

T. U. C.

WEAPON OF THE CORPORATE STATE

THE Trade Union Congress at Bridlington produced little enough in the way of surprises. Indeed, these annual affairs have settled down in recent years into a more or less fixed pattern. The leaders issue appeals for a "responsible" attitude from the rank and file, urging that any kind of union militancy upsets the delicate course of the unions and the Labour Government, and may result in disaster for "the whole structure of Trade Unionism as we know it" or "everything for which organised labour has striven for many decades"—the phraseology has become monotonously familiar. The atmosphere is like that of wartime, everything must be subordinated to some over-riding consideration, and it is really best to leave things to the wise judgment of "the leaders of our movement".

It is, of course, just this blanketing atmosphere which has taken all life out of trade union activity, creating that apathy amongst rank-and-file workers which has seemed the characteristic aspect of organised working class activity during recent years.

NATIONALISATION

After all the trumpetings about the great advantage to the workers which nationalisation of an industry would bring, the realities are beginning to be seen in just the light in which anarchists (including this paper) described in advance. Thus Arthur Horner, the Communist secretary of the Mineworkers' Union, explained to the delegates that nationalisation does not alter the relationship between

HONG-KONG

"Watching Britain's interests. Mounting guard over a vital bit of British territory far from home, you can't help feeling a tingling pride in what you stand for."

—Newspaper advertisement for the Army, August, 1949.

IF the United States is finding China an incandescent potato, says a *Worldover Press* despatch, so have the British a burning issue in Hong Kong. For 108 years they have had possession of this great trade outpost, which consists of 391 square miles of islands, rugged mainland, and water. Urged many times by liberal world opinion to give Hong Kong back to the Chinese, British governments, including the present Labour government, have turned deaf ears. With Communist forces likely to reach the border soon, voices have not been lacking, in the United Kingdom and even in Hong Kong itself, counselling a return of the territory if the Communist regime makes the expected request.

But there are many critical considerations which recommend a contrary decision. If Britain should accede to Chinese demands at such a juncture, it would perhaps cost highly in prestige, and stimulate new Communist uprisings in Burma, Malaya, and elsewhere. There are thousands of refugees who would be harshly treated by the Communists. Yet if Britain hung on in the face of a Chinese Communist *démarche*, this would add fresh fuel to the criticisms of white western imperialism. And if somehow a trade deal were made between Mao Tse-tung and the British, Britain would become the target of attacks by the western democracies opposed to any compromise with the Communist forces.

Confronted with this series of dilemmas, the British are saying little and making extensive military preparations. It is doubtful that they can muster more than 25,000 troops against a possible Chinese force of eight times that number, and they must rely primarily on air power. But even should a successful defence be put up in a showdown, again the effect on other sections of South-East Asia would be portentous. The advances of Chinese Communism have produced many embarrassing and ticklish problems,

is for production costs to be cut so that British goods can compete favourably on the export market. This means that greater rationalisation must be introduced into industry, more labour-saving machinery, more elimination of waste. Workers are not unnaturally afraid that all this means unemployment, and they see only too clearly that unemployment can be used to lower wages and so add another factor favourable to the owners of industry in their struggle on the foreign markets. It falls to the Trade Union leaders to dissipate such fears, and they set to work with the usual vague appeals about helping our country to recover, about not pressing sectional interests against the needs of the workers as a whole, and so on. The Trade Unions see these matters solely through the framework of capitalist production, which they seem to regard as sacrosanct. Since their idea of socialism does not extend beyond the transfer of ownership—not to the workers but to the State—such as nationalisation brings, it is perhaps not surprising. But even if one did not have years of past experience to guide one, surely this vision of struggling to cut production costs to get markets, this whole business of workers looking at industry through the eyes of the owners is too completely dreary and deadening.

THE QUESTION OF DISMANTLING

Some light is shed on this question by the discussion on the dismantling of German factories. German Trade Union leaders had appealed to the T.U.C. on the matter of dismantling, claiming that many factories scheduled for dismantling were not engaged in war production at all. Walter Padley pointed out that such attempts to destroy German industry would result in lowered wages for Germans, and hence would permit a later revived German industry to compete favourably with Britain and so force down wages here. One is here very near to a most absurd paradox: "responsible" trade unionists will look with approval on wage levels abroad higher than here because such wages hamper competition with British goods, while at the same time a "realistic" tightening of the belt and abandoning of wage claims by British workers is extolled as needful for the sake of successful competition in the world markets! Such a position is not stated in so many terms, but it is the logical implication of much that was said at Bridlington.

An interesting comment on this

WHAT THE LABOUR PARTY MEANS BY WORKERS' CONTROL!

	1945	1949
Lord Citrine	Gen. Sec. T.U.C.	Chairman British Electricity Authority, £8,500.
Mr. Ebby Edwards	Gen. Sec. National Union of Mineworkers.	Labour Relations Officer, Coal Board, £5,000.
Mr. J. Benstead	Gen. Sec. National Union of Railwaymen.	Member of British Transport Commission, £5,000.
Mr. W. P. Allen	Gen. Sec. Amal. Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen.	Member of Railway Executive, £5,000.
Sir Joseph Hallsworth	Gen. Sec. National Union of Distributive and Allied Workers.	Chairman North-West Electricity Board, £4,000 (succeeded Mr. George Gibson).

THE CRIME OF BEING COLOURED

DR. MALAN, Nationalist Premier of South Africa, announced on September 6th that to protect the European race everyone in the Union would have to carry an identity card classifying him as European, native coloured, or Indian.

He told the Transvaal congress of the Nationalist party that the Government was determined to enforce apartheid (racial segregation), and that in the next session of Parliament it planned at least to create machinery to make it possible to enforce apartheid.

Dr. Malan said that the Government was also determined to stop non-European students mixing with European students at Witwatersrand and Capetown Universities.

In "socialist" Australia a Bill was recently passed to close loopholes in the immigration laws which allowed Asiatics to remain in the country, and to enforce the "White Australia" policy.

matter of competition from low wages abroad was provided by the discussion on the Polish coal mines. Large numbers of women are employed as surface workers in these mines while much of the underground labour is provided by German prisoners-of-war. It is interesting to know that this new socialist Poland employs such methods, and keeps German slave labour at work four and a half years after the end of the war. But the seconder of the resolution which brought forward these facts was no other than Abe Moffat, the Communist Scottish Miners' leader!

ROLE OF THE T.U.C.

Apart from all this, the Congress confirmed another trend which *Freedom* has frequently pointed out—that of the increasing incorporation of the Trade Unions as part of the State structure. Before the Congress, Ministers apparently conferred with T.U.C. leaders to brief them for putting over some of the less palatable of the government's pills. The *Manchester Guardian* remarks that, "The T.U.C. is apparently intended as a shock-absorber between the government and the impact of unpopular policies upon the people who will have to bear the brunt of them. The same political technique was followed over the decision to re-introduce direction of labour and over the attempt to enunciate a wages policy, when it was left to the T.U.C. to put its own interpretation on last year's White Paper."

This is another way of saying that the government increasingly regard the T.U.C. as the interpreters of its policies. But, as the *Manchester Guardian* goes on to say: "It is not a technique that has worked happily, because it has increased suspicions of national trade union leaders among the very people they are supposed to represent." The vilification campaigns in the press against unofficial strikers perhaps indicate the way in which a government might act in giving powers to trade union leaders which would make them independent of the suspicions or distrust of their rank and file. In several countries we have seen the trade unions degenerate into mere disciplining bodies for bringing the workers to heel. The attitude of T.U. leaders here makes such an outcome by no means impossible here.

A writ seeking an injunction to restrain the Immigration Minister, Mr. A. A. Caldwell, from exercising powers under the new legislation is to be filed on behalf of some of a number of Chinese arrested in Sydney and elsewhere for deportation.

The writ will seek a declaration that the Act is invalid.

A writ of *habeas corpus* will be sought for the release of the Chinese, who are being held in prison without bail.

Police are conducting further raids to pick up Chinese who have gone underground.

[See page 2 for a review of a new book on Negroes in the United States, and page 3 for further news of apartheid in South Africa.]

British Association SCIENTISTS CURRENT PROBLEMS

IT is sometimes said that we live in a scientific age, that science has made great strides, that man is capable of mastering his environment. In fact, however, the advantages which science has made available remain potential advantages only—at least as far as the mass of people are concerned. And this is true not merely of the vast Asiatic populations but of the bulk of workers in the most advanced countries of the world. All this has not prevented the scientist from being regarded in such an awestruck light that several thinkers—of whom Bakunin was one—have warned against enthroning scientists in the place of the priests.

Nevertheless, a rationally organised society would in fact turn to science for guidance in those matters requiring the organisation of fact and experience which is its proper province. Scientists, being human, already concern themselves with the practical problems which confront humanity, even though our type of society does not encourage the solution of practical problems in straightforward ways. The Annual Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science recently held at Newcastle indicates how ready scientists are to play their parts in the improvement of human life. This enormous gathering at which many sections met to receive considerable numbers of papers, and which was attended by a record audience, testifies to the interest in contemporary problems and perhaps to a belief that they can be solved by the methods of science.

In particular, the meeting concerned itself with the problems of agriculture and world food supplies, and Lord Horder struck the right note when he stated that our approach to such problems must be *global*, regarding it from a world standpoint. The sections on agriculture, chemistry and economics all had contributions to make to this most pressing problem, approaching it both in the broadest lines and also in matters of considerable detail, so that it becomes apparent that scientists in many fields have concerned themselves to make a very practical approach to this question.

It is not possible to discuss here the papers read to the meeting but it will not be out of place to say something about the kind of way in which scientists tackle practical problems. In doing so we must bear in mind that it cannot be a matter of ignorance for scientific men that their abilities are not fully exploited by our society, and that the benefits that they and their forbears have been able to confer have not in fact filtered through to the great mass of people. One would therefore have expected that they would also have considered why this is so—why the structure of our society inhibits them from being the benefactors of humanity which they could be.

(Continued on page 4)

FREEDOM FROM NATURE

ONE of the speakers at the recent anarchist Summer School pointed out that when talking about freedom it is much safer to ask "freedom from what?" rather than "freedom for what?" for the latter implies a doctrine. But later on in the discussion it was agreed that one cannot leave out either of the prepositions. For one wants freedom from restrictions in order to have freedom for carrying out one's desires.

There is no good definition of freedom—one could quote dozens, and for those who have time it would be extremely interesting to make a historical study of what this word "freedom" has meant during the centuries. For freedom is linked to time. It has no absolute value, no changeless meaning. Anarchists and others subscribing to this paper in another thousand years will interpret its title differently from their twentieth-century comrades. To the Greeks and Romans there were two kinds of humans—free men and slaves, and the slaves were scarcely men. Paul of Tarsus, much influenced by Greek thought, brought into Christian theology the idea of the willing slave, calling himself the bond slave of Christ, thus making it easier to link up with the concept of the Messiah as the suffering servant which had been foreshadowed by the Hebrew prophets.

Even when the idea of liberty came to be interpreted in economic and political terms—when the German Humboldt for instance concerned himself with "freedom of the individual from the infringement of the State", when English reformists

like Mary Wollstonecraft, Godwin, Mill, and Tom Paine tried to define the rights of man, the word freedom still eluded definition.

SUBSERVIENT

Is it sufficient to say that freedom is not only a function of Time, but also of the individual—that it varies from one man to another, and can best be represented as the removing of those restraints which the individual wants to be removed in order to carry out his desires? Would anarchists be satisfied with such an interpretation? I think if we interpret the history of our species honestly we are bound to admit that just as the aggressive and the co-operative urges exist side by side in all of us (in some, one set developing more strongly at the expense of the other), so the desire for freedom exists side by side with the desire for shelving responsibility, the desire to be obedient to a boss, whether it be a parent, husband or wife, teacher or Führer.

One must also recognise that when individuals coalesce into a mass, sometimes the desire for freedom is uppermost, as at the beginning of revolutions, sometimes the desire for obedience, as in movements like Catholicism or Fascism. It is no use blaming popes, priests, police-

men and leaders—no use blaming anyone. There is innate in each human being the desire to be a bond slave—and the weaker the personality, the more a man wishes to be a "willing servant". Even the Leader himself talks about serving the State, or the people or God or posterity.

I think I have stated before in *Freedom* my disbelief in the slogan "Man is born free but is everywhere enslaved". At any rate it cannot be included in present-day interpretations of freedom. For just as we have to be concerned now with freeing ourselves from the cruder manifestations of our aggressive urges before we annihilate the entire planet, so we have to be concerned with freeing ourselves from the desire to obey.

OBEDIENCE

The problem of freedom is immensely complicated—it is not merely a question of dealing with the environment but also with our own inherited tendencies. Much can be done, I believe, in the progressive schools to solve it, but I sometimes wonder if we realise what method we are using? We talk of self-realisation, fulfilment, of leaving the child alone to grow up naturally. But have we really thought what we mean by *naturally*? As grown-ups we deal with the aggressive urges by letting the children "play them out" amongst themselves. We, as teachers, provide no "food" for them—we do not organise cadet corps, corporal punishment and so forth. Similarly, we deal with the urge to be regimented, to obey a leader, by providing no food for it ourselves. We do not boss. Is the same

treatment always useful in both cases?

Personally, I feel that we have not yet discovered the best method of dealing with the natural docility of the human being—for the ordinary child is every bit as docile as he is aggressive. And to return to that favourite dictum "let the child develop naturally", are we not acting upon the assumption that something called "Nature" is right and good? Have we dispensed with a benevolent Deity only to substitute a benevolent Nature? We may also be assuming that the child born to-day is the same basically as the child of Neanderthal Man—forgetting the extreme capacity for variability which *homo sapiens* has to a degree unknown in other animal species.

ACCEPTANCE

Get back to Nature, live like a man in a primitive society, and you will be much freer. Will you? I do not accept the point of view that man in any form of primitive society was free, nor do I think it possible to obtain the maximum amount of freedom, i.e., freedom to fulfil all one's potentialities and to carry out one's desires except in a society which has made full use (instead of abuse, of course) of applied science. In other words, I believe that while revolutionary anarchists may knock down all the barriers (and a very necessary process this is), it is only by co-operating with the scientist that it will be possible to remould the world "nearer to the heart's desire". The lady who "accepted the Universe", and was told by Carlyle, "By God, Madam, you'd better!" died a long time ago, and I

cannot see that we need to be like her. Man, the only animal, so far, who can contemplate Nature at all, surely cannot accept it if he wishes to be free. To accept the "natural urges" *in toto*, because no other human being imposed them on one, is no different from accepting man-made laws—unless we believe that some mystical power called Nature, is wiser and greater than Man.

It isn't any longer safe to let Time and accidents alter our basic character as they altered the basic characters of animals in the past. We cannot get freedom unless we take on the responsibility of saving ourselves. As Alex Comfort pointed out in his recent broadcasts, no-one else will save us. Certainly not Nature. It was a novelist, Thomas Hardy, not a scientist, who said that Man's misery and his bondage comes from the fact that he has so many more potentialities than the limits of his environment will allow him to fulfil, and he *desires* to have even more.

Man wants a hell of a lot. He may start off thinking the simple life will satisfy him, but either he or his descendants will soon want to complicate it, and the thirst for knowledge is as acute as that for beer, and to frustrate it is as dangerous as any other sort of frustration. There is an obverse side to George Orwell's "1948". Instead of becoming one of the most dangerous tools of the State, science can be used by freedom-loving individuals to extend their freedom still further, so that finally man is released from slavery to the natural, as well as the man-made, law.

MARJORIE MITCHELL.

CHRISTIAN REBELS

THE CHRISTIAN ORIGINS OF SOCIAL REVOLT, by W. Dale Morris. Allen & Unwin. 12/6

TO those who have had any extensive contact with what passes for Christianity in the world to-day, the idea that it can ever have been connected with revolt seems at first sight plainly ridiculous. The organised religious bodies are, for the most part, enthusiastic supporters of reaction, and those individual Christians who stand outside the various churches usually find, or at least seek, some purely personal fulfilment which rarely brings them into the revolutionary or even the radical stream of activity.

But this was not always so, and, as Mr. Morris shows in his new book on *The Christian Origins of Social Revolt*, there was an intimate connection which lasted, in England at least, up to the beginning of the nineteenth century, between the more extreme of the heretical and dissenting sects of Christians and the movements of social unrest which were in progress at the time.

I do not think this need necessarily be taken to mean that there is any intrinsically revolutionary element in Christianity. The New Testament contains some phrases which can become highly explosive if they are used in the right way, but reactionaries can usually pull out a tag of the opposite kind to cap that used by the radicals, and the old contention that Christ was a revolutionary only holds water if his reputed sayings are read in a very special way.

The reason why the great movements of social revolt in the middle ages and the 17th century assumed a Christian symbolism is to be found, I think, merely in the fact that the thought of the age was still predominantly Christian and men thought in religious terms. The Bible remained the basic philosophical authority right down to the enlightenment for all except a tiny minority of intellectual sceptics, who were usually very discreet

about their doubts, and it was the natural place, for those who sought justification for their rebellion, to find intellectual support.

The result, as Mr. Morris shows, was a series of revolts, lasting over ten centuries, whose record cannot be read without admiration. The author takes us from the early heretics of the Middle Ages, the Albigenians, the Cathari, the Waldenses and their fellows, down to the last big fling of Christian radicalism in Western Europe, in the shape of the Christian Socialist movement, with its attempt to revive co-operative production on a wide scale in England. There are important chapters on the peasant revolts, the Hussites, the Anabaptists, the Levellers and the Diggers, and the information contained therein is of absorbing interest. Particularly so is the extent to which the author shows that almost all the heretical movements of the Middle Ages and the seventeenth century had left-wings who advocated communism and social equality, and some of the fulminations of the early religious agitators have a strongly libertarian ring in their denunciation of rulers and their practices. John Ball, the itinerant preacher who seems to have been the chief theoretician of the fourteenth century peasant revolts, declared: "Things cannot go well in England, nor ever will, until all goods are held in common, and until there will be neither serfs nor gentlemen, and we shall all be equal." The Taborites, the extreme wing of the Bohemian Hussites, also preached communism of goods, declared the possession of property a sin, and said that "there should be no kings, no masters, no subjects on earth."

Mr. Morris's book suffers from the fact that the information he gives is ill-digested, the author being content to make long quotations from other authorities instead of using his own powers of description and analysis, and there are some important omissions. For instance, he pays no attention at all to the widespread dissenting movement in Russia, where, before the rise of the revolutionary movement in the mid-nineteenth century,

Book Reviews

the heretical sects led peasant resistance to the Tsar. The Doukhobors, in particular, carried on a fine anti-militarist struggle, while their free communist practices aroused the admiration of Tolstoy and also helped to make Kropotkin an anarchist communist, as he tells us in his *Memoirs*. There is also no reference to a number of Christian rebels in our own time, such as Gill and Schweitzer, whose contribution to rebellious thought cannot be ignored.

These criticisms should not, however, be taken as intended to minimise the interest or value of this book to all who are concerned with the history of social revolt.

GEORGE WOODCOCK.

Films

PRIVATE ANGELO. Director: Peter Ustinov. General release.

THIS is a very funny British film made in Italy, with Peter Ustinov as an Italian who is allergic to fighting, and Godfrey Tearle as the Count Piccologrando who begins the film as a cavalry general and ends as a salesman of American sewing machines. The Italian, the German, the American and the British army "types" are mildly guyed, and the dialogue of Angelo and the Count is full of a quite unequivocal anti-militarism, but Angelo, of course, has to end as an unexpected hero to satisfy the conventions of the cinema. The dedication to all conscripts at the beginning should not be missed, while future Schweik* should pick up a few hints and tips.

W.

THE FOUNTAINHEAD. Director: King Vidor. Now showing in London.

IN connection with the discussion of Communist and individualist anarchism in *Freedom* (23/7/49), a recent American film, "The Fountainhead", has a very special bearing on the concept of the latter type of anarchism that "a man has the sole and exclusive right to the product of his own labour". In addition to its melodramatics, the film proposes the interesting and provocative question: Does a radical architect who agrees to supply a design for a slum-clearance project on functional principles on the strict understanding that if accepted it must not be altered in any way in construction have the right to destroy the nearly completed project because the conditions are not fulfilled? In his court defence the architect has some interesting things to say about the broader relation of individualism to progress and reaction. The story is based on the life and ideas of Frank Lloyd Wright.

JACK DIETHER.

* See *The Good Soldier Schweik*, by Jaroslav Hasek.

BLACK MAN'S BURDEN

BLACK ODYSSEY by Roi Otley John Murray, London. 18/-

BEFORE I opened *Black Odyssey*, I thought that it was going to be one of those autobiographical books by coloured people which are of great value to those of us who happen to have been born with white skins because they make us understand more clearly the special disadvantages of having been born with a dark one. *Black Odyssey*, however, is not the story of an individual, but of a race, the story of the Negro in America; and it is such a tragic and terrible story that it is remarkable how dispassionately it is written. Roi Otley says in his introduction that his book is not so much history as reporting, and I think that this is a just, though modest, estimate of it. It is a collection of revealing facts and stories, rather than a considered historical work, but within its limits it is extremely informing.

I found the account of the Negroes in Colonial America particularly interesting. Those were the days when you could find in a newspaper an advertisement offering for sale:

"Englishmen, Cheshire cheese, Negro men, a Negro girl and a few Welshmen."

They were in fact the days of the indentured servant and the bond slave, and the Negro was only one among many unfortunes in the new worlds. But in the future pattern of Negro slavery soon emerged. And with it appeared that strange duality of American thought that has puzzled so many foreigners; a duality that is present even in some of the best Americans. Patrick Henry who cried: "Give me Liberty or give me death!" also said when apologising for the anomaly of his being a slave owner: "I am drawn along by the general inconvenience of living without them; I will not, I cannot justify it." Jefferson is the most extreme and tragic case of this duality; as someone has said: "He dreamed of Liberty in the arms of a slave."

It seems clear that there was comparatively little 'colour feeling' as we know it now, in Colonial America. Marriages between white and coloured people were quite common and many white women married or lived with Negro men, without rousing any opposition. Negroes fought in the American Revolution and a feeling of hope ran through the Negro community. They thought that the declaration of freedom and equality of all men really meant what its words implied. It was Mark Twain who wrote, after he had seen some American State-House or Court-House, with the words "All Men are created free and equal" inscribed on it in large letters that they should write underneath that inscription in very small lettering "Except the Negro race."

Little good came to the Negroes out of the American Revolution, except the passage of a bill forbidding the bringing of more slaves into America under heavy penalties. This was a measure that the American Colonists had tried in vain to secure: too many Englishmen were financially interested in the continuance of the slave trade. The prosperity of Bristol and Liverpool—the great slave trading centres, was largely based upon it. This is an aspect of slavery which English people generally manage to forget.

Mr. Otley is extremely good on the period of the Abolitionists, and also on the Underground Railroad, the secret organisation which assisted slaves to escape to the North, passing them on from one sympathiser to another. Some of the workers in this dangerous task were themselves escaped slaves who took the desperate risk of going back to help others.

It is interesting to know that the early Abolitionists were denounced as Anarchists because they followed their great leader, William Lloyd Garrison, in adopting the 'non-voting principle'. And it is a pity that we are not told more about their views. This period did not last long, however. Frederick Douglass, the remarkable Negro Abolitionist, was a disciple of Garrison's and was against using the ballot as a weapon. But Negroes alarmed by the activity of the pro-slavery politicians in the North, opposed him. Douglass finally united the dissident Negro groups by breaking with Garrison on this point; and in the end the Negro became affiliated to the Republican Party.

The Civil War and Emancipation aroused even more ardent feelings of hope and expectation than the Revolution had done. But though freedom secured the Negroes against the horrors of slavery, the early promise was not maintained. Gradually the coloured people were disenfranchised again, Jim Crow laws were passed, lynchings grew common. The turn of the century, however, marked a definite turn for the better in the course of Negro affairs. There had been a great migration of coloured people to the North and they had had more opportunities there. The result was the emergence of a great many extremely talented Negroes in the fields of sport, music, the theatre, and finally literature and science. And the appearance of these gifted people had a real effect on the attitude of white people towards the whole race.

To-day, difficult as the position of the Negro still is in America, it has certainly improved. In the North, Negroes are employed in innumerable trades and professions where they were practically outlawed a few years ago. Again, there is hope in the air. Negro leaders are relying principally, however, on the pressure of public opinion outside the United States to improve things within. For even Imperialist nations are affected by the ill-treatment of Negroes in the South since it offends all races of a darker colour than those which have been ironically called "the yellowish-pinkish races". As Mr. Otley says, it seems apparent to the Negro that "the United States must attempt to square its high-minded slogans of Democracy with the fact of the Negro citizen's position in America"—or give up any pretence of moral leadership of the world.

Can such a tragic story have a happy ending? That remains to be seen. Recently, when two Negroes were excluded from a public golf course at Martha's Vineyard in Massachusetts, the editor of the small country newspaper published there wrote an editorial denouncing racial discrimination which has been widely quoted in papers all over the United States. It ended: "The real test to-day is the ability and desire of all of us to meet Americans as Americans and men as men."

GAMEL WOOLSEY.

... from our stock ...

CHRISTIAN ORIGINS OF SOCIAL REVOLT.

W. D. Morris 12/6

BLACK ODYSSEY. Roi Otley 15/-

DOWN AND OUT IN PARIS AND LONDON.

George Orwell 8/6

Penguin Island Anatole France 2/6
The Cage Billany & Dowrie 9/6
Colossus of Maroussi Henry Miller 8/6
William Cobbett W. B. Pemberton 1/6
Story of San Michele Axel Munthe 9/6
Promise and Fulfilment (Palestine 1917-1949) Arthur Koestler 12/6

The World's Masters (New Series) Ingres, Hogarth, William Blake Vermeer, Holbein, and Botticelli each 3/-

Ready September 23rd: The Meaning of Art (Penguin) Herbert Read 2/6

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

27 RED LION STREET LONDON - W.C.1

THE MUGWUMPS OF EASTERN EUROPE

TO say that America and Russia may go to war with one another, is to wilfully disregard a present fact. These two empires have been at war for the past few years, the battle areas ranging from the Far East to Europe: it is true that the main loss of life and wealth has been on the part of Chinese, Malaysians, Greeks, etc., but one of the privileges of being an imperial people is to have other nations suffer carnage in one's interest. The imperial States provide the propaganda, the directives, the technical experts and the war material, and the stooge satellites provide the cannon-fodder and the battlegrounds.

What is generally meant by the "coming of a third World War", is the shift of the theatre of war to our doorsteps—and then civilisation may perish, as civilisation lies behind our own front doors, of course! What is of vital interest to every student of our times therefore, is the possible outbreak of peace in the European theatre between uncles Joe and Sam. This threatened outbreak of peace looms more closely as the inevitable troubles develop in the mugwump states of Eastern Europe. For Joseph I of Russia has simply repeated on a larger scale the error whereby the various Peters, Alexanders and Nicholases of Russia burnt their fingers from time to time. The Russian empire is again seeking to engulf countries which, technically, culturally and politically are a century or so in advance of Russia. Even such little countries as Finland, Estonia and Latvia have at different times in history thrown off the yoke of the backward Russian Empire; and now Russia is seeking to digest such territories as Czechoslovakia, Eastern Germany, Poland and a slab of the Balkans which, though backward by Western standards, is far in advance of Russia.

Such a condition has its historic parallels: backward and even barbarian despotisms have sometimes over-run the more advanced areas of the world, but no stable empire has ever been established on such a basis. The peoples who were more advanced technically and culturally have always rid themselves of the dominance of a backward power.

Russian Progress

For many years we have been inundated by propaganda to the effect that Russia is the last word in progress. During the 1920's and 1930's any intellectual who wished to show himself a real 'progressive' had the easy means of retailing the propaganda which Russia churned out—predigested pabulum proving that Russia was the most progressive country in every sphere, and hence that her foreign adherents were the most progressive people in every sphere. Now the gilt has worn off the gingerbread and the Communists and fellow travellers instead of basking in the glow of the great illusion, are harassed people continually trying to justify and explain away the facts about Russia. The man in the street has many illusions, but one cannot live in this country at the present time without gaining some real conceptions about other parts of the world in spite of all the lies of the various propaganda

of the Red Army. Second, the Red Army is a clumsy and inefficient force when operating on a narrow front (as in Finland) and Tito might well inflict a huge blow to Russian prestige by severely mauling the Red Army by guerilla fighting in the mountains of Yugoslavia.

Reading the Stars

Now I am expected to tell you the future, how the Red Star in the seventh house of Mars, puts Germanica in the Libra with the Stars and Stripes. I ought to deduce moreover that the Russo-Yankee war in Greece will spread to include all the Eastern Mugwumps with their oil, wheat, heavy industries and mineral deposits, and that we ought to dig ourselves a very deep hole in the back yard.

But prophesy is a chancy thing. The plain fact is that in these days of intensive dissemination of "news" by press, radio and cinema newsreel, we are kept in appalling ignorance of the real issues and real facts behind the manoeuvres of the statesmen who claim to speak in our name. The future does not yet exist, the present is an appalling muddle, but in the past which we have experienced we can see a little cause and effect and try and sift the truth from the spate of lies and irrelevancies which the high-powered propaganda machines pour on us daily. And when we consider the line of powerfully placed mugwumps along the East of Europe, such a thing as a straight war between Russia and America seems too simple an outcome of the vast complexity of international tensions. The Kremlin gang, so accustomed to being cock over their own big dunghill, have plainly overreached themselves Westwards, and the capitalists of America are also in danger of burning their fingers in Europe.

Such is the fickleness of history (which never seems to follow the prognostications of the wise) that our home-grown Stalinists may soon be denouncing the Trotskyite-fascist Czechs for refusing to buy the nice dried egg that democratic America offers them. To-day, the Communist Party is seeking alliance with the anti-militarist and pacifist forces of this country, as Oswald Mosley did in 1939, but there is no point in anarchists soft-peddling the truth we have always proclaimed—that the Communists are the blind servants of a State as inhuman and wedded to war as any other State, and that any co-operation with them is to court betrayal. An unexpected twist in the haggling of Foreign Ministers, a reshuffle of the international line-up, and the *Daily Worker* may be yelling for a patriotic war to-morrow.

The international scene is chaos—as it always has been in our time. The organs of propaganda delight to make our flesh creep to intimidated us into supporting one or another centre of power, a State machine. But we were not intimidated into taking sides in the late war against Germany, nor shall we take sides in any future conflict of States. No-one can prophesy the future with any accuracy, but the experience of our times has shown the anarchist analysis of the situation to have been unfailingly correct.

IN A NUTSHELL The German Tragedy 1919—1949

[The document below seems very useful as a concise summary of the historical background to the latest events in Germany.]

1. The attempt of a spontaneous social mass rising 1918/19 was wrecked and a period of skulking reaction was opened. Hunger and unemployment finally led to the seizure of power by the National-Socialists.

2. The dictatorship of the NSDAP (National Socialist German Workers' Party—Nazis) was marked by:

(a) Immediate removal of hunger caused by the world economic crisis and mass unemployment; the incorporation of the workless into the production system; the raising of the standard of living in the period 1933-39.

(b) Systematic physical extermination of all political opponents.

This double game of National-Socialism assured on the one hand the support or at least neutrality of the broad masses, also of the youth, and on the other hand hindered the development of a strong underground movement.

3. The war opened, especially since 1942/3, the period of military and moral defeat of Nazism as well as the growing material lowering of standards amongst widening circles. The final result was the complete break-down of mass sympathy for Nazism in the German people.

The attempt at a palace revolution on 20th July, 1944, was broken and

1. The seizure of power by the NSDAP in 1933 was furthered by:

(a) The broad masses in Germany who through misery, Nazi propaganda, and the treachery of the working-class parties were driven to desperation.

(b) International, especially American, capital, which was interested in the Hitler dictatorship as a bulwark against its French and Russian rivals.

2. Denial of these facts regarding the 1933-1939 period by anti-fascist propaganda is useless and prevents an understanding of the true cause of Nazi success, the NSDAP reigning not only by terror but also by its economic and psychological success which enables it to obtain the consent of the German masses to its seizure and holding of power. It is a question of a new form of counter-revolution, with the Bolshevik Revolution for a model.

An underground movement in Germany has existed; to deny it would be as false as to exaggerate its true deeds and expansion subsequently.

with it the possibility of an anti-fascist and even social revolution arose, whose buds were trampled underfoot by the victorious powers, East and West, in conjunction with the Gestapo.

4. In spite of this conspiracy of the Allied, Russian and German governments, and in spite of the bomb terror which was clearly directed against the working people, the German people as a whole hoped for liberation and bread from the democratic and Russian invading armies in 1945. Instead they received newer and possibly grimmer slavery and sheer hunger.

5. From 1945 to 1949 the disillusion and fury of the German people against the democratic and Russian victors grew. A Super-Versailles, new unemployment, mass hunger, the misery of refugees, and the dismantling of works essential to life, caused a similar but worse situation to that in 1918/33.

6. This development caused on the one hand:

(a) A natural increase in German nationalism, independent of party-political colouring;

(b) Nostalgic memories of the period 1933-39 which for the majority of people meant secure work and livelihood (one soon forgets the bad and prefers to remember the good);

On the other hand to the creation of a strong majority which sought new, libertarian and internationalist ways.

7. The new nationalist development has been furthered by the victorious and occupation powers not only indirectly by their brutal suppression and exploitation, but also directly by favouring Nazi officials, officers and politicians in the new State apparatus. The new German reaction has the political, financial and moral support of the authoritarian powers of the whole world.

Unfortunately, the slowly-growing libertarian and anti-authoritarian forces in Germany have not been supported in the same way by their comrades in other countries.

The situation is serious. We have not only a duty to fulfil international solidarity, but a historical task. To-morrow may again be too late.

MARTIN BUCHER.

CRY, THE BELOVED COUNTRY...

ONE of the most revolting aspects of racial discrimination is its application to children. The letter below from a reader of the *Manchester Guardian*, illustrate very clearly the barbarous nature of *Apartheid* in South Africa:

I have just returned from South Africa, a country of sunshine and beauty, where for Europeans there is the lowest tuberculosis rate in the world, and for non-Europeans the highest; where the white baby grows strong and vigorous and the black baby dies at the rate of one in every four in the first year of life.

Perhaps the greatest need of South Africa's 7,750,000 non-European peoples is food. The Government makes a grant towards a school meal: of sixpence for European children, fourpence for Coloured children—presumably because of that drop of white blood in their veins due to miscegenation—threepence for Indian children, and twopence for African children. However, this last miserable sum has now been abolished by Government edict, and the words of the annual report of the Department of Public Health for the Union are as true to-day as they were when written in 1934: "To attribute most of the deaths among natives to starvation may appear startling, yet there is no doubt that this is literally true."

It is some consolation to know that many of the children in European schools offered to forgo their grant of sixpence so that less fortunate African children should continue to benefit from their meagre twopences. The Government, however, refused to take advantage of this generous gesture.

In Britain children whose poverty does not approach that of the South African masses have their school meals provided free, for, in the words of the Declaration of Geneva, "The child must be protected beyond and above all considerations of race, nationality, or creed." This Declaration of the Rights of the Child has just been signed by Dr. D. F. Malan, the Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa. This is the same Dr. Malan who has just refused twopence towards meals for African children—because they are "African" children.

The same Dr. Malan has taken away from Indian children, because they are "Indian" children, though the total earnings of their parents may be under two pounds a week, the family allowances which are a recognition of Principle II in

the Geneva Convention: "The child must be given the means requisite for its normal development, materially and spiritually."

These native children of South Africa are starving and diseased. But their fate is to be pawns in a political game.

★
Again from this benighted land comes a *Worldover Press* report on the appalling prevalence of blindness among South African natives which has been brought to light by recent studies. In official figures, one out of every 84 non-white persons in the Union of South Africa is blind. But the reliable Race Relations News points out that private medical surveys show blindness to be far more common than these statistics imply.

Chief cause of the blindness is believed to be malnutrition. In some areas of the Transvaal, there are whole colonies of blind people "living aimlessly and guided by others with partial sight". In one region of the Northern Transvaal, 804 out of 1,249 people were afflicted with some form of eye disease.

★
To complete the picture, the Rev. Michael Scott, who works among the natives of Johannesburg's slums and shanties, told the unofficial "Commission of Inquiry into Forced Labour" that:

"Slavery is in some respect preferable to the present growing system of 'compound labour' on South African farms.

"The system has led to abuses which can only be compared to the early days of the Industrial Revolution when labour was not protected by unions and was only one stage removed from slavery—if it was not actually in a worse condition than under the slave system.

"The labourer is very often exploited in a most ruthless manner for the six months or more of his contract so that his health is permanently impaired.

"Meanwhile, his wife and children must provide for themselves as best they can until their man returns—if he does return.

"The overall picture of South African life to-day is of a rapidly accelerating break-up of tribal life and social organisation through overpopulation, over-stocking and erosion of native reserves, a spread of shanty towns and a corresponding deterioration in the moral and physical condition of the people."

THROUGH THE PRESS

WORLD VILLAGE AGAIN

We don't want to fight any more. And if a whole village says that, what are the authorities going to do? Shoot the lot of us? Put us all in jail? I don't really see how they can.

—Gaston Méric, Mayor of the "World Village" of Trouillas in
Leader Magazine, 3/9/49

UNBRIBED

As election day drew near I got into the habit of walking slowly and suggestively past the committee rooms of various parties in my district in the hope that one of them would furtively slip me a bottle of rye or a \$10 bill. But it was all to no avail. When election day approached I had to make up my own mind as usual without help from anyone.

—Letter in
Montreal Standard, 11/6/49

Well, why should anybody bribe people to vote, when they're silly enough to do it unbribed?

FACTS ARE SACRED

Police shot five villagers, including a woman, in a clash yesterday with "violent Communist aboriginals", armed with bows and arrows at a village 100 miles from Calcutta.

News Chronicle, 20/8/49.

Are there any limits to the extent to which the cold-war propagandists will go?

IN CHINA TO-DAY

More than half the Chinese population had either never heard, or just barely heard, of Chiang Kai-shek and his government or of Mao Tse-tung, the Communist leader, and his party. They would have been hard put to it to show a preference for either one.

Illustrated, 10/8/49.

FACTORY OCCUPATION IN ITALY

Late in 1948, when the management of the Breda works "went on strike" over the question of dismissals, for 45 days the workers carried on without them rather than leave the works. Production during this period remained at much the previous level. Running short of materials, these workers collected about six million lire (nearly £3,000) among themselves for the purchase of ferro-manganese and other raw materials. Workers at Isotta-Fraschina (closed down in July) copied this example by giving up three days' pay as a contribution to the purchase of raw materials. Workers at the Barghetti steel-works at Trezzo d'Adda lately refused to take back-pay which was owing to them if this should mean—as the owner proposed—the sale of raw material stocks. Remarkably few employees are said to have accepted the offer, made currently at Breda's of 1,200 hours' pay for any man who should spontaneously sack himself—and help the employers, that is, "to get rid of surplus labour". Most recently, the owners of Alfa-Romeo last week declared a lock-out for 20 days, since "the abusive re-entry of dismissed workers has put the management in an impossible position—has forced them, that is, to keep the wheels turning.

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/-
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
ORGANISED VENGEANCE	
CALLED JUSTICE	2d.

★
FREEDOM PRESS

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

THE PERENNIAL QUESTION

WILL ANARCHISM WORK?

ONE of the most frequently-raised objections to anarchism is the suggestion that an anarchist society could not successfully manage production and distribution. Here is the anarchist answer to the question: "How does anarchism propose to maintain a unified economic organisation?"

SUCH a question usually has in mind the complexity of capitalist economic organisation. It is necessary to consider that much this complexity derives from the difficulties encountered by competitive capitalist groupings in an economy based on a varying and increasingly hazardous market. The special difficulties of capitalist organisation need not be carried over into a society based on production for use and for need, instead of for ever-contracting markets. One must begin from the basic concepts of anarchism and consider the economic problem in anarchist terms: that is to say, one has to organise economy in such a way that the needs of all are satisfied. Such a re-statement of the problem immediately simplifies the whole issue since the needs of men in the shape of food, shelter and clothing, are comparatively simple compared to "needs" as visualised by capitalist society in which if a man is going to produce a commodity, he must first be assured that there is a demand for it, so that he can sell it, and so realise a profit on it. This means to say that if no such demand spontaneously exists, it must be created. Hence the vast superfluous structure of advertising. Hence the fact that, under capitalism, the majority of workers do no productive work at all, their basic needs being fulfilled by a small proportion of productive workers. The war illustrated this very well, since, about a million workers were civil servants, and a vast number more were either in the services or in munition work. From the standpoint of human needs none of this vast group of people did productive work, and they were wholly dependent on the small proportion of food producers, builders, and clothing workers. The integration of this work demands that one knows how much is needed of various commodities or services, and what resources are available for satisfying those needs. In a society in which everyone has free access to the means of life, everyone is dependent on everyone else. Thus a doctor is dependent on others for his food supplies, housing, clothes, transport, etc., while a food producer is dependent on the same people and also on the doctor for combating illness or accident. The problems therefore are problems of mutual welfare. No-one could hamper the work

of others without in the long run injuring himself. This means that right from the start there will be every incentive to see that problems are solved. Consequently, if a steel plant needs coal, it must make those needs known to the coal miners. The whole question is: Will those needs be recognised and met, without recourse to coercion and centralised authority? Most socialists, who are convinced that they are cleverer than everyone else (and that workers are so stupid and inherently immoral that they will inevitably make a mess of things even though their own interests are immediately damaged as well), naturally plump for centralised government—with themselves (the most intelligent, the "vanguard", etc.) in the positions of power. Such is the method tried in Russia. It has produced more artificial famines (1918, 1921, 1932) in a country which used in Tsarist times to export food, than any other country has ever seen. Anarchists are entitled right away to point out as powerful negative support to their theories, the failure of the authoritarian centralisers.

Syndicalism provides for the problem of integrating knowledge of needs with ability to satisfy them, by linking up the syndicates relating to each particular industry, first in local federations of industry and also in National (one envisages also International) Confederations of Labour. Clearly, many needs can be satisfied by merely local or regional discussion. (In this connexion, Mumford, in *The Culture of Cities* has shown that the extreme localisation of certain industries round the coalfields, for example—is a tendency of capitalist society that is already giving way to a degree of decentralisation, made possible by a variety of factors such as electric power, improved road communications, etc.) Parish councils, local communes, the *Mir*, and such-like institutions have demonstrated the vitality of local methods of administering the local needs of a district. Special needs over and above the abilities of local areas to satisfy, demand a linking up with remoter industries. Such a linking up is supplied by the National (or International) Confederations of Labour. It is necessary to remember that the problems which these organisations exist to serve are simply ones of pooling information, of the integration of needs. Hence they do not require to possess any authority in the sense of means to enforce their decisions. Organisation is certainly necessary, but that is not to say (as it is too often assumed) that organisation implies

authority and government.

Living in capitalist society, in which the naturally sociable qualities of men are obscured and throttled by a system based on competitive economy on the one hand and desperate poverty on the other, it is easy to regard human nature in a cynical light and say that the features of capitalist society are also the features of human nature itself. That even after the need for competition has been abolished, man will still lust for domination, powers and so on, and so sociable living will remain a Utopian ideal and simply a dream. If one holds such a view, human life must seem ineffably dreary. On the grounds merely of the dreariness of such an outlook, one ought to reject this view, and embrace a more optimistic one as necessary if life is to be tolerable at all. Fortunately, such a negative position is not necessary since anarchism can bring a tremendous body of evidence in favour of its conception of the essential goodness and sociability of men. Kropotkin in *Mutual Aid* showed the scientific and historical justification for anarchist "optimism". But since his time, just as Russia has demonstrated the ghastly failure of bureaucratic centralism, Spain showed, during the brief months before the revolution was undermined from within by the counter revolution, that anarchist ideas can more than stand the test of practical application. Peasants not only collectivised the land but sent agricultural products to the cities without stipulating that they should be "paid for" in industrial products. Meanwhile, workers not only ran industries more efficiently than the capitalists had done, but actually created the war industries of Catalonia. In addition, they sent modern machinery to the peasant collectives. Productive forces were immediately released, so that all basic activities showed increased production (Leval states that wheat yields in Aragon increased by 39 per cent. in the first year—cf. the famines of the *War Communism* period in Russia—while farm stock increased due to efficient methods of selection, by 300 per cent. Meanwhile, transport became more efficient, and industries needed for the war were created. See *Collectivisation in Spain*, by Gaston Leval, Freedom Press 1d.). With the setting up of a "Strong Government" under Negrin to "organise" production, all this gradually collapsed, so that by the winter of 1938-9 the Spanish workers were starving, and nearly defenceless.

But the point one wishes to stress is that the organisation and integration of all this was carried out through committees perfectly satisfactorily even by "illiterate" peasants and workers. Such people know their job and so are quite capable of organising it in the way they want, i.e., to subserve the needs of society.

READERS WRITE...

HOW TO WIN FRIENDS & INFLUENCE PEOPLE

I ARRIVED in Britain with a few friends of mine about six weeks ago, on a yacht, for a tour of Britain. We tied up at London one Sunday afternoon, then after the formalities had been taken care of, we had a meal and went for a stroll. We entered Hyde Park and were amazed, and rather interested, in the soap-box orators. You see I am in my thirties, there are seven of us, between 25 or 30, ordinary human beings, wanting to know what happens around us. We bought plenty of literature, socialist, communist, S.P.G.B., etc., and our last periodicals were four *Freedom*s, which we are delighted to have.

When we listened to all the propagandists in Hyde Park, you were the last we came to and, believe me, comrades, according to me and my mates you were worth listening to. In that 25 minutes we decided to find out what this Anarchy was all about, so after supper we read your July 23rd issue where there was an article about dockers, and, being dockers, we were interested in your attitude.

The following week we tied up at Glasgow, and that is where I really enjoyed your speakers. I admire the courage of Eddie Shaw, Johnnie Gaffney and Frank Leach. Eddie is most enlightened in explaining the facts, and has plenty of humour although I guess he is serious. I have listened to your Glasgow comrades expounding anarchy and I have grasped what it is all about, because it is based on human nature and I, like you, want freedom from the police, politicians, etc. I know it is a hard struggle, but I agree we should keep fighting.

VAN DER ROOKEEN.

Schierdam, Holland.

★
REVOLUTION

Years of struggle between authoritarian ideas and libertarian principles will mark the years following upon capitalism's final eclipse as the basic economic form. This will not at all follow the clear-cut "heroic" line à la Bakounine but is likely to be piecemeal resistance to state encroachments by the strongly organised industrial workpeople. "Libertarianism" will be identified with measure of real workers' control gained and held in the many struggles contributing to the fall of private and nationalised industry. The evolution of society from a lower social form will be "dialectic" in character—people will accept the new principles which, in struggle contradict the old. Hostility to the rigour of formal Marxism should not exclude a "neo-Hegelian" outlook—something to which Stirner, Proudhon and Bakounine owe a very real debt.

Having in mind, not organising for an ephemeral *coup-d'état*, but a permanent

role as innovators of the new, it behoves us to re-organise ourselves and re-orient our philosophy. Stirner first spoke of "permanent insurrection" and that is plainly the historic rôle of anarchism. Liverpool. D. E. PUBE.

THAT BOMB STORY

KITTY LAMB, speaking from the anarchist platform in Hyde Park on September 4th, told the following story, which is worth recording:

"I recall an Anarchist meeting in a London suburb a few years ago, held to protest against the war. At the end of the meeting, the usual policeman came up and looking suspiciously at the speaker, said: 'Anarchists? Aren't you the people who make bombs?' 'Oh, no,' he replied, 'that's the capitalists.' 'Oh, I beg your pardon, sir,' said the policeman, 'I thought it was the anarchists.' And off he walked, perfectly satisfied."

The British Association

Scientists on Current Problems

(Continued from page 1)

Actually, such gatherings give very little indication that such matters have been pondered by the speakers. It is a fallacious view of what is practical for scientists to concern themselves minutely in dealing with a given problem within the context of a society which disregards and frustrates the scientific approach. Some contributors at Newcastle took such practical aspects with fantastic seriousness, as in the discussion on the possibility of a "glut" of coal resulting from the necessary rationalisations and increased mechanisation envisaged by the National Coal Board. Such a "glut" is to be expected not because the new methods will provide such enormously increased output, but because the existing output (190 million tons annually) is not so very far short of the amount required (estimated at 205 million tons) to saturate the home and overseas market. Not so very far short of the 250 million tons which the NCB expects to produce in a few years. If this comparatively slight increase is obtained by methods of rationalisation it will obviously be accompanied by unemployment. Now it is valuable to know this, but one feels that such a demonstration so clearly exposes the limitations of our society, that one would have expected a statement to that effect and some speculation on how a more rational solution could be achieved.

Scientists are beginning to show some signs of social consciousness. But the practical possibilities of science will only begin to be realised when such a social consciousness is the rule rather than the exception.

J.H.

Special Appeal

Aug. 27th to Sept. 10th:

Glasgow: A. McD. 4/-; Anon. 2/6; London: R.R. 3/9; Northolt Park: K.N. 1/6; New Jersey: per O.M. £17; [New York: J.G. \$2; Brooklyn: P.N. \$1; Chicago: Group \$10; Providence, R.I.: Circolo Libertario \$15; San Francisco: Group \$40; Cambridge: C.L.D.* 5/-; London: E.D. 10/-; London: F.E.D.* 5/-; London: I.A.* 2/-; Glasgow: J.W. 6/6; London: L.G.W.* 5/-; London: T. & E.E.* 5/-; Gosport: F.G.* 5/-; London: C.W.* 5/-.

Total	£20 0 3
Previously acknowledged	£223 8 11
1949 TOTAL TO DATE	£243 9 2

*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
AnnouncementsUNION OF ANARCHIST GROUPS:
CENTRAL LONDON

OPEN AIR meetings are held in Hyde Park every Sunday.

Speakers, support for the platform and literature sellers will be equally welcome.

INDOOR Lecture-Discussions will begin weekly on Sundays at 7.30 p.m. at the Trade Union Club, Great Newport St., W.C.2 (near Leicester Square Station). PLEASE NOTE the CHANGE OF ADDRESS

OCTOBER 2nd Albert Meltzer
"Revolution in Mexico"

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

Outdoor Meetings
MAXWELL STREET,
every Sunday at 7 p.m.,
Frank Leach, John Gaffney, Eddie Shaw.

MERSEYSIDE ANARCHIST GROUP

OPEN AIR meetings on Lewis Blitz Site
Sunday evenings at 7.30 p.m.
All comrades welcome.
Enquiries: Ring Royal 4669

GODWIN SOCIETY

A Godwin Society is being formed. Its objects are:

1. To encourage the study of William Godwin's social and philosophical writings.
2. To investigate ways and means by which Godwin's social principles can be related to the problems of contemporary life.
3. To publicise by press and platform the results of these enquiries.

Will readers interested write for further information to:

ALAN SMITH,
12 Shawville Gardens, Ilford, Essex.

WILL ANY READER, wanting to correspond with a French anarchist student, write to Freedom Press?

PIONEERS OF FREEDOM IN EDUCATION—I
JEAN JACQUES ROUSSEAU (1712-1778)1. Jean Jacques Rousseau
(1712-1778)

"MAN is born free; yet everywhere we see him in chains." Everyone is familiar with this saying of Rousseau's but not everyone appreciates its significance. Rousseau based his theories on the doctrine of original goodness, a startling doctrine at the time because it was the complete reversal of all former educational principles. His chief work on education, *Emile*, which has been variously described as "the Child's Charter" and "one of the seminal books of the world's literature", inaugurated a completely new era in education.

The opening sentence of *Emile* reads: "Everything is good as it comes from the hands of nature but everything degenerates in the hands of man." Education then, Rousseau decides, according to nature; and his ideal is the natural man, the noble savage. Such a man could obviously only grow up in freedom. "Freedom, not power, is the greatest good. That man is truly free who desires what he is able to perform and does what he desires. This is my fundamental maxim. Apply it to childhood and all the rules of education spring from it."

Discipline of Natural
Consequences

In his book, Rousseau applies it to childhood in considerable detail and goes on from childhood beyond adolescence to maturity. He divides the development of the child into three periods; the first of which is of chief concern to anarchists, that from birth to twelve years of age. He describes how the boy *Emile* will be taken from his family to be brought up in the country. He will be brought up the hard way, to go barefoot, not to be allowed a light in the dark and as far as possible to live a completely natural life.

The only discipline approved by Rousseau is the discipline of natural consequences.

sequences. Children should never receive punishment as such; it should always come as the natural consequence of their faults. There is to be no moralising either, not even by means of fables. The only maxim he would give his pupil is: never hurt anyone.

Rousseau's chief contribution to educational theory for this phase of education is the important negative aspect. Nothing is to be taught up to the age of twelve. Exercise the child's body, his limbs, his senses, his strength, but keep his mind idle as long as you can. "You are afraid to see him spending his years doing nothing?" demands Rousseau. "What! Is it nothing to be happy, nothing to run and jump and climb all day? He will never be so busy again all his life long."

The Heuristic Method

The succeeding phase of education, covering the years twelve to fifteen, is the transition stage between childhood and adolescence. During this phase, the child will make up for the time apparently lost earlier. Even now, however, Rousseau does not believe in driving his pupil. The method advocated for this period is that which has come to be known as the heuristic method. Let the child know nothing because you have told him, but because he has learnt it for himself. You have not to teach him truths so much as to show him how to set about discovering them for himself.

As far as possible, too, the child should learn only what appears to him to be useful; and the general principle should be to learn by doing. At the age of fifteen *Emile* is to begin to learn a trade and it is interesting to note here that the trade which most completely satisfies Rousseau's conditions is that of a carpenter.

A Core of Authority

Finally, from fifteen to twenty, comes the training of adolescent. Rousseau believes that this stage—when education has

usually been completed, is really just the time to begin. There is a lot to be said for this point of view. The value, however, of the kind of education, suggested by Rousseau for this period, is highly questionable. For one thing, it is largely moral and religious.

But there is much in Rousseau that is questionable. One has the feeling all the time that the educator is always lurking in the background consciously influencing what the child absorbs and experiences; and one is left wondering whether the freedom, talked about so much, is in fact real or only apparent. Rousseau certainly believed, for example, in training through imitation and there are times when he seems to be advocating the use of deception in order to pretend equality between master and pupil while the master in fact wields the most complete authority.

The truth of the matter, as George Woodcock has pointed out, is that just as the political teachings of Rousseau and his group contained that germ of force which led to the Jacobin dictatorship, so their educational teachings had a core of authority which led to the perpetuation of the old ideas of deliberately moulding the pupil's mind. Rousseau's educational ideas were adopted by most of the revolutionary intellectuals and they were made even more rigid by the imposition of the Jacobin conception of the State as the moulder of public opinion, so that even some libertarians like Tom Paine advocated the establishment of systems of state education. The only important revolutionary to reject these ideas of authority in education, just as he rejected them in politics, was Godwin. He will form the subject of the next article.

TOM EARLEY.

[In connection with Rousseau's ideas on Natural Goodness, see the article Freedom from Nature in this issue, which expresses another point of view.]