreal went on strike for higher wages and the right to form their own union. When they walked off their jobs they forgot to turn in their guns, much to the alarm of the City fathers. They won their strike and now have their own union, but that does not prevent them from breaking the heads of the strikers.

Recently the workers in the asbestos industry in Quebec went on strike mainly in protest against their working conditions. When the company threatened to bring in strike-breakers the workers put up barricades on the highway leading to the village where the asbestos mines were located. The police of Montreal, armed with machine guns, tommy guns and tear gas were sent to the village for the purpose of slaughtering the workers if they remained on the barricades and resisted the police. Faced by this overwhelming

force, the workers went peacefully home. But the policemen, with guns in their hands pointed at the strikers, ratified a donation of several hundred dollars in aid of the strikers and their families.

The Canadian seamen's strike is, however, taking on a patterned form. War preparations are as equally concerned with the labour front as with the strictly military front. When the rulers of a country are faced with an enemy whose working population is terrorised daily, it becomes increasingly necessary to guard against sabotage and strikes which will hinder a successful prosecution of the war.

In many industries the threat of workers striking is always present. In too many cases the problem is not why the workers went on strike but why they continued so long at their jobs without expressing their resentments. Because of this, the rulers of a country preparing for war want to be assured of at least trade union leaders whose patriotism will transcend the interests they are allegedly representing. The seamen's strike in Canada is an example of how this problem is being and will be handled.

The present leaders of the Canadian Seamen's Union are members of the Labour Progressive Party (the Canadian Communist Party). Their concern to entrench their power within the union is only equal to the need of the government to have loyal Canadian labour leaders at the helm of the trade union organisations. And so another seamen's union is formed to compete with the communist-led union and which "represents" to the same extent the seamen's interests—only its leaders are loyal to the Western Powers and not to the Russian leaders. Both, in turn, try to outdo each other in verbalising their concern over the living standard and working conditions of the seamen, but the words merely serve to disguise the actual struggle which is taking place—preparations for the next war are in full swing and that includes a regimentation of the working population.

THROUGH THE PRESS

A CONSCRIPT ON CONSCRIPTION

To be dragged from home by a slip of paper and shoved around at someone else's whim for a couple of years, in an atmosphere at best like a boarding school and at worst like a prison, is hardly an 'education for citizenship'.

Service pay, food, quarters and hours of work may all be extremely good, but they are only gilt on the bars, and, at least sub-consciously, the conscript knows it. Military discipline, voluntarily accepted and combined with the ideal of service, may have its virtues, but, when it is imposed on the resentful and indifferent, it breeds cynicism and the slaves' attitude, viz., always grumbling, but never willing to take responsibility. When their service is over, they are let loose, having been drilled into accepting 'authority' without ever questioning on what grounds any 'authority' rests.

Picture Post, 14/5/49.

OUR OLD NOBILITY

One of the first reflections that occur to the mind is the manner in which power re-adjusts itself, landed-interest giving place to company-directing (Vicary Gibbs lists 167 peers as company directors so far back as 1896); company directors yielding in turn to high-salaried executives, often in official or quasi-official appointments; and—turning over Burke's pages—the reader muses on the ever-widening gap between the popular concept of a peer and the existing reality.

—Review of
Burke's Genealogical and Heraldic History of the Peerage, Baronage and Knightage, Privy Council and Order of Precedence in Times'
Literary Supplement, 13/5/49.

PACIFISTS AND PARLIAMENT

It is with great concern that I learn that the P.P.U. intends to engage in parliamentary electioneering.

Anti-war candidates would be exposed to the same temptations of careerism and de-humanising influences that have made members of the present government betray their socialist anti-militarist principles. I, as an anarchist, believe that peace can only be attained in a free communistic society, and that to perpetuate the existing order by putting up candidates for the ruling class is to make peace more distant. Threatened industrial action by the British workers stopped the government's military intervention in Revolutionary Russia; political action has got them just another clique of ruling parasites.

—Letter from Peter Green in
Peace News.

GUARANTEED HOLY

There were indignant cries of protest and frequent interruptions in the Lords last night when Lord Amwell, during a debate on the future of Jerusalem, cast doubts on the validity of the reputed Holy Places.

"The realistic fact," he said, "is that there are no guaranteed Holy Places, either in Jerusalem or in any part of Palestine."

When he declared that there was no certainty about the actual position of the tomb of Christ, Lord Stragbolli interposed with a sharp, "Have some respect for the feelings of people who believe in them."

Lord Amwell, who called for more realism and less emotion, was again interrupted, this time by Lord Cecil, when he spoke of "myths" about the Holy Places.

News Chronicle, 1/6/49.

American School Teaches World Government

ROUNDING out its first year, the Verde Valley School, located between Flagstaff and Phoenix, and established on non-profit principles for boys and girls from 10 to 15 years of age, is teaching world citizenship as the major aim of its curriculum.

Dedicated to the promotion of international understanding, the school is based on a belief that children must be trained for global living while their minds are still flexible. The school has a skilled teaching staff, and has availed itself of advice from hundreds of well-known educators in the United States and foreign countries.

Hamilton Warren, founder and executive director, is convinced that by learning to live and think as world citizens, pupils can fit themselves to help the world toward peace. The training is on a college preparatory level, and meets the usual academic standards, but is not limited to conventional methods. One emphasis is on foreign languages; Spanish is required, and by practical and interesting methods

of work for five months the students can converse easily with nearby Mexicans and Indians. One inquiry in civics investigated the development of federal Switzerland, against the European background.

On field trips, taken in trucks especially prepared for study and camping out, the pupils have travelled several thousand miles during the school's initial year. They have visited Hopi and Navajo reservations, inquiring into the lives of the people, their social customs and economic problems. Such visits have been kept on a level of equality and friendliness. In lieu of a spring vacation, the school decided to make a long trek into northern Mexico, visiting rural communities, "To get an insight into Latin American culture." Altogether, ten such field projects have been carried out already.

Starting with 20 boys and girls from ten states and one foreign country, the school expects to accommodate 50 pupils next year, and is eager to receive students of high intellectual calibre from the United States and abroad.

Worldover Press.

International Briefs

Denmark.

Danes have invited 1,800 Austrian and 500 Italian children to spend vacations in Danish homes this summer. Another 600 will come from South Schleswig to stay with relatives.

Belgium and France.

The Belgian and French governments have made an agreement through which passports are no longer required for citizens of either country travelling back and forth.

Sweden.

Swedish organisations are building 10 day nurseries in Germany, each for 100 fatherless children. There are already Swedish nurseries in Austria and France. With a population of 7,000,000, Sweden has so far spent £8,000,000 on relief work in Europe.

Pakistan.

Dr. Maria Montessori, celebrated Italian educator, is to give a teachers' training course at Karachi.

Sherlock Holmes, Trade Unionist.

Private detectives in Vienna have banded together in a sort of trade union. With international conditions what they are, it was felt that too many persons claiming to be super-sleuths had no real qualifications. Too many licences were issued to applicants, without investigation. Now, the largest detective firm, in co-operation with city magistrates, has worked out a plan for a two-day examination which must be passed before a would-be detective can practice.

Intellectual Purge.

No fewer than 10,000 university students have been expelled in Czechoslovakia, to eliminate "politically unreliable elements," according to the Minister of Social Welfare at Prague.

Cross-Frontier Joblessness.

European labour administrators are seeing a new need for closer economic federation in the fact that the most serious unemployment is affecting "frontaliers", workers who live close to the boundary in one country and work in another. The whole economic balance between France and Belgium, for example, is rendered difficult because of Belgians who normally work in France, but are out of jobs.

Worldover Press.

DEATH OF TWO GERMAN COMRADES

Stefan Bellman

WITH sorrow we record the death on 19th March of Stefan Bellman who devoted his life to the revolutionary cause. An anti-militarist in the first World War, he took an active part in the German strike movement as a member of the Spartakusbund, and later participated in the Spartakus rising of Winter 1918 and the German workers' rising against the Kapp putsch.

As an outspoken anti-parliamentarian and anti-centralist, he became a political refugee in the Ruhr, where he founded the Free Workers' Union of Germany advocating the free council system on libertarian lines.

During the recent war, Bellman worked illegally in close connection with the anarchists and has taken a large part in strengthening anarchist tendencies in the Ruhr.

Karl Börder

Karl Börder died on May 1st, aged 80. As a young man, he worked in the revolutionary movement as the delegate of the Hamborn metal workers' union. Becoming an anarchist in 1908, he worked for *Der Freie Arbeiter* (the Free Worker), a paper that survived Bismarck, Noske, Hitler, and now, the Russians!

In 1919, sent to Noske's concentration camp at Paderborn for syndicalist propaganda, where he was systematically starved for 13 weeks. In 1921, with Carl Lange, publisher of the anarchist paper *Alarm!* he founded groups in Hamburg and many other towns. Arrested and imprisoned several times under the Weimar Republic, he was arrested in 1933 by Hitler's gestapo and was with our comrade Erich Mühsam in prison in Brandenburg. His health completely broken down, he was released in 1934, only to be arrested and tortured twice more afterwards.

After the collapse of Hitler's Reich, he joined the Kulturfederation, Hamburg, and took up the work of anarchist propaganda with undimmed enthusiasm. In recent years he had supported the policy in Germany which *Freedom* has advocated, in opposition to the tendency of Rudolf Rocker.

His life was devoted to Anarchism. Our movement loses in him a valuable and well-loved comrade.

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/-

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 Hewetson:
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) 3/6

FREEDOM PRESS

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

C. Berneri:
KROPOTKIN—HIS FEDERALIST IDEAS 2d.

Errico Malatesta:
ANARCHY 6d.

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/-

John Olday:
THE MARCH TO DEATH 1/6

THE LIFE WE LIVE, THE DEATH WE DIE 2/6

A. Ciliga:
THE KRONSTAT 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/-

The John Lewis Purge Challenge from a Fellow Traveller

THERE is a ring of retail stores in London, including some of the most up-to-date, known as the John Lewis Partnership. It employs about 12,000 people and has a capital of about £12,000,000, and it uses the term "partnership" to describe a peculiar "democratic" system through which it operates its internal worker-management relations.

The Background

The workers in this organisation are not "employees"; they are "partners". There are 23 Branch Councils, and through these, any partner is able to make his or her opinion felt on any matter affecting their store—theoretically. We say theoretically, because there is, of course, a Central Council which is elected in part by the employees—sorry, partners—but at least one-third of which is nominated by the Chairman of the Company—sorry, partnership—or are ex-officials of the firm. And, inevitably, this Central Council makes the decisions.

Now, it is maintained by the directors of this organisation (oh, yes, comrade, it has directors—a democracy must have its government, mustn't it?) that this partnership system has great advantages for the partners, great and small. It provides for a pension fund, sports and welfare activities, and training methods, by which presumably, likely members are encouraged for promotion. Unfortunately—for some more ungrateful partners—the advantages do not run to trade union rates of pay for all the partners. They do not even run to any of the partners being allowed to join their appropriate trade union, the Shop Assistants, Distributive and Allied Workers', which looks with covetous eyes upon these 12,000 potential dues-payers.

This, then, is the background to the events which have brought the name John Lewis into the limelight because of the decision—democratically arrived at, we are assured—to purge the partnership of Communists and Fascists.

The Purge

Early this Spring, the Central Council were discussing what to do with certain "distributable surpluses" (profits, in fact), and one councillor suggested that instead of passing to the Pension Fund they should be used to supplement the wages of the lower grades of partners—which are beneath the union rates. This led

to an exchange of letters in the house organ, to a reprimand for this bold councillor by the Chairman of the firm, J. Spedan Lewis, and a request by this Chairman that the Central Council consider "whether the Partnership ought to admit or retain Communists—or for that matter, Fascists."

A point on the democratic procedure taken should be noted here. Out of 23 Branch Councils reporting their views on the matter, 15 opposed the purge, 2 were neutral, and only 6 supported it. Nevertheless, the decision to throw out the Communists was taken, to be followed as an afterthought by a decision against Fascists, since a ban on Communists only "would be so open to misunderstanding and misrepresentation as to be dangerous to the business", to quote the Chairman.

Since then, the matter has been much discussed in public places. Papers, from the *Evening Standard* to the *New Statesman* have roundly condemned the decision as has also Mr. George Isaacs, Minister of Labour. Mr. J. Spedan Lewis has written to the press defending his Council's decision, persisting in claiming it a democratic one, but not being quite convincing. His main argument was that a democracy has the right to defend itself against totalitarians, while a fellow director, ex-colonel Thornton Kemsley, assures the public that "the sackings will be done in a sympathetic way" and will be the result of factual evidence and not hearsay.

A Dirty Business

All this apologising is nauseating. But, of course, frankly to admit political discrimination might be bad for business. In point of fact, the Communists have been singled out (Fascists were included as window-dressing—there are none in the firm) to make an example to deter others from suggesting the introduction of trade union practice in the firm. If a democracy is so feeble as not to be able to defend itself against totalitarians, it deserves to fall, but if it uses totalitarian methods itself, it ceases to be a democracy anyway.

It is obvious that J. Spedan Lewis and his co-purgers are petty dictators of a particularly sinister kind. Outwardly benign and democratic, supposedly concerned for the welfare of their employees, they show that they are not prepared for one moment to let those employees choose for themselves anything that does not meet with their bosses' approval.

We know only too well the destructive nature of Communist activity; many an anarchist has met his death at their hands. Nevertheless, intolerance cannot be fought with intolerance without resulting in the continuation of intolerance. Freedom of speech and opinion are not defended but denied by the slimy "democracy" of such transparent hypocrites as the creators of this discrimination.

WILL you allow me to comment on the article entitled "The Stalinist Fifth Column", in your issue of 14/5/49, which, as it is unsigned, I take as being editorially approved, and in which you discuss the Congrès Mondial des Partisans de la Paix held in Paris, April 20th to 25th. As a delegate to that Congress from a group of Scottish Nationalists (United Scotland Secretariat) I fall to be classed by you amongst "fellow-travellers and other weak heads", though my individual insignificance is a guarantee that I was not among those you refer to as "carefully hand-picked". I would like to ask two questions, and to make two brief comments on the Congress.

First, I would ask, do Anarchists object to "fellow-travellers" as such, or only to travelling along with Communists? I ask because I seem to be a "fellow-traveller" with both Anarchists and Communists. As a Scottish Nationalist I advocate to the best of my ability the kind of social and political organisation and coordination which is generally spoken of by some such epithet as "syndico-anarchist"; but outside the political sphere I repudiate many ideas which certainly obtain considerable authority among Anarchists, if they are not an absolutely essential part and *sine qua non* of Anarchist doctrine—for example, many of the ideas on sexual behaviour, especially in regard to juveniles, which I find advocated in *Freedom*. On the other hand, I am not afraid of finding myself in the same train as Communists on certain matters; and when they take their stand against the Atlantic Pact,

SHE KNEW ALL ALONG

Anna Louise Strong's articles about her N.K.V.D. troubles are most interesting, but morally quite nauseating.

That wretched woman has spent 30 years in what she calls "friendly interpretation" of the Soviet State. And even now all she begs is to be allowed to continue.

Yet she knew the terrible truth all along. Otherwise why did she expect the worst the moment she was arrested? Here nerves were immediately in tatters and her thoughts full of nightmare fears—exactly the sort of thing she pooh-poohed for 30 years.

She is patently surprised at not being beaten; the doctor's examination must be "to see how much she could stand"; inquiries about health must be with a view to setting her—an entirely innocent, frail old woman of 63—to hard labour in the forests. Being expelled is visualised as being thrown out to die on some snowy waste.

What touching faith in the humanity of the "New Civilisation" from one of its foremost supporters! And what touching fidelity to an ideal, to be rushing into "capitalist" print with a loud moan the moment one's own skin is touched, while still advocating the same treatment for other people.

—Letter from G. Kerensky in *News Review*

which as a Nationalist and a Pacifist, I repudiate with every ounce of energy I can muster, I am delighted to co-operate with my Scottish Communist comrades. The Paris Congress met, specifically pledged to oppose that Pact, and to rally world opinion against it, while claiming also the wider object of advocacy and defence of world Peace and co-operation of all peace-loving peoples, and the co-ordinating of public opinion generally for the preservation of peace and the support of the United Nations Charter. With all of these purposes, provided in the last instance my own country, Scotland, is recognised as entitled to a vote in the councils of U.N.O., I am in sympathy, whether or no Communists also support them. So my second question is: provided you admit me as a "fellow-traveller" with yourselves (which perhaps, of course, you don't) do you consider I should refuse to travel along with Communists in their march against the Atlantic Pact, at the risk of having to keep silent, or at least of finding no effective way of voicing and working for my own policy of opposition to the Pact?

To come, however, to more important matters, may I point out just two aspects of the Congress which are left unmentioned in your article? Firstly, when a man of the intellectual standing of Frédéric Joliot-Curie declared that Science must refuse to submit to any policy of secrecy, and must be free to share its

discoveries internationally among all scientists, irrespective of political frontiers; when he repudiated the suggestion that atomic scientists, himself included and indeed one might say at their head, should use their knowledge for purposes of war; when he showed us the possibilities for human welfare and advancement which lie in the right application of atomic energy to the purposes of peace and construction in place of destruction, I refuse to believe he merely spoke with his tongue in his cheek, or with a mental reservation in favour of Communist "interests" or the U.S.S.R. For apart from the question of a personal integrity never yet called in doubt, the whole tradition of French thought gives the lie to such a suggestion.

The second point which you omit to mention is, I feel, indeed fraught with promise for the world to-day, in the tragic moral conditions which confront us. This was the immense part played by men and women of colour in the Congress, the almost preponderant rôle of Africans (including American negroes and West Indians of African descent) and of Asiatic peoples, a preponderance willingly accepted by the fraternal sympathy of their white comrades from Europe and the Americas.

These are the two points I wish to raise; there are many more one could stress, but my letter is already too long. If no room can be found for it in the pages of *Freedom*, where as I know your space is limited, I would like to think it will at least be read by the comrade who, presumably, recorded his own experience of the Congress in your article.

Yours fraternally,

Edinburgh. M. P. RAMSAY.

The Warning Was Needed!

From the foregoing letter it seems that our epithet of "weak heads" was not too strong. And does one detect a streak of malice in her last sentence?—for it goes without saying that anarchists were not represented at the Congress, as the whole content of our article made clear. But to deal with her points, we will discuss them in reverse order. It is indeed tragic that the Stalinists can draw so freely on men and women of colour. Nothing is more desirable than that white and coloured workers should join hands in the fight against oppression; but that means Africans and American Negroes joining with the workers of the Soviet Union as well as the workers of the west to throw off all oppression, Soviet imperialism as well as western. It does not mean joining with your own oppressors' rivals for world power.

We shall be more convinced about Professor Joliot-Curie when he demands freedom for science in the Soviet-Union, and urges the Soviet Union to publish its atomic secrets. So far he shows only the familiar transferred patriotism of all the other Stalinist intellectuals.

Now on the question of fellow travelling our correspondent does not quite seem to understand the accepted meaning of the term. Applied to Communist

fellow travellers it implies conscious or unconscious acceptance of being used by the Party for its own ends without actual membership. Lenin enunciated the doctrine behind this practice quite clearly: Communists must enter other organisations in order to dominate them or to break them up. It is difficult not to feel repelled at the moral obliquity of this doctrine, which has done more than anything else to break up what mutual solidarity used to exist on the left. But is quite clear how the tactic can be resisted—by refusal to co-operate with any Leninist outfit, whether Stalinist or Trotskyist, which employs it. We do not think it too strong to call the unconscious tools weak heads, while the conscious fellow travellers cannot escape the stigma that attaches to decoys, marks, and other such fry.

Does our correspondent not realise that the Communists have been systematically exterminating not only our anarchist comrades (in Russia, Spain, Poland, and all the countries of eastern Europe) but all revolutionary socialists as well? How can one retain any moral integrity at all while collaborating with such people? In our article we did not use the term "Red Fascism" lightly.

Our correspondent's letter clearly shows that the warning we issued to uncritical pacifists was only too sorely needed. It lends added point to the final paragraphs of our article.

EDITORS.

Special Appeal

MAY 19th to JUNE

Oakland, Cal.: K.O. 7/-; St. Helier: R.T.* 10/9; Anon.* 2/6; Gosport: A.J.M.* 5/-; Leeds: P.M.M.H. 10/-; Llanelly: L.W. 5/-; New York: C.K. 5/-; London: G.G.* 2/6; Llanelly: L.W. 2/6; Glasgow: A.M.C.* 4/-; Long Eaton: C.W.R.* 2/-; Liverpool: H.S. 6/6; Romford: E.A.W.S. 1/4; London: C.A. 14/-; St. Helier: R.T.* 5/-; London: L.G.W.* 5/-; Sidmouth: J.S.* 2/6; New Earswick: H.A.A. 5/6; Liverpool: H.H.J. £1/1/-.

TOTAL £5 17 1
Previously acknowledged £154 8 2
1949 TOTAL TO DATE £160 5 3

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

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.

Is Liberty a Bye-product?

(Continued from page 1)

decision: blaming those who have no share in framing them for their own failures. For this is characteristic of all governments, whether of left or right.

Materialism and Liberty

But Bevan went on to say things which throw into even sharper relief the differences between the socialist and the anarchist way of looking at things. "The verdict of history," he said, "is against us... Not in the history of mankind had any society been able to build up the complicated furniture of civilisation on the basis of individual liberty. It had never happened. All history proved so far that only the disciplines of oppression had been effective in building up social wealth. They now had to show that if the disciplines of oppression were no longer in existence, the disciplines of dignified self-restraint could take their place."

There is an unpleasantly menacing quality in these words. In them one sees the pre-eminent importance which even non-marxist socialists attach to material goods, for it means in plain words that one cannot have the advantages of cheap shoes and all the other shoddy products of civilisation without the policeman and the national insurance snoopers. Indeed, the complicated furniture of civilisation, as the workers know it, is a very poor return for the sacrifice of individual liberty. But Bevan does not say that social wealth must be built up with the aid of workers' freedom, but only that dignified self-restraint must save the Labour administration the embarrassment of themselves applying oppression. One might remark that the Labour Party have shown no delicate shrinking from the task of disciplining the workers. One might also speculate on what exactly "dignified self-restraint" means—presumably it means that if the workers don't like particular measures enacted by "their" government, they mustn't give effective expression to their discontent, but must kiss the rod instead. What is much more interesting is the

implied reversal of socialist teachings here. For in the past, socialists used to say that capitalism had solved the problem of production, socialism would solve the problem of distribution while releasing still further productive energies. There is nothing in the past teachings of socialists to suggest that the oppressions of capitalism were a necessary part of the building up of social wealth; only that they were necessary to maintain the unequal distribution of that wealth. With socialism this necessity should disappear.

Bevan actually gives away the fact that the Labour Party is operating capitalism while trying to give it a socialist gloss. For while inequality exists, while profit for the few is still the driving force of production, while national economies seek to force their way competitively in the world markets, a "socialist" government, just like any other government, must continue to use oppression.

Liberty and Dignity

In Bevan's speech individual liberty appears as a desirable bye-product to material prosperity—perhaps even it is incompatible with it. Anarchists insist that individual liberty is essential to men whether they have material prosperity or not, and the verdict of folk-lore and tradition and literature is the same, that freedom even in frugal circumstances is better than unfree wealth. This is not to glorify poverty or to overlook its sultry and destructive influence. But anarchists to-day declare that individual liberty is the pre-condition for the erection of a society possessing true social wealth. Its suppression is only necessary in a society which maintains all the old divisions with unequal remuneration, extreme division of labour, and the vesting of responsible decisions in the hands of a few central planners and administrators, and a few managers and directors. Indeed, it is difficult to see how dignity, even if self-restrained, can be achieved without full individual liberty.

Meetings and Announcements

UNION OF ANARCHIST GROUPS: CENTRAL LONDON

OPEN AIR meetings will be held in Hyde Park on alternate Sundays, coinciding with the publication fortnight of *FREEDOM*. From 3 p.m. to 6. Speakers, support for the platform and literature sellers will be equally welcome.

Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.
At 8, Endsleigh Gardens, W.C.1.
JUNE 12th Tony Weaver
"Leo Tolstoy"
JUNE 19th John Olday
"Tales of German Revolutionaries"
JUNE 26th John Hewitson
World Food Supplies

HAMPSTEAD

From Wednesday, 1st June, the weekly discussion meetings will recommence at 5, Villas-on-the-Heath, Vale of Health, Hampstead, N.W.3. Evenings at 7.30 All welcome

GLASGOW ANARCHIST GROUP

On and after April 24th:
Outdoor Meetings
MAXWELL STREET,
every Sunday at 7 p.m.,
Frank Leach, John Gaffney, Eddie Shaw.

SUMMER SCHOOL

will be held this year in Liverpool on Sat. 30th, Sun. 31st July, and Mon. 1st August.
Accommodation and meals available. Will readers who would like to attend, assuming the cost to be reasonable, please write to:
Joan Sculthorpe,
Flat C, 45, Catharine Street, Liverpool, 8.

Students sympathising with the U.A.G. are invited to contact the C.L.E. (Liberarian Students' Circle) in Paris, who publish a well-presented bulletin (in French) and are interested in corresponding in various languages with comrades abroad. Write to:
Cercle Libéraire des Etudiants,
Maison des Sociétés Savantes,
28 rue Serpente, Paris 11e, France.