

Freedom

AN ANARCHIST FORTNIGHTLY

Vol. 10, No. 15

July 23rd, 1949

Threepence

THE EMERGENCY POWERS ACT IS A CHALLENGE TO ALL WORKERS!

SUPPORT THE DOCKERS!

SO-CALLED 'SOCIALISTS' HAVE JETTISONED EVERY PRINCIPLE

IT is indeed a far cry from the days when the Labour Party stood for the solidarity of the workers, for internationalism against war, imperialism and conscription. One by one the principles have been jettisoned on the journey to respectability and power; one by one excuses have been found for fighting wars, exploiting colonial peoples, conscription and—strike-breaking.

For the second time in just over a year, Britain's Labour Government has invoked the Emergency Powers Act of 1920 to break a strike in London's docks. Previously used only during the General Strike of 1926, this Act provides the Government with totalitarian powers, including the right for any police constable to arrest any person on suspicion, and giving the military the right to billet troops on any household they may choose. These powers, it is true, have not been used to the full, but it is in the nature of governments to invest themselves with all possible power, so that determined opposition can be met with the full force of the State.

This has been expressed in the docks by the use of troops as strike-breakers. With many specious excuses and misrepresentations, the politicians and the Trade Union leaders have tried to disguise the fact that they are no longer concerned with solidarity, but only with keeping the noses of the workers at the grindstone in the name of "the nation's recovery" and in contravention if necessary of every principle of Socialist thought and trade union practice.

The Origins of the Strike

The very beginnings of the dispute seem to English eyes obscure and complicated. Originating in Canada as a result of inter-union intrigue and double-dealing by the employers of seamen, it has now lasted over three months, although the flare-up occurred in the London docks only three weeks ago.

Briefly, then, the strike of the Canadian Seamen's Union began when, because that union is dominated by the Labour Progressive Party (the Canadian Communist Party), the employers refused to renew contract with them, preferring to sign with an American Federation of Labour union called the Seafarer's International Union (which is international only with reference to the North American continent), and attempting to force the seamen to join this union. In self-defence the C.S.U. called a strike of all its members, whether in home ports or overseas.

The relative strength of the S.I.U. and the C.S.U. we have been unable to discover, but the former seems to be generally regarded among militants in Canada as a scab union, imported by the A.F.L. and incorporating an organisation on the Lakes known to be company dominated, for the express purpose of ousting the C.S.U.

When the strike broke, all ships manned by C.S.U. members were declared "black" to trades unionists as soon as they berthed. In Avonmouth and Liverpool dockers went on strike rather than unload them, but went back to work after troops had cleared the ships. In Southampton

there is still one ship which the dockers will not touch and the Dock Labour Board is not trying to force them to unload. In London the *Beaverbrae* and the *Argomont* were declared black months ago—the former on April 3rd and the latter on May 8th. Dockers and stevedores refused to unload them and were given alternative

work by the Dock Labour Board, who realised the existence of the dispute.

On June 22nd, agreement was reached between the C.S.U. and the Canadian authorities for a resumption of work on a plan consisting of four points designed to protect the seamen from victimisation, ensuring wages for the time they worked

before the strike and in getting the ships back to Canada, and arranging for the Canadian Government to supervise a free ballot for the seamen to choose for themselves to which union they shall belong. Two days later, however, the union declared that the no-victimisation clause was

(Continued on page 4)

Politics Saving Franco

POLITICS is an extraordinary business. Few observers fail to note its general baseness, its tendency to dirty the hands of those who touch it. One might have expected that for men and women generally participation—active or passive—in the political game would bring some rewards to compensate for its ugly sides. Yet few human activities are so consistently frustrating—for it is only seldom that the aims of the peoples are achieved or the rewards found to have reality. One has only to think of the desire of men to live in peace, an almost universal yearning; but who can say that our present generation is likely to achieve its wishes? It is notorious that war, perhaps the dirtiest of all political manoeuvres because of its unscrupulous use of genuine idealism, does not achieve its aims, whether abstract ones like the setting up of permanent peace, or the uprooting of tyranny, or the establishment of justice; or even the humbler material ones

of providing adequate housing for those veterans who return, jobs for all, and the rest.

When electors return a Labour Government to power in the hope of giving the workers a fair deal; or a Conservative one so that trade may revive and prosperity return; or a government of the Resistance so that the ideals which bound men together during the struggle against tyranny may be carried on in the administration of liberation; one cannot blink the fact that these political hopes are not realized. There must be few activities indeed which so consistently defeat the aims of its participants and yet survive.

Spain

These general reflections apply with especial force to Spain. It is now thirteen years since the Spanish workers revolted against both the Popular Front government and the military putsch of General Franco; ten years since the firm establishment of the dictatorship. Franco is like Hitler

an object of very nearly universal detestation. The left hate him as a fascist, and it is charitable to think that even those Conservatives and Catholics who supported him did so for the negative reason that they considered him a lesser evil. Universally execrated, he is still in the saddle. During the war, many Spanish refugees believed and hoped that the defeat of Hitler and Mussolini—who had put Franco in power—would see the eclipse of the fascist régime in Spain and the return of democratic institutions. But that has not happened.

Now, in life, if we want something to happen we order our actions in a way calculated to bring it about. There is no real doubt that in so far as conscious opinion exists among the British people, Franco is held in detestation. The members of the Labour Government continually express their loathing for the man and his régime. But it by no means follows that any actions are taken to oust him, or even that actions which directly or indirectly assist him are expressly eschewed. More than once his tottering régime has been saved by timely loans or trade agreements from Britain, America or France.

Most paradoxical of all, the recent proposal to admit Spain to the "united" nations received a majority vote in favour (Britain and U.S.A. abstaining) though not the two-thirds majority required for admission. We all hate and despise him, but let him come in just the same—that is the reasoning of politics.

Vested Interest in Stability

Of course, the reason underlying all this paradox is that the nations are more concerned that the Spanish régime should be stable than that it should be just. They are more concerned with the part Spain can play in helping them out of their economic difficulties than with bringing to an end the concentration camps, the overcrowded gaols, the continual shootings of political opposition. This is the dirty side of politics with a vengeance!

On July 19th, anarchists look back to the heroism of the Spanish workers and the great revolutionary experiment with which they enriched history. But we should also bear in mind at such times our mistakes, and our knowledge of political manoeuvring should prevent us making them all over again. For in 1936 and after men of good will in Britain believed that Spain was fighting not merely Franco but everything that his backers, Hitler and Mussolini, stood for. It seemed inconceivable that the democracies would not see it in that light and throw their weight on the side of the anti-fascist struggle (we have not space here to discuss the relation of that struggle to the revolutionary struggle). Even revolutionary strategy in Spain was based on the idea and expectation of help from the democracies. Yet that help did not come, and the revolutionary strategy based on it miscarried.

Clearly, it will not do for us to feed on illusions. To achieve the justice and peace which we all crave, we must abandon the tortuous methods of politics, and embrace wholeheartedly the direct methods of the revolution.

Hysteria in the Super-State

I AMERICA, the Successful State, the Super State, the State which has never lost a war (yet) and never failed to weather a depression (yet) is going through a period of major hysteria in preparation for the "coming war" between U.S.A. and U.S.S.R.

As an indication of the extent of the hysteria, a summary of the contents of two New York newspapers, selected at random, shows all told about 34 separate items on Communism and its related aspects, including "Defence". This is about one out of every three news items, excluding sports and theatre items.

Let you think this is just a reflection of the gutter press [N.Y. daily circulation of the Hearst papers *Mirror* and *Journal American* and the N.Y. *Daily News* (Medell-Patterson) pushes 4,000,000. Sunday circulation must reach 6 or 7 millions including out-of-town circulation] an analysis of the N.Y. *Times* of June 13 shows there are 38 "Communist" items out of a total of about 150. Or, as they say on 14th Street, "Get up out of the sewer, you dirty dog, and come up into the gutter with me!"

In addition to the "news" papers, there are the radio, magazines, comics, movies ("The Red Menace") and the total idea barrage which is enough to make one insensible with its stupidity.

II

There are at present three spy-treason trials going on in this country in addition to deportations past, present and pending. (Harry Bridges is supposed to be up again.)

I was present at the Communist Leader Trial in New York City's Federal Court House. (Alger Hiss is on trial in the same building). The same oppressive atmosphere as at any trial, the same façade of impartiality, the seeming stupidity of the jurors' faces, the formalistic arguments of the Communists not

pleasant to take, then the total airing of ideologies which most of the press ignores, the D.A. objecting, the judge shaking his head in agreement, the rephrasing of the question, the D.A. objecting, the judge nodding his head, the rephrasing of the question, and the sneaking-in of evidence. "No speeches," says the judge, so the defence reads pamphlets into evidence. The whole feeling of a strange level of reality. The "funny" idea that someday the judge may be in the defendants' dock.* The judge bursting out in anger and humour at the defence counsel, saying, "I've been accused of everything here—twitching and turning my nose, and the next thing you will accuse me of is winking at the jury!" The defence jumping up, "No, you haven't done that—yet—your honour." The judge calling a recess when too exasperated. . . Boring legal and technical procedures. The ubiquitous, rough and ugly guards shushing everybody, threatening to throw them out. (You must wear a jacket to get into the court.) The guards with guns in the long white marble halls. The F.B.I. office on the top floors (my friends have been there). The atmosphere of disgust about the whole stinking thing.

III

It all proceeds like a well-planned campaign, like a well-oiled machine—proceeds consciously or otherwise.

Late item: I.W.W. put on subversive list.

Late item: N.Y. State Board of Regents lists 6 groups here as subversive (C.P. German-American Bund (Ha) and Trotskyist group) will bar their members from teaching in N.Y. public schools.

★

Outside of the obvious and basic material struggle between the two empires, these things bear noticing:—

1. The anti-Communist hysteria serves

* I am against all trials.

as the proper ideological counterweight to the new factor in American society: The up and coming recession-depression. The unemployment total is pushing 5,000,000 (Government figures always lag about 1,000,000 behind trade union figures). Strangely enough the total employment figure is quite high (around 60,000,000). What this combination of figures means quite simply is this: the society by its "attractions" and repulsions is driving everyone into the labour force (the new elements are women, young people and possibly older people). The society is demanding its due. Everyone must "do their part". Families need more money. This is also part of a totalitarian trend and best exemplified in shooting-war time. It also challenges the ability of even American capitalism to provide its vaunted high standard of living (always obtained at someone else's expense, anyway).

N.Y.C. Dept. of Welfare relief rolls reached a high of 153,000 last month. Unemployment insurance rolls are at their highest level in years. 5 States have started planning public works projects. Several cities have already instituted them. There is some talk of a Federal Public Works Project. President Truman said a few months back that he wasn't going to worry until the unemployment rolls reached 5,000,000. Well, now maybe even he will start worrying.

The Dept. of Commerce's May Survey of Current Business showed only one major sector of the total economy on the upgrade. You guessed it: the government contract sector (including, of course, E.C.A.). All other major sectors were going down. It seems that only a war or the rumour of war can stabilise the "great" American economy which has become a permanent war economy.

2. The anti-Communist hysteria in America serves the same psychological and personal function as anti-Semitism

has served, and still does, in other countries. (I am not saying there is no anti-Semitism in America. As a matter of fact the two are often not so subtly linked.) But on the basis of "national unity", anti-Jewishness and anti-Negroism are fought by "the authorities" except perhaps in certain backward areas. Because, well, they want a lot of happy anti-Red soldiers (and who knows, even for honest reasons, too—by the wrong methods though, of course).

But after all, the main enemies of the country are "the dirty Reds". They are subverting "our democracy". They are a threat to our lives and your property and freedom and our children. One suspects that anti-Communist sex cartoons are just around the corner. The Reds are "the enemies of everything we hold sacred." (In America the \$ is sacred.) They have concentration camps there: but we never had concentration camps (except for 100,000 Japanese). And, of course, there are no prisons in America (except some of my C.O. friends are still in them). The Reds are the sworn enemies of religion and we are perfectly tolerant (except perhaps against red views and Zionists with "double allegiance" and Finns who still read their own newspapers).

The Reds become the outlet for all the pent-up aggressions of the mechanical mass men, the frustrated automatons of the music-machine, powdered chemical doughnut society. For America produces more useless, harmful, dopey things than any other ten countries in the world and everybody has to work making these "whether they want to or not". And the vital forces of these mechanical men are not entirely lost but express themselves in violent aggressions against whoever seems weak, topical or really free.

O yes—a Red is anyone who thinks children shouldn't work in factories before they are 21.

New York.

JACK GALLEGO.

CULTURE AND RELIGION

THE two books I propose to talk about to-night, although they have somewhat different titles, deal with what is essentially the same theme—it might be called the crisis of our western civilisation.

Both authors are Christians, and Christians with a highly-developed sense of tradition. Both assert that culture is in some sense dependent on religion. For Mr. Eliot culture is the incarnation of religion. Professor Weidls puts it the other way round—religion is the life-giving element in culture. Both authors assert, as an incontrovertible fact, the decline of culture since the Renaissance, and both seek to associate this decline with a disintegration of European art, manners, learning and law, due to an absence of religious faith and unity. Professor Weidls, who is the more colourful if less precise writer, expresses their common point of view in these words:

"In a world whose soul is growing dark and cold, art cannot remain the only source of heat and light. All its roots are deeply embedded in the religious life, but that does not mean that it could itself replace religion. On the contrary, it is perishing itself precisely because of the lack all round it of a world imbued with religion."

Herbert Read recently reviewed on the wireless T. S. Eliot's book *Notes towards the Definition of Culture and The Dilemma of the Arts* by Wladimir Weidls. In the course of his review, which we reprint here, he developed ideas regarding the relation of art, religion and society which are of considerable interest to readers of *Freedom*. The review will appear in two parts, of which the second, to be printed in the next issue, develops in an anarchist manner the idea of equality.

Professor Weidls assumes that Christianity had its ideal embodiment in the art of the Middle Ages. "For a thousand years and more," he writes, "the arts of Christian Europe remained indissolubly tied to the religious life, and that meant to the whole of life. The artist worked not merely for the Church but in the Church. He did more than provide for the needs of worship: he took part in it, for the planting of his work was an act of adoration and its growth to maturity was one long prayer."

Mediaeval Attitude to Art

This romantic conception of the Middle Ages, and of the place of the artist in the society of that time, has little correspondence with the historical facts. Professor Weidls is presumably a member of the Eastern Orthodoxy and he may

have more justification in the history of Byzantine art and religion; but of the West no such dogmatic statement could be made. Recent scholarship has entirely discredited the notion of a pious craftsman devoting his art to the service of God. Much of medieval art is neither pious nor anonymous; on the contrary, as Meyer Schapiro has shown in an essay on *The Aesthetic Attitude in Romanesque Art*, "by the XIth and XIIth centuries there had emerged in Western Europe within church art a new sphere of artistic creation without religious content, and imbued with values of spontaneity, individual fantasy, delight in colour and movement and the expression of feeling, that anticipate modern art." The texts which Professor Schapiro has studied show that the medieval attitude to art was very much what it is to-day; "con-

trary to the general belief that in the Middle Ages the work of art was considered mainly as a vehicle of religious teaching or as a piece of craftsmanship serving a useful end, and that beauty of form and colour was no object of contemplation in itself, these texts abound in aesthetic judgments and in statements about the qualities and structures of the work. They speak of the fascination of the image, its marvellous likeness to physical reality, and the artist's wonderful skill, often in complete abstraction from the content of the object of art." We are driven to the conclusion that there was just as much sheer delight in the sensuous qualities of art then as now; that the artist had the same freedom of expression and was prized for the same kind of skill; and that he was only incidentally religious. It is of course true, and it is an immensely important fact, that the artist was living in a stable religious community; he had a steady job and patrons who knew what they wanted. But the fact remains, as Hegel said, that in an age of piety one does not have to be religious in order to create a truly religious work of art, whereas to-day the most deeply pious artist seems to be incapable of producing anything comparable to the art of Ancient Greece or the Middle Ages.

It is essential to get this point clear, because the whole of Professor Weidls's case depends on it. I shall presently put forward a different theory of the relation of art to society, but first let us note some of the curious inconsistencies. The art which does not fit into Professor Weidls's theory he calls romantic art, and in general he has no words too bad to describe it. It is the death of style, the paralysis of the creative will, the genuine *mal du siècle*, the disease of a century, a fever that has attacked great souls, the men of genius. No poet worthy of his name has escaped it, after Goethe, after Pushkin. Why Goethe and Pushkin are excluded from a company which includes Hölderlin and Kleist, Coleridge and Keats, Leopardi and Baudelaire, Flaubert and Chateaubriand, Carlyle and Browning, De Quincey and Wordsworth, is not made clear. Constable and Turner, Ingres and Delacroix, von Marées and Cézanne,

Wagner and Verdi, Yeats and Mr. Eliot himself are thrown onto the flames, with the assurance that nothing is to be gained by despising an evil which one cannot cure.

Modern "Decadence"

Professor Weidls can point to many qualities in modern art which justify his poor opinion of it, but they all amount to the same lack of a unity of style. We must not be mesmerised by this word "unity"—it is a word dear to tyrants and dictators no less than to religious fanatics and historians of art. Words like diversity, variety and individuality also have their charm. But there can be no doubt that the "greatness" of a style, such as the Doric, or the Gothic, or the Baroque, is related to a certain coherence in the societies responsible for such styles. But in my opinion, and I think I have Meyer Schapiro's support on this point, such unity is not determined or even guaranteed by religious faith. It is due to something still more basic, a collective consciousness, or group unanimity, which is the substance of life itself—life in its economic, familial and associative groupings and activities. At the base is an active civil community, participating in joint enterprises, spontaneously creating an expression of expanding life and joy. What puzzles me in Professor Weidls's book is that in more than one place he seems to recognise this fact. For example, he says that "Style is a universal principle which does not in the least infringe upon the play of the particular and the unique. It is not the individual creation of a genius, not the final result of a great number of convergent efforts; it is only the external manifestation of a deep community, an abiding fraternity of souls; its roots are in the unconscious; it is impossible to replace it by reasoning, by desire, by an exact description of forms and methods, of the grammar and vocabulary of a given style. When community breaks up, style is extinguished and nothing can bring it to life again."

I can accept that as the truth of the matter. But there is nothing here about "higher" and "lower" religions, nothing about the necessity of a Christian interpretation of the world. There are, instead, two or three phrases which imply both more and less—"a deep community", "an abiding fraternity of souls", and a reference to the unconscious. I wish Professor Weidls had said a little more about the unconscious, because it should be very much in evidence in our discussions of art and religion. But for the moment I would like to concentrate on the meaning of "community" and "fraternity", for therein lies the whole of our dilemma.

(To be continued.)

The Levellers

JOHN LILBURNE, THE LEVELLER, by M. A. Gibb. (Lindsay Drummond, 18/-)

TO do full justice to the Levellers, who represented the principal movement of resistance against the Cromwellian dictatorship, and to John Lilburne, their most active and courageous representative, is not always easy. For the most part, they were men of great personal integrity, who realised that, far from the Parliamentary victory in the Civil War having given the common man all he had expected, it had in fact resulted in the imposition, in the place of a royal tyranny, of an oligarchy of the new middle class of merchants and landed exploiters. And, without fear or favour, they came out in fierce denunciation of the fraud that had been put upon them; Lilburne twice defied the new autocrats in trials for his life, and each time gained a great moral triumph over the Grandees by securing an acquittal. The Levellers did, in fact, represent the only mass movement in the ranks of the army and among the populace who were openly and fully opposed to the new dictatorship.

On the other hand, their general attitude was by no means so revolutionary as that of the early libertarian communist group represented by Winstanley and the handful of Diggers. The Levellers, while they denounced the economic expropriations which were being practiced by the new middle class, did not do so in the name of the whole of the people, but only in that of the small property owners and peasants, whose survivors were to become the petty bourgeoisie of the industrial age. Thus, while Lilburne and Wildman took an active part in efforts to resist the enclosure of the common lands on behalf of the yeoman farmers of East Anglia, they shrank from the demands for the landless man which were put forward by Winstanley and his friends in their practical effort to seize the waste lands of England and cultivate them in common. Also, they thought that the parliamentary system might still have its uses, if the suffrage were extended, but even in this they merely put the level of exclusion rather lower than that of the Grandees, by embracing all the small masters and farmers, but excluding rigorously the serving men and those who had no property at all.

Their failings, indeed, have been summed up appropriately by Miss Gibb in her new biography of Lilburne, when she says: "They aimed at reform by reanimating the spirit of existing institutions

rather than by their radical alteration. They failed, perhaps, to perceive that law is more often a reflection of the social system than its determinant, that economic abuses are sometimes less easily remedied by legislation than by a drastic recasting of society. From this extreme socialism they shrank, yet it was the direction in which their theories would seem to lead."

This is the first life of Lilburne that has appeared in the three centuries since his death in 1657 as a prisoner of his Cromwellian enemies, and it is good to see this remarkable man at last subjected to a conscientious study.

Miss Gibb's book is extremely well documented, and provides, besides an adequate narrative based on all the available material regarding Lilburne himself and the Leveller movement, enough background material regarding the Commonwealth period in general to make the central figure stand out in relief. Inevitably, there is a bias, as in any lively biography, and it is towards attempting an explanation of Lilburne and his actions in the terms of the Christian beliefs which the authoress herself clearly holds. But this attitude is in no way offensively obtruded, nor it is entirely inappropriate, since, however much Lilburne's career may have been affected by the social and economic circumstances of his time, his theories were at least ideologically based, like those of Winstanley, on a desire to recover the levelling spirit which the sectarian enthusiasts of the time saw in the Christian doctrine. And Miss Gibb gives so full a presentation of the material regarding her subject, that it is not difficult for the reader to make an interpretation more in accordance with his own view of the process of social change. For, though one might not share the biographer's point of view, her scholarship is unimpeachable. At times she expresses opinions of a rather surprising naivety, as when she remarks that after 1917 the Russian "lower classes did manage to hold on to their gains" (remember that she is not herself a Communist), but her facts are always adequate.

Reading this book as an illustration of the failings of any attempt to create a revolution through legal and parliamentary means, I have been more than ever convinced that Winstanley, with his revolutionary ideas of economic organisation, his belief in direct action, his rejection of government (unfortunately weakened in his later years), had a far greater sense of social realities than Lilburne, who anticipated all the errors of compromise into which subsequent political revolu-

tionaries have fallen. This does not mean any denial of his personal qualities, for Lilburne had a fundamental sincerity which was perhaps one of the first reasons for his failure as a politician when faced by the vast cunning of a Cromwell. If only his social insight had been as great as Winstanley's, Lilburne, with his personal dynamism, might have laid the foundations of a really important revolutionary movement in seventeenth-century England, for at the time of his trials his following among the people was so great that there was no idle boasting in the rhyme then freely spoken in London:

"And what, shall then honest John Lilburne die?

Three-score thousand will know the reason why."

As it is, he remains merely an impressive historical failure and a warning of the futility of merely reformist attempts at social change.

GEORGE WOODCOCK.

QUESTION AND ANSWER

A READER asks: What is the difference between the following: (a) The anarchism of Bakunin; (b) The anarchism of Proudhon; (c) Communist Anarchism; (d) Federalism; (e) Syndicalism?

Proudhon

Proudhon is chiefly significant because he was the first in the socialist working-class movement to demand the abolition of the State. However, he thought that the removal of restrictions on individual liberty by a central authority would be quite enough to deal with the problem of revolution. He did not teach that money should be abolished, but expounded an idea of "free credit" and "free Banking". His ideas on currency and related issues became the basis for the mutualism of the American individualist anarchists led by Josiah Warren. Proudhon also repudiated the idea of violence, holding that the revolution would be brought about by understanding preceding action. Nevertheless he took a prominent part in the revolution of '48. He did not teach the need for working-class action to overthrow class society.

Bakunin

Bakunin went very much further than Proudhon, under whose influence he had been while living in Paris in the '40s. He believed in the total abolition of all private property, as well as the right of inheritance. His followers were successful in making the latter one of the declared aims of the First International, in spite of the adherents of Marx who held that such a radical proposition would alienate support from the International—an example of compromise with reactionary views for the sake of vote-catching such as has vitiated the labour movement ever since. Bakunin also taught the necessity for a declared atheism and absolute anticlericalism. Finally, he believed that the revolution would only come by united working-class action such as would inevitably provoke violence. In short, he thought the revolution was bound to be violent, and did not shrink from advocating it on that account. In contrast to Proudhon he considered that the human race, left to itself, would set up an equi-

table society. Hence he taught that the prime necessity was to overthrow the shackles on progress which were epitomised in the State. Destroy authority and it would then—and only then—be possible to build up the new society. This is the interpretation anarchists place on his oft-quoted remark, "The destructive urge is also a creative urge."

Communist Anarchism

Communist Anarchism implies simply a society without government or other instrument of authority or coercion, in which all the means of production—land, mines, factories, means of transport and power—are held in common, and worked in common. No-one should be denied access to the means of production, nor should they fall under the control of any exclusive group in society. Communist Anarchists see that the denial of freedom of access to the means of production (i.e., private property, or State property types of society) is the principal means whereby a minority group in society is enabled to impose its will on the majority. Indeed it is this denial of freedom of access to the means of life, which puts men in the position of having nothing but their labour power to sell. Communist Anarchism recognises that the complete development of men depends on their living together in society—i.e., in common—and does not see in such combination a diminution of individual liberty, but rather, its greater fulfilment. In this they are opposed to the idea implicit in the Individualist Anarchists' teaching that the highest goal is individual liberty in the sense of complete individual independence. For the Individualists, living in society implies a surrender of part of one's individual freedom to the collective needs of the group. Hence they teach that a man has the sole and exclusive right to the product of his own labour. Communist Anarchists point out that almost all labour is to an extent social, and depends on mutual co-operation between the individuals comprising a group, so that it is impossible to say that a man's labour is wholly his own, since it depends to a greater or less extent on his fellows. They claim therefore that the Individualist Anarchist's teaching regarding labour products is

based on a fundamental misconception. (This problem is discussed on by Berkman in the *ABC of Anarchism*.)

Federalism

Federalism simply means the linking up of autonomous groupings in society by free agreements without their all being subservient to a centralised authority (but see Camillo Berneri's *Kropotkin's Federalism*).

Syndicalism

Syndicalism, briefly, is the theory of working-class combination based on the prosecution of class struggle with a view to overthrowing the existing class divided society by expropriating the bosses. In this it differs from reformist unionism which seeks merely to better the worker's position within the framework of capitalist society, and has therefore degenerated into the instrument of state control of labour such as we see in the Nazi Labour Front, the Soviet Trade Unions, and the T.U.C. (This bracketing together is not mere abuse; there is a real identity of aim in these trade union institutions.) But Syndicalism also implies a method of organisation based on a revolutionary conception of the future society. Thus, since it intends that the workers shall take over production, it seeks to organise them throughout an industry, so that they can run that industry after the overthrow of the boss. But since they also wish to see a society without coercive authority, they also repudiate the conception of Union Bosses. Officials in a syndicate can only hold office for a limited period, after the expiration of which they must go back to the bench. They must not be paid more than they would earn if they were working at the bench; hence there is no careerist incentive to accepting official positions in the syndicate, such requiring mainly militancy and hard work. Syndicalist delegates and officials are subject to recall immediately, and their decisions are subject to the approval of the workers who elected them. Syndicalism therefore is a method of organising workers for revolutionary class struggle, and for avoiding the reformist pitfalls of ordinary unions. In accordance with its aims and methods of organisation, Syndicalism has its own methods of struggle.

... from our stock ...

George Orwell's <i>Homage to Catalonia</i> ...	10/6
Norman Haire's <i>Everyday Sex Problems</i> ...	10/6
W. B. Curry's <i>Education for Sanity</i> ...	7/6
Wilhelm Reich's <i>Character Analysis</i> ...	30/-

Sexual Behaviour of the Human Male, Kinsey and Pomeroy ...	32/6	See You in the Morning, Kenneth Patchen ...	8/6
Sexual Behaviour and the Kinsey Report, Roth and Ernst ...	6/-	Evolution of the Papacy, F. A. Ridley ...	1/-
The World as I See It, Albert Einstein ...	2/6	Resistance, June 1949 ...	3d.
The Distressed Mind: An Outline of Psychiatry, J. A. C. Brown ...	2/6	Retort, Vol. 4, No. 1 ...	1/-
The Paradox of Oscar Wilde, George Woodcock ...	15/-	Journal of Sex Education, August, 1949 ...	2/-
		Etudes Anarchistes, No. 3 ...	9d.
		Volonta, June, 1949 ...	1/-

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

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

THE EXPERIENCE OF NATIONALISATION

MEETINGS IN THREE LANGUAGES IN PARIS

OUR comrades of the Sacco and Vanzetti Group in Paris are making an attempt—so far with notable success—to run meetings in languages other than French. The large number of English-speaking people in Paris have so far been ignored by political and social groupings in the city, and our comrades are to be congratulated on taking the initiative in this internationally-minded way.

Our correspondent writes:—

"On 29th and 30th June and 1st July, meetings were held at the Palais de la Mutualité in Yiddish, English and French respectively, all widely advertised on the one bill by the Groupe Sacco et Vanzetti of the Federation d'Anarchistes. To meet the interests of the English-speaking Parisians, a lecturer went from London to talk on Art and Sex: a lecture on the New Education.

"Previously a lecture on Art and the State had been given by C. Devancon, in English, and some 200 people were interested. This lecture was therefore a sequel to the former, though in the middle of the summer would not be so well attended. Nevertheless, some 50—60 people attended, and discussion was lively, the Jewish speaker from the previous evening, and a practising psycho-analyst lending their support to much that the speaker had said.

While the principles of this subject may be familiar to English anarchists, it must be taken into consideration that discussion in France is more circumscribed. There is, for instance, the law which makes it an offence to disseminate knowledge of contraceptive methods, punishable by five years in prison. It is possible that visits by English lecturers to Paris will have as good an effect on French-speaking circles there as among English-speaking ones. It is at any rate encouraging to see their growing interest in free education, and we may expect some of these young anarchists over in England to see it for themselves. At the same time it is good to know that anarchists in Paris are developing a field that is neglected by their rivals, for there is evidently an English-speaking group there large enough to justify meetings such as this. Visitors to Paris will be welcomed as much for the stimulus they can bring to the talks in English as for the contacts and encouragement they can provide for the French anarchists of the Sacco and Vanzetti Group."

NEXT TIME IT WILL BE A HOLY WAR

Admiral of the Fleet, Lord Cork and Orrery, said at Steeple Ashton, Wiltshire, recently:

"We cannot hide from ourselves the possibility of another world war. There can be few who do not perceive that we are confronted by a situation of the greatest gravity that it behoves us to look to our defences. More could be done by appeals to Christianity than by use of the overworked word 'democracy'. The next war will be a religious war fought with material weapons but with a spiritual object."

NO FUN FOR COLOURED KIDS

One of the most pathetic sights I have ever seen, and one which almost brought a lump to my throat, was in Rhodesia. There was a fair, and while the white people's children swarmed over the swings and roundabouts, evidently enjoying themselves, hundreds of little black piccaninies, their eyes wide with wonder, gazed at them from outside the fence.

Letter in Picture Post, 16/7/49.

VILLAGE OF THE WORLD

The little French village of Trouillas, in the foothills of the Pyrenees (pop. 1,000), has staked its claim as the First Village of the World.

The announcement to-day by the Citizens of the World Organisation, headed by Garry Davis, says because of its ardent desire for peace, the local council passed a resolution saying: "We declare the Commune of Trouillas world territory."

News Chronicle, 13/7/49.

GOOD NEWS

When young lads are told to pick up matchsticks off the square, polish their bootlaces, and cut grass with penknives, whereas they could be doing an interesting job for themselves in Civvy Street, it is natural that 70 to 80 per cent. of privates do not believe in the new British Army.

Anonymous conscripts in Leader Magazine, 23/7/49.

LETTER FROM FRANCE

THE capitalist counter-offensive, aided by the weakness and disunity of the working class just as much as by the errors of the techno-bureaucracy, continues to grow and tends to give to the Fourth Republic all the appearance of the third. The question that arises is this: are the workers of the organisations which represent them, or are supposed to, going to submit, or are they going to profit by their experience and go forward?

It will be useful to examine those tendencies which enable us to keep a certain confidence in the capacities and possibilities of the workers without concealing the fact that these favourable elements are very much in the face of the immense popular apathy and in comparison with the enormous political machines. However, if the signs of a revival of the revolutionary spirit breaks out in the near future, we will know where its origins lie. And to confirm our reasoned hope of such an awakening there is the sudden explosion of spontaneous stay-in strikes of June 1936 and the new tactics which they threw up. There are also the long-standing influences due to the vigour of the ideas set in motion in working-class circles by such pioneers of revolutionary syndicalism in France as Pelloutier, Pouget and Tortelier.

Many great problems face this country to-day, and the types of solution given them will let us know which are the most active and dominant social forces. There is, in the first place, the question of the return to private industry of numerous nationalised enterprises. The big industrialists and their parliamentary representatives obviously support the private control of the aeroplane factories and the maintenance of a regime where private investment remains possible and profitable. On the other hand the party bureaucracies strive to retain the maximum number of nationalised firms in the hands of the State. But no voice is raised to demand workers' control, the unrestricted administration of these industries by those who work in them, and the transformation of armaments works to useful production—the manufacture of agricultural machinery for example. When we say "no voice is raised" we imply no official voice, for we find among the militants of the independent metal-workers' unions as among the technicians' organisations a certain number who agitate for a greater "democratisation" of the control of nationalised plants.

The situation is basically the same in those printing works formerly owned by individuals, private companies or shareholders, which because of the attitude taken by their owners during the German occupation, were confiscated by the authorities. The result of this is that the majority of printing works are now in the hands of a new bourgeoisie, born and sustained by the political parties. Here again a vigorous revolutionary current can be discerned demanding a transformation of the structure of the industry and claiming that it should be run by those who for years have been used and exploited, the printing and book-binding workers. This effort is to be found mainly in the

small towns of the Midi where the wage-earners have organised themselves in production co-operatives to manage these confiscated works. To-day when the legal status is to be fixed and when the former owners have taken the offensive to demand their 'rights', favoured by the melancholy experience of the nationalised companies which have accumulated nothing but muddle and debts, the workers can only escape the confusion into which they have been driven by the political parties, more concerned with gaining the advantages of power for themselves than with gaining socialism, by fighting for workers' control, a policy which is already gaining ground in some union locals in the Paris region.

We must mention the practical studies which have been made by some militant workers, coming from many different attitudes but sharing the view that experience has taught them, that the theory and practise of nationalisation and state-control are a swindle so far as any real socialism is concerned. These studies bear on the possibility of getting rid of legal proprietors, thinking no longer merely of wage increases which the fluctuations of currency render illusory, nor of ameliorations of living conditions which are automatically cancelled out by recurring crises and the international situation, but of complete changes in the structure and control of industry. In other words, in considering works committees not as mere consultative bodies concerned with sport or welfare, but in giving them a supreme role in the factory administration. These workers envisage a system whereby the future accumulations of capital will go to the wage-earners themselves resulting in their taking control of the management and the accounts. These efforts and preoccupations may seem less clear and direct than the tendencies towards the "stay-in strike of control" which we have previously mentioned, but they are symptoms of the same anxiety to give the working-class a clear view of their present and future situation, and to give them a programme corresponding to the realities of the period of social transition in which we live, to prepare the way for a more equalitarian, integral and free society and to give the workers confidence in their own strength.

One can see the harm done by the so-called working-class parties in suggesting that nationalisation is the same thing as socialisation in examining the attitude of the employees of the big Renault works. All that they pressed for were certain wage increases. Thus the National Renault Administration is considered by its workers not as their concern, nor as a national asset, but as just another firm run by their bosses. This is an admittance that the road that has been taken can only lead to a new form of exploitation.

So the question of to-day is whether we are to remain content with the economics of exploitation, with no other perspective than of a proletariat condemned to remain proletarianised, or whether we will learn the lessons of experience and seek an alternative both to capitalism and the State.

S. PARANE.

THROUGH THE PRESS

DOSSIER DEPT.

Fears that new Government regulations may mean secret dossiers on school-children were voiced in the Commons last night.

The regulations—made under the Employment and Training Act, 1948—compel schoolteachers to provide youth employment officers with confidential reports on boys and girls leaving school at 15.

Daily Express, 15/7/49.

UNIVERSITIES OF CRIME

"Suicide caused by the after-effects of Borstal." That, in my opinion, would not be an inappropriate verdict to return in the case of Peter Waring, the actor, who in despair took his life in a lonely prison cell.

A barrister friend tells me that some time ago he was instructed to defend the unfortunate man when he was charged with a certain offence.

With sorrow and bitterness Waring said: "It is the blight of Borstal, I can't shake it off. The thing haunts me. I seek diversion to forget it and to escape from it."

A former Commissioner of Police for the Metropolis said to me some years ago: "The surest and quickest way to make a young chap a confirmed criminal is to send him to Borstal."

A magistrate writing in Evening Standard, 14/7/49.

FACING-BOTH-WAYS

You condemn the trade unionists here because they do not obey the instructions of their leaders; you condemn them in Australia because they do.

In short, trade unionists should obey their leaders, but only when told to do just what you think is right.

Mr. Facing-both-ways has nothing on you.

Letter to the editor of Manchester Guardian, 16/7/49.

THE BISHOP GETS TOUGH

Everybody knows that the real reason why youngsters become criminals is that their parents are weak, indifferent or so ill-housed that they can't look after them properly.

Everybody? Well everybody except the Bishop of Dover and twenty-four other eminent men—and women—of Kent who have decided that the only way to cure child crime is to "get tough" with the kids.

One of their bright ideas is to cancel the ban on newspapers reporting names and addresses of children brought before juvenile courts. Another is to put them in the dock, in the cells, and generally to frighten them into submission.

Sunday Pictorial, 17/7/49.

EVEN SCIENCE SUFFERS IN WARS!

IN the midst of the misery and destruction brought by wars, people are always to be found who point to the fact, by way of consolation perhaps, that tremendous strides are made by science during these periods, which would be impossible in peace time, and which benefit mankind as a whole. Cynics might retort that this "progress" seems generally confined to the field of plastic surgery and the perfection of artificial limbs as well as in preparations for bigger and more destructive warfare. And one can add that modern warfare shows little respect for scientific research as the following A.P. report (12/6/49) clearly shows: "The wartime destruction of science laboratories is seriously hampering education and research in Europe and Asia, a United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation survey said. It estimated that in France alone it will cost \$4,000,000 to replace science equipment in universities." Which is rather a blow for those optimists who would like us to believe that mankind can ever benefit from war!

"Under a headline, 'Moscow Likes Slump Here, And So Do We', the big money weekly chortles: 'The cycle [boom or bust] seems to be a basic principle of nature. Planets have their orbits and years their seasons. Night follows day. Trees and animals grow, mature, decay and die . . . Recessions and depressions are unpleasant. No-one likes to see stock prices going down, businesses cutting dividends and losing money, or worst of all, working people losing jobs. But there are times when recessions are needed. A healthy man can lose the power to walk if he stays in bed long enough.'"

"As a final illustration of the silver lining in the depression cloud, *Barron's* offers this solacing thought: 'Layoffs are painful, but they do induce those who are still on the job to work harder; and they also tend to bring the working force of the nation down to where it includes only those who really want jobs. It weeds out the temporary and the casual workers, and those who are normally experimenting with jobs.'"

"Barron's current attitude parallels other big business statements that what the country really needs is a good depression. The trade journal *Automotive and Aviation Industries*, carried an article by Ralph Blodgett some time ago declaring: 'It is to be hoped that depressions are never abolished, for they have many desirable features. That very name depression is inappropriate. It horribly maligns those great periods so full of splendid opportunities and human benefits. Let us keep those periods and abolish only the name.'"

It's not news to us since the Anarchists have often pointed to the fact that unemployment is a weapon which capitalism cannot dispense with if it is to keep the workers "in their place". But it's as well to have confirmation straight from big business circles.

LIBERTARIAN.

THE VATICAN AND BIRTH CONTROL

IT would appear that "authoritative Vatican sources" have been most upset by the Royal Commission's Population Survey. They fear that legislation would be introduced in Britain to extend birth control. They recalled that the encyclical "Casti Connubii" of Pius XI, in 1930, "condemned, with extreme severity, that neo-Malthusianism which frustrated the primary aims of matrimony and which, even then in English-speaking countries, pretended to have a scientific basis and asked for juridical recognition."

These sources said: "It is hardly necessary to say that the position of the Catholic Church has not changed. It has even, if possible assumed an attitude which is even clearer, especially when racists eugenicists have wanted to impose by force the planning of births."

They said: "In the case of Britain, there have not been until to-day provisions which in any way limit the individual free will, but it is not risky to suppose that any eventual legislation which attempted to regulate births would find a strong protest on the part of Catholics."

What a curious idea these people have of "free will". Surely free will in these matters consists in having children if one desires them but also of not having them if one prefers it that way. And the only way this can be done is by making available the knowledge of how to control births and the free access to the applications for putting into effect this knowledge gained.

ITALIAN ANARCHISTS AND BIRTH CONTROL

THESE were the views which moved our Italian comrades who edit the monthly magazine *Volontà* to publish a pamphlet with the title *Birth Control*. As a result of a denunciation to the police by a priest in Naples they are now being prosecuted for this publication. A number of progressive journals and individuals have taken up the case and expressed their solidarity with our comrades. These are reproduced in the current issue of *Volontà*. But no definite date for the hearing of the charges has yet been fixed. Much more could be made of this case however, if the Italian anarchist press as a whole gave more importance to the problem of birth control in that country. But we believe there exists in certain sections of the movement a feeling that it is not a subject which should interest "revolutionaries".

This curious attitude is revealed in a sentence from a critical article by a group of comrades and published in *Volontà*, in which they state "How pleased the Italian bourgeoisie would have been if Gori or Malatesta had worried themselves about . . . the sale of effective birth control appliances!" It should be noted that the signatories of this statement were all males. But there is no excuse for not understanding the problem facing Italian women who, after all, may wish to enjoy a full sex life without having eight or ten children in the process. Of course, these comrades may share the Vatican's view that women have no right to a sex life except for the purpose of producing endless numbers of offspring, in which case one cannot but feel a little suspicious as to what they mean when they preach freedom to the "masses".

DEPRESSION IS GOOD FOR YOU!

AN American comrade writes: *Barron's*, the national business and financial weekly which urged, during the recent Presidential campaign, that government policies be manipulated to bring on a quick depression, greets with delight in its June 20 issue 'reports of deterioration in the America economy'.

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	
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 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/-	

ANARCHIST COMMENTARY

SOFT HEARTS AND WOOLLY HEADS

SOFT-HEARTED M.P.'s were disturbed last week when they saw newspaper photographs of Princess Elizabeth inspecting a W.R.A.C. guard of honour standing rigidly to attention while one of their number had fainted. Mr. Shinwell described the photographs as "regrettable", but refused to answer whether "there is any penalty attached to one woman going to the rescue or assistance of another in such a predicament," saying that it was a matter for the discretion of the commanding officer.

But why are the M.P.'s so squeamish? Do they really think you can have a military system without the petty stupidities—as well as the major evils—that go with it? It's the same

with the anxious parents, public busy-bodies and clerical do-gooders who get worried about the demoralisation of "our boys" in Britain's conscript army. They want militarism without its results. They want "our boys" to dress up like chocolate soldiers for the trooping of the Colour, to carry out punitive expeditions in the Far East, and to scab on strikers here at home, but they don't want the by-product of conditioning "our boys" to do these things. But if the soldiers refused to strut up and down in fancy dress, or to risk their lives in the Malayan jungle, or to unload ships, would the warm-hearted British public protest against the savage punishment they would receive?

WHO WANTS PEACE?

THERE is a type of person who is continually harking back to his school-days whose vivid reminiscences of "the happiest days of his life", and activities with Old Boys' Associations and nostalgic reading of school magazines, seems not merely irritating but pathetic when we reflect that his adult life must be so devoid of interest and enjoyment, that for a sense of community and common purpose he can only look back to his childhood. I had the same impression listening to the news on the radio on Sunday night. We heard of the celebration in Belgium of the anniversary of the entry of British troops, then the memorial parade in London for the 50th anniversary of the South African War and to crown it all there followed a talk on the magnitude and glory of the British war effort. Like the old bores with their everlasting schooldays, there must be a very large number of people who look back with unconscious regret to wartime days, despite all their suffering and danger. They think of the days when life was exciting, when they were united in a common cause. Some remember the responsibilities which are denied them in peacetime, some on the other hand yearn for the cheerful irresponsibilities of hectic wartime days.

Isn't this the most telling and terrible condemnation of our society? Not only that its economic problems can be solved by war alone, but that its social life is so dreary for great masses of people that it is only made tolerable by periodic wars which release energies and capabilities which cannot satisfy themselves in peace time?

When peace breaks out they have to look back with more nostalgia than horror to the happy days gone by. But while the Peter Pans of this world who pine for the jolly days of inky classroom desks, harm nobody and represent at most one of the more comical of sexual deviations, the "Old Comrades" of the Regimental Association and the Those-were-the-days merchants who talk about peace but unconsciously hanker after war, are victims of a disease which can have fatal effects for all of us. How can we cure them? By building a society in which, besides removing the economic causes of war, we make peace so attractive that nobody would be willing to fight in one.

C.

AS CLEAR AS MUD

In the House of Commons Standing Committee on the Patents and Designs Bill yesterday, Mr. F. J. Erroll asked why Clause 1 amended a clause of the Atomic Energy Act.

Mr. J. Wheatley (the Lord Advocate) replied: "The subsection repeals subsection 5 of section 12 of the Atomic Energy Act, 1946, and an amendment to subsection 8 of section 12 of the Atomic Energy Act, made by subsection 2 of this clause, is consequential upon amendments made by clauses 20 to 29. Subsection 8 refers to and depends upon section 29 of the Patents and Designs Act and requires amendment accordingly."

Mr. Erroll and other members accepted the explanation in silence.

Manchester Guardian, 13/7/49.

THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN CHILD & ADULT

I AM strongly in sympathy with the article "Childhood and Social Revolution", and agree entirely with the thesis that "social revolution is logically founded on childhood revolt". I think it helps to put ourselves in a better perspective, and so regard our work more honestly, if we realise that on the one hand, its effectiveness is limited by the degree to which this natural revolt is filtered by adult conditioning (made impotent, in Reichian terms), and that on the other hand, we still have the social responsibility implicit in the fact that the majority are not even consciously aware that they have lost anything.

Wagner expressed this awareness beautifully in a passage from his letter of January 25, 1854, to Roedel: "One thing excels all others—freedom. But what is freedom? Is it—as our politicians believe—licence? No, indeed! Freedom is integrity. Whosoever is true—that is, completely at one with his nature in accordance with the law of his being—he is free. Outward compulsion really attains its end only when it destroys the integrity of its victim, when the latter becomes a hypocrite and tries to make himself and others believe him other than he really is. That is true slavery. But the victim of constraint need never let it come to this, and the man who preserves his integrity—even under compulsion—preserves his essential freedom also; at least, he is certainly more free than one who no longer notices the constraint of which our world is full, because his soul is wholly submissive, and who has defaced himself by submission."

The increasing number of us who believe the child to be manifestly more "in accordance with the law of his being" than the adult, must welcome the natural and inevitable evolution of anarchist theory and practice in the direction of that yet more fundamental struggle of oppressor and oppressed which exists between child and adult. The deliberate appropriation in this regard of the term "class struggle" by an anarchist writer in your columns will be another shock to some of our friends of the old school; nevertheless, this distinction of classes represents, in psychological as well as physiological terms, a more definite reality than that between rich and poor, workers and parasites. And if the sociological difference is less, it is, as the writer points out, only on sufferance of the adult, who gives or withholds from the child, allows or prevents, according to his whims and prejudices. Nothing therefore could be more important to the propagation of our ideals than the re-education of the adult to the true nature of his despotism over the child, and wherever this is impossible, the combatting of that despotism with every means at our disposal.

Fraternally yours,
Santa Monica. JACK DIETHER.

INDUSTRIAL NOTES

Manchester Railmen Work-to-Rule

THE recent nation-wide go-slow threat on the railways for a wage increase, and the every-Sunday strikes against the lodging-out turns, were called off on the promise of a re-opening of negotiations.

As is always the case, this in fact means the re-introduction of delaying tactics, and at least one section of railmen are not having it. In Manchester, according to the *Manchester Guardian* (14/7/49):

"In spite of the appeals of Mr. W. N. Hayter, the district organiser of the National Union of Railwaymen, thirty delegates representing the 3,800 Manchester and Salford goods workers who have been 'working to rule' since Monday decided yesterday not to resume normal working."

"Discussions which began on Monday evening and continued yesterday lasted for more than seven hours. Mr. Hayter said at the end of yesterday's resumed meeting: 'I have addressed the delegates for over three hours and appealed to them time and again not to carry on with this policy, but they consider that by taking this action they will impress upon the Railway Executive the strong resentment of the Manchester men against the long delay in meeting their claim for increased wages. They are not completely satisfied with the arrangements for the Conciliation Board. I have used every argument I can think of to persuade the men to get back to normal working.'"

DEAKIN'S "REALISM"

MEANWHILE, at the Transport and General Workers' Union Conference at Scarborough, Arthur Deakin, Secretary of the world's biggest (1,337,000) union was opposing a resolution demanding an increase in the real value of wages. "I am going to be no party," said Deakin, "to leading members into the belief that

we can do those things in the face of the circumstances now confronting this country."

There is always an excuse, isn't there? If it isn't the War, it's the Export Drive, and if it isn't that it's the Circumstances Now Confronting the Country, and soon there will be something else.

Workers might look a bit more kindly on this sort of fobbing-off if we saw some evidence of our leaders tightening their own belts. But while £5,000 a year—£100 per week—is the basic wage for members of nationalised Boards, we are not going to take too easily to the idea that the rising cost of living should leave us behind.

One might ask in whose interests is Deakin paid his fat salary? Is it to defend the stupidities of the Labour Government or the economic interests of the members of his union—who pay his salary? There really does not seem much point in their continuing to pay union dues (and the political levy) to an organisation which leaves them at the mercy of the capitalist system against which it is supposed to defend them!

WANT A JOB IN W.F.T.U.?

THE Communist Giuseppe di Vittorio, new President, refuses to believe that last January's split when British, American and other union delegates walked out (*Freedom*, 5/2/49) is permanent, so vacant chairs have been left for "authentic" trade union organisers claiming to represent British and American labour in opposition to the present T.U. leadership.

Anybody want the job? Sorry, comrade, the first credential necessary (and perhaps the only one) will obviously be a Party Card—but it will all be done in the name of all the workers.

The End of the R.C.P.

AT a "fully representative National Conference" on June 4—6th the Trotskyist Revolutionary Communist Party decided to dissolve as an organisation and cease publication of their journal *Socialist Appeal*. This decision was taken because Trotskyists feel that their best sphere of activity is within the Labour Party. But since 1946 the Labour Party has not accepted affiliation of such organisations as a body, so the only way open to them is by joining as individuals.

Actually, the Trotskyists have been losing ground for some time, and this decision probably reflects internal difficulties. Since Trotsky's assassination, they have

had no real theoretical leader. Their adherence to certain shibboleths, like "defence of the Soviet Union in all circumstances" (which led them to hail the Stalinist putsch in Czechoslovakia as a "workers' revolution"), and "100 per cent. Trade Unionism" have made advanced workers suspicious of them. For a time they cashed in on dissatisfied elements in the Labour Party, but the switch of the Stalinists from support to opposition to the Government has stolen most of their thunder in this respect.

Trotskyists are essentially party men, and no doubt many of them will go far in the Trade Union and Labour bureaucracy.

SUPPORT THE DOCKERS!

(Continued from page 1)

being interpreted by the employers as referring only to the voyage back to Canada, that there was no protection for the seamen on landing, and that therefore the strike was on again. Meanwhile London stevedores had begun work on the *Beaverbrae* and *Argomont*, but immediately downed tools on hearing of the breaking of the agreement. The Dock Labour Board, however, issued an ultimatum to the men that if they did not continue work on these two ships, now "black" again, they would not be allowed to work any other ships.

This, the dockers rightly maintain, is a lock-out. Within a week over 10,000 dockers and stevedores were on strike, and the Government invoked the Emergency Powers Act.

Communist Influence

It will be seen then, that there has been no need for "Communist agitators" to incite this strike. It began as an anti-communist move in Canada, and the union has all the time been defending itself. But as far as British workers are concerned, they have been faced with a simple trade-union principle: unionists must not black-leg. Naturally, however, the Communists have done their best to "cash in" on the dispute, but it is simply insulting to refer to the dockers as dupes of the Communists. The typical attitude of the politician is to think in terms of leaders and dupes—that is how he prefers it, after all.

One docker was quoted in the press as saying: "So you think we don't know that under Communism we wouldn't be allowed to strike?" and it seems to us that the strikers are not the fools and irresponsibles the authorities would have the public believe.

After all, it entails considerable sacrifice for workers to launch on a strike which may be long-drawn-out. Because of the strike at Easter in defence of 33 dockers threatened with "redundancy", average earnings for many men have been less than £4 per week. They went into this strike with no reserves, have since been deprived of the £5. 4. 6. holiday money on which many of them must have been depending, and now the Dock Labour

Board threaten to suspend them all from the Dock Labour Scheme, which would mean each man being re-engaged personally, with all the attendant screening and possibility of victimisation.

Is it likely that 15,000 men will face this economic stress at the behest of "agitators"? No, let the Labour politicians and middle-class journalists think again, and realise that the dockers are standing by principles to which they—the politicians—now only pay lip-service.

The Use Of Troops

If there is any criticism to be made of the dockers it lies in the easy way they have accepted the use of troops by the Government. The dockers have maintained that if only the troops would unload the two ships involved, the strike would be over. It seems to us deplorable that workers can be so sanguine about the States' usage of uniformed blacklegs—and whosoever unloads a "black" ship is a blackleg whether he is in uniform or not. Because the conscripts go there under orders is no excuse for them; every worker who goes into the Forces knows full well he may be used by the State against his fellow-workers in time of unrest. The way out is not to accept these things but to resist and destroy them.

Admittedly, it is easy for us to talk;

SOLIDARITY WITH THE DOCKERS

The London dockers are in need of cash! Already some hundreds have been forced on to Relief to provide for their families. Support them and the principles for which they are fighting by sending all the cash you can spare to:

Philip Sansom,
c/o Freedom Press,
who will pass it on to the Lock-out Committee.

we are not directly involved in the present crisis. But we have all had to face the State in our individual lives and have had to choose between taking the line of least resistance and—resistance. In this dispute, as in any other in which we are not ourselves involved, we do not, as politicians do, presume to tell the dockers what they should do.

The Anarchist View

From our standpoint as anarchists and syndicalists we see that the only lasting solution of all labour problems and disputes is for the workers to take control of their places of work themselves. We see that the lack of solidarity shown to the dockers by other workers (Spitalfields market men will not refuse to handle goods unloaded by troops) is a deplorable comment on the power of the authorities to divide the working class. We see the lack of support within the dockers' own industry as a direct result of the years of reformist activity by trade union officials whose one concern is to maintain their positions, and which could not happen if the dockers were to create their own industrial organisation controlled by the rank and file and with a militant, revolutionary attitude.

Some of the dockers' statements have shown a grasp of these things. They are obviously disillusioned with their union leaders; they refused to take part in a ballot on returning to work because C.I.D. and M.I.5 men were taking notes in their meeting, and whereas last year they returned to work on the first threat of the E.P.A., this year they were prepared to face the State and fight it.

Let it not be forgotten that there are two ways of finishing any dispute—the employers could have accepted the men's attitude to the "black" ships on the first day of the strike as they did two months ago. But they preferred to send troops to load necessities such as nylons, cars and tobacco for export, and army supplies for Hong-Kong.

The application of the Emergency Powers Act is a challenge to the working class. It is an indication of the depths to which a "Socialist" Government can sink. It is a lesson for all to see that the struggle for the emancipation from slavery is not yet won—nor will it be while Governments exist.

LEGAL MORALITY

Sir Hartley Shawcross, Britain's Attorney-General, has appeared for the prosecution or the defence in about forty capital cases, but is himself opposed, in principle, to capital punishment. But to quote from his speech in the debate on the Criminal Justice Bill in July last year: "... it is the duty of a member of the Bar, as it is the duty of a judge, to assist in administering the law as he finds it. We cannot select the cases which we try or appear in according to the view which we may have as to whether the particular law involved is just or expedient."

Illustrated, 16/7/49.

Special Appeal

Llanely: L.W.* 2/6; Anon* 2/6; Sidmouth: J.S.* 2/6; London: E. & T.E.* 5/-; Gosport: F.G.* 5/-; Hyde Park Sympathisers: 9d.; Long Eaton: C.W.R.* 2/-; Leyton: L.W. £1/3/0; London: I.A.* 2/-; L.G.W.* 5/-; Tampa, Florida: 5/-; Los Angeles, per Alex £6/5/0; Chicago: A.W. 10/-; Stirling: R.A.B.* 10/-.

Total ... £10 0 3
Previously acknowledged ... £190 17 10

1949 TOTAL TO DATE ... £200 18 1

*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.

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.

ULY 24th
Questions and Answers

LAST MEETING OF THE SEASON

The lectures will be discontinued during the summer, recommencing in the autumn. Comrades are asked to lend their support to the out-door propaganda work at Hyde Park.

HAMPSTEAD

Weekly discussion meetings are held every Wednesday 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 Leech, John Gaffney, Eddie Shaw.

INTERNATIONAL CORRESPONDENCE BUREAU, U.A.G.

c/o 27, Red Lion St., London, W.C.1.
A circular has been received from the C.R.I.A. (International Committee for Anarchist Relations) in Paris. Comments are invited from all groups in order to formulate a response and the proposals to be taken by our delegation to the coming Conference.

Copies available for groups and individual militants. Apply as above.