

# Freedom

AN ANARCHIST WEEKLY

January 2nd, 1954

Threepence

We need many new readers in 1954. Will you help? Why not make a present of three months Subscription (4s. 6d.) to a friend?

## BERIA

of the legend of Stalin as the right-hand man, the most intimate champion, the most devoted and consistent comrade-in-arms, of great Lenin.

"Soon after Beria's fall his book was denounced by the Georgian Central Committee as 'anti-Marxist' and the cause of 'enormous damage', but no widespread attack on it has yet been made. If Stalin's successors wish to continue their efforts to discredit their old leader, they have here a weapon ready for use. They can let it be generally known that the legend of Stalin's special relationship to Lenin, on which so much has been founded, turns out to rest largely on the testimony of a 'traitor', executed for his crimes."

The above is a "comment" taken from the *Observer* (27/12/53) and provides interesting additional support to the suggestions put forward in *FREEDOM* regarding the present régime's desire to profit by, rather than be tarred with, the hatred of Stalin, which we are quite sure underlay all the official adulation.

### Economic Background to "Liberalizing" Concessions

In the same issue of the *Observer*, Edward Crankshaw points to the movement of loosening up and of the concessions of the Malenkov régime. "For several months now it has been clear that the uncertain

liberalizing policy which showed itself in fits and starts had its main cause in an economic crisis of considerable magnitude. Concessions had to be made to keep the economy from breaking down."

Despite all the free discussion and criticism in the press and the living up of women's fashions (to say nothing of the attack made by the Soviet Ambassador to Persia on Moscow's perfumes for men as being of inferior quality and not so good as formerly); not forgetting even the well publicized attack by the Soviet composer Khachatryan on the Zhdanov decrees of 1948 regulating Soviet music: despite all this the "liberalizing" cannot detach itself from the slave army which Beria's M.V.D. maintained in labour camps all over the Soviet interior and whose population has been estimated at 15 to 20 millions or even more. This labour force is an essential part of Soviet economy. Beria's death will hardly liberate these forgotten millions whose formidable death rate required a continual replenishment from the secret police.

Nor should the soft heads in the West forget these men when they eagerly embrace the liberalizing face of party leader Malenkov.

## Diminished Production in the West

THE crisis in Soviet economy mentioned elsewhere in this issue (see "Shades of Beria") is part of the periodical crisis which afflicts State capitalism in Russia and increasingly State controlled capitalism in the West. Russian propaganda confidently foresees—economic depression in America, but is careful to make no such admissions of their own economy.

Nevertheless, it is true that there are increasing indications of declining production in the West. The following is reported from Glasgow on 28/12/53:

"The problems that have confronted shipbuilding firms this year in the form of diminishing orders, severe foreign competition, and reluctance on the part of shipowners to order new tonnage are reflected in the output returns for Clyde shipyards in 1953.

"Output on the river has fallen by over 50,000 tons compared with 1952, but even more serious is the fact that new orders are down by about 500,000 tons.

"This does not mean an early slump in the industry, because most of the yards have orders on hand to keep them busy for three years. Contracts aggregating about 1,600,000 tons are being carried forward into 1954, but builders would naturally like to see orders keeping pace with output.

"CONTRACTS CANCELLED  
"Their most serious worry is the growing competition offered by foreign ship-

yards. The problem of British builders is their inability to quote fixed prices and to guarantee fixed delivery dates. Provided they receive adequate supplies of steel and that there are no serious labour troubles they can maintain present output in 1954, but the outlook is not reassuring.

"How new business is falling off is illustrated by the fact that in 1951 almost 1,200,000 tons of shipping were ordered from Clyde yards; that figure was halved last year, and in 1953 new orders represent only about 100,000 tons, or about a quarter of the year's output. Several contracts were cancelled during the year by shipping firms alarmed by rising costs and uncertainty about delivery.

"From the 23 principal yards on the Clyde 69 vessels aggregating 398,403 tons were launched in 1953. This compares with 79 ships of 450,378 tons in 1952 and with the Clyde's record year in 1913, when 377 vessels aggregating 766,490 tons were launched."

—(Times).

The same issue of the *Times* contains the following somewhat cautious despatch from New York:

NEW YORK, Dec. 27

"Business activity as a whole is still declining though not at any rapid rate, and certainly not fast enough to be alarming. The volume is still very large by any reasonable standard, and the readjustment going on throughout the economy remains as orderly as ever.

"In these last few weeks of the year total industrial production has been less than it was in the corresponding weeks of last year, but it has to be remembered that this season a year ago was one of unparalleled activity for it. So also it was for trade, but trade now, both wholesale and retail, is about as large in dollar volume as it was then.

"Many weeks ago it became evident that after years of record-breaking production the steel industry and the automobile industry had satisfied all the country's really urgent needs for their products, so it has hardly been surprising that lately both have felt a necessity at times for reducing their output. For the same reason, though less markedly, new starts of private housing have been declining and there are some other lines of industry wherein it has been found advisable because of slackened demand to reduce operations somewhat. Thus recently there has been some decline of television sets. Sales of these last in the 10 months of this year were greater than those of radio sets, but since then, both because of the excessively high production for what had seemed to be an almost insatiable demand and because of the prospective advent of colour tele-

Continued on p. 4

## The Ethics of the Boycott

FOLLOWING the one-day strike by engineering and ship-building workers on Dec. 2, many of the strikers have instituted boycotts against those of their workmates who went to work on that day.

These boycotts have taken the form of "sending to Coventry" the offending blacklegs and in most cases returning strikers decided to impose this ban on speech for a specified period. (See *FREEDOM* 12/12/53).

The capitalist press, of course, have denounced this as childish behaviour, and have praised those workers who showed no solidarity on the day of the strike as "independent" and "responsible individuals" who "think for themselves". Which really means in this case that they allowed the capitalist press to think for them.

For it is an interesting thing that when a worker acts against the interests of his own class, he is a "sturdy independent", but if he is at another time equally independent of the boss class, and acts against their interests, then we are told that he is a stooge for red agitators, a tool in a red plot, etc., etc.

It all depends, it seems, just which direction your independence takes as to whether you are a sturdy Briton thinking for yourself, or a mutton-headed dupe following a leader.

Precisely the same attitude, incidentally, is adopted by the Stalinists, for whom strikers in Britain and France are sturdy working-class militants, whilst those in East Germany are tools of Western agents.

### Union Orders

In the case of the blacklegs of Dec. 2, there was little enough independence about their actions, for most of them were members of those unions within the Confederation of Engineering and Shipbuilding Unions which opposed the strike, and they were consequently carrying out official instructions. Or they were simply afraid for the security of their job, or did not want to lose the day's pay, that the strike cost them. None of which are strong motives, but rather

"The phrase "Send to Coventry" originates from the time when the townsfolk of Coventry, in a protest against bad behaviour by troops of the local garrison, refused to speak or have any social contact with them. Ever since then, when any group have refused to speak to anybody, they have "sent him to Coventry."

motives which carry weight with weak, short-sighted or frightened people.

Ron Hewitt, for example, the Chesterfield crane driver we have previously mentioned, who has been "sent to Coventry" for six months by his 300 workmates, was a member of the General and Municipal Workers' Union, which sent out no strike call for Dec. 2. He told the press that he had just become a tenant of a council house, had payments to keep up on his new furniture, and had a wife and child to think of. He could not afford to miss a day's pay.

Now there must have been thousands among the 2 million strikers in similar personal and financial positions. But he is a craven and short-sighted worker who cannot forgo one day's pay in order to bring pressure to bear on his employer to increase his pay for every day thereafter.

Hewitt was not sturdily independent. He showed himself to be very dependent upon his employer, a typical "governor's man" who was sure that his "firm would look after him". He was happier crawling to the boss as a blackleg than standing together with his fellow workers against the exploiter who was refusing him an increase he very obviously needed.

### Tragedy

This particular case attracted attention in the press because it was the first. But there were plenty more, and their effectiveness is clear. The social pressure which the tactic carries is in fact so strong that one worker has committed suicide as a result.

Now this is a very terrible thing, but it does indicate that sturdy independence was not behind all the blacklegging, if any. For if a man believed he was right not to strike, and was prepared to face the inevitable criticism of his mates, he would not allow himself to be driven to suicide.

At the works of Electro Hydraulics Ltd., Warrington, Lancs. James Alcock was the only one who worked on the day of the strike. Not surprisingly, he wasn't treated very kindly afterwards, and when he put his head in a gas oven three weeks later he left a note saying that he could not face his workmates any longer and he was taking the only way out.

Giving evidence to the coroner, Al-

cock's widow said that he had several times come home crying since the strike, and on one occasion, she said, his glasses had been knocked off when a fellow-worker had thrown a dirty rag at him.

In view of this tragedy, and because of the unpleasant circumstances that led up to it, should we re-assess our attitude to the boycott? Should we discard it as barbaric and cruel, a coercive means for the majority to force its will upon a minority?

### Majority Rule?

It is of course amusing to see the moralising that comes forth when the boycott is used, by those who are quite happy to use other means of coercion. Those who accept the democratic idea of the majority vote, for example, are quite content to see the minority left without a voice, or any representation, at all. Those who support private ownership of the means of production are perfectly happy to see a minority wielding economic power over the majority.

But as anarchists, should we support

Continued on p. 4

paper, especially this week. While speculating about Beria's fate, and all his fellow accused had already been shot. The Russian picked up the news in order to effecting of collective farmers to send in an indignant demanding death for the defunct "traitor", but obliged it for foreign correspondents somewhat earlier so that news agencies received the news hours before it was released itself.

It is interesting to note that the news had been earlier still in actual fact in the passage quoted in the last week's issue. It seemed to be a piece of knowledge in asking for the next news may be the announcement of the execution rather than the date of the trial proceedings." Since the *Water Guardian* had a similar article it looks as if well informed people were abroad in Moscow before the official handouts. Beria may have to have been dead long before his confession and official trial. Rather similar doubts have been entertained regarding the date of Stalin's death.

## Beria on Stalin

The execution of L. P. Beria, at the head of the apparatus of terror which had controlled for so long, was the first major casualty in the power within the ruling circles of the Soviet Union. But there is one interesting aspect of his disgrace which will prove to be important. Beria published a book called "The History of the Organisations in Transcaucasia" in which he had made a report of the Tiflis party leaders. This report, unassisted, is in fact

## Criticism of Paddington Housing Committee

THE article which is written in *FREEDOM*, though it is an anarchist paper, is more than humane commonsense, and is written by an ordinary sensible person and not a special hobby-horse of "hot heads", "cranks", and "minorities". What we wrote last week about the decision of Paddington Borough Council's Housing Committee to evict the family of a man serving a prison sentence is substantially endorsed by an editorial comment in the *Observer* (27/12/53):

"Local councils, with the best intentions, may sometimes get a wrong idea of their function. This seems to have happened in the London borough of Paddington, where notice to quit has been served on the families of two men sent to prison. There may be special circumstances in these two related cases. But the Housing Committee chairman distinguished himself by arguing a general principle, namely, he says that some law-abiding citizens should not be housed at the expense of law-abiding citizens."

The Housing Committee which grants tenancies only to those who are not in receipt of a notice to quit is reverting to the decision of a Victorian charitable organisation which was to let the sole criterion should be housing need. By evicting the families of men sent to prison, it is imposing an extra punishment not listed in the penal code. It is also behaving, as landlord, in a way no private landlord is allowed to behave towards tenants of houses covered by the Rent Act, or most working-class houses are.

"Paddington may be persuaded to change its mind. But other councils are not presumably free to exact on similar grounds. If there are no laws or rules limiting the way in which a Local Authority in this respect, it is perhaps time that some law was passed by the Ministers."

## BISHOPS BACK KABAKA

MR. LYTELTON'S colonial policy has been seemingly a succession of blunders. Yet they are so conscientious (and he is still in office) that it is apparent that his actions represent the official policy of the government. Political commentators, however, are now pointing out that in removing the Kabaka the Colonial Office has removed a constitutional outlet for any Buganda discontents, and at the same time has destroyed the good relations between the government of Buganda and the British government. "Having forcibly disrupted the traditional social organization of Buganda, the British government should not be surprised if Uganda—hitherto regarded as one of Britain's model Protectorate States in Africa ceases to be as docile as it has been in the past."

It is not only political commentators and Buganda delegates who feel like this. The ex-bishop of Uganda, who crowned the now deposed Kabaka Mutesa I, in a well reasoned public letter (*Observer* 27/12/53) places the responsibility squarely on the shoulders of Mr. Lyttelton and his "crassly stupid speech" about

Federation last July; the "half-hearted withdrawal of his remarks impressed no one."

But it is not only the retired Bishop Stuart who writes thus. In the *Times* (28/12/53) the present Bishop, the Right Rev. L. W. Brown is reported to have "prefaced his Christmas sermon by announcing that he had sent a message to the Press stating that he knew nothing of the plans for deportation of the Kabaka before the public announcement was made."

The *Times* Correspondent at Kampala goes on to say that "The Buganda are naturally distressed at the government's decision. While the delegation was seeing Mr. Lyttelton, and until the final announcement was made, they were profoundly perturbed but could still hope that the Kabaka might be allowed to return. Now that hope has gone, and there are naturally some who are deeply embittered, though they appear confused in their objects."

Africa continues to be a volcano for the White settlers.

### THE FREE CHILD, A. S. Neill. (Herbert Jenkins, 9/6d.)

HERE we have yet another book by A. S. Neill, as usual humorous, irritating, stimulating and easy to read. The ideas he propounds are not new to Anarchists. Briefly he demands freedom for the child and demonstrates that thwarting the child's interest in sex produces a warped personality. Neill's importance lies in the fact that for some thirty years he has been running his own school, Summerhill, along the lines he advocates. In *The Free Child*, an attempt is made to sum up the achievements and influence of Summerhill and the Neillian form of progressive education.

In the Preface he states that he has discarded the easy political solutions to the world's ills. "I have found that I have tended to drop theories when the test of reality made them inadequate. . . . I was once tempted to lean towards Communism when its attitude to children was like my own, but slowly I discovered that Communism had no more use for freedom for children than had Colonel Blimp. I used to call myself a Socialist and anathematised private enterprise . . . until it dawned on me that Socialism, while killing the private enterprise of the profiteer, would at the same time

slowly strangle the private enterprise of my own work. Hence to-day I have no politics at all, for I cannot see the future happiness of mankind resulting from any political system." We must face it. Political parties are interested in votes and power not in the happiness or freedom of one single child. The official mind thinks in terms of giant abstractions—Training for Citizenship and a Liberal Education. Buildings, inspectors, qualifications and Education Acts have come to mean more than the individual boy or girl caught up in this vast state sausage-machine. The great truth that Goethe wrote, "Everywhere we learn only from those we love," which has been practiced by all the great teachers throughout history, is being strangled by the state's need to inculcate conformity and orthodoxy.

A recent visitor to Russia in her articles in the Sunday papers wrote that the atmosphere in the Soviet schools was "Victorian". A. S. Neill devotes a chapter to "communist education", and his quotations from official sources provide an implicit condemnation of a system that has deliberately given up co-education and every progressive teaching method. From the pamphlet "Hungary Builds a New Education" we learn that "free activity is frowned on, as a method

arising from a curriculum of subjective interests of the state, directed by the teacher as a conscious progress". From conditions the reader quickly sees "social discipline" and obedience far more importance to the state than individual thought and development. Of course this is just a more than form of moulding children's minds to obedience than the American school, flag-saluting and the British State school, where the day must commence with a compulsory 'act of worship'.

After Neill has written on play, progressive schools, sex, etc., he ends his book with the Report on Summerhill drawn up by two H.M. Inspectors. This gives the reader a chance to see Neill's own school through the eyes of two officials, comparatively sympathetic but definitely thinking in terms of academic prowess and the traditional ideas of school. That the Report should be as favourable as it is does credit to the fair-mindedness of the Inspectors and gives proof of Neill's success.

How far the work of A. S. Neill will survive it is impossible to say. The days of the progressive school appear to be numbered as it caters largely for the middle-class child, whose parents have increasing difficulty in finding the fees.

Every time the T.U. goes to James' Square they do so with their heads between the legs. Hence the great sell-out of the Communist E.T.U. guerilla strike, the meter-walkers, the lightermen and the Communist misled petrol strikers.

In the present Engineering Dispute—so the *Financial Times* tells us—all that the kicking and dancing will win for the rank and file will be only a 2d. And in this case—and in the N.U.R.—it is not a case of "orders from the Kremlin". Even the National Press do not know sure where the orders come from.

The only results that have been achieved

through the motion picture, and some goodness in the ranks of the T.U. movement who have been fleeing their leadership to go to the T.U. machine for their own ends. While the bosses may have got some of the T.U. machine for their own ends they have not got control of it and file membership.

While we live in a world where there is no alternative but the class struggle of the T.U. rank and file, we must fight the bosses every day if we are to maintain the standards of living and the class struggle is trying to reduce

SYNDICATE PRESS &

## VOLINE'S Nineteen—Seventeen

LET ME tell here of an experience of my own, of a less tragic nature, but one which throws light on certain Bolshevik procedures worthy of being written up among the high exploits of State Communism. At the time of which I speak, this happening was far from unique in Russia. But since then it could not be repeated in a country wholly subjugated by its new masters.

In November, 1918, I arrived in the city of Kursk, in the Ukraine, to attend a congress of Ukrainian libertarians. In those days, such an assemblage was still possible in Ukraina, in view of the special conditions in that region, then struggling against both the reaction and the German invasion. The Bolsheviks tolerated the Anarchists there, while utilizing and supervising them.

From the beginning of the Revolution, the laboring population in Kursk never had heard a lecture on Anarchism, the small local group not having the necessary strength, so that the few libertarian speakers went elsewhere. Taking advantage of my presence, the group proposed that I give a lecture on that subject, in a large hall. Naturally I accepted with joy.

It was necessary to ask for permission from the president of the local Soviet. He, an honest ex-worker, gave it to us readily. The precious document in hand, the hall was engaged two weeks in advance, and impressive posters were ordered a few days later and placed on walls. Everything was ready.

The lecture promised to be a great success for our ideas. Certain indications—talk around the city, crowds reading the posters, requests for information to the local group—left no doubt about the matter. Evidently the hall would be packed. Unaccustomed to such a response (for in Great Russia, by that time, no public lectures on Anarchism were possible) we felt a legitimate satisfaction.

Then, two days before the appointed date, the secretary of the sponsoring group came to see me, worried and indignant. He had just received a note from the president of the Bolshevik Committee of Kursk (the real power there), informing him that "because of the holiday" the Anarchist lecture could not take place, and that he had so notified the custodian of the hall, which was now reserved by the Communist committee for a popular dancing party.

I hurried to the office of that committee, and had a stormy session with its president—whose name, if I recall correctly, was Rynditch (or it may have been Ryndin).

"What is this?" I demanded. "You, a Communist, do not recognize the rules of priority? We obtained the authorization of the Kursk Soviet and engaged the hall two weeks in advance, precisely to be certain of having it. The committee must await its turn."

"I'm sorry, Comrade," he answered, "but the decision of the Committee, which is, don't forget, the supreme power in Kursk, and as such may have reasons of which you are ignorant and which supersede everything else, is irrevocable. Neither the president of the Soviet nor the custodian of the hall could have known in advance that the Committee was going to need the hall on that date. It is absolutely useless to discuss the matter, or to insist. I repeat, it is irrevocable. The lecture will not take place. Either hold it in another hall or on another date."

"You know very well," I said, "that it is not possible to arrange all that in two days. And then, there are no other halls large enough. Moreover, all the halls must already be taken for holiday parties. The lecture is out, that is all."

"I'm sorry. Postpone it to another date. You will lose nothing. It can be arranged."

"That would not be the same thing at all," I contended. "Alterations like this always injure the cause greatly. Then, too, the posters were expensive. Furthermore, I have to leave Kursk

quickly. But tell me—how are you going to manage on the evening scheduled for the lecture? It is my opinion that you are going to expose yourself to the resistance of the public, who certainly will come in large numbers to hear the lecture. The posters have been up for two weeks. The workers of Kursk and the surrounding country are awaiting it impatiently. It is too late to have notices of the change printed and posted. You will have difficulty imposing a dancing party on that crowd instead of the lecture which they will have come to hear."

"That's our affair. Don't do anything. We will take full charge of it."

"Therefore, fundamentally," I pointed out, "the lecture is forbidden by your committee despite the authorization by the Soviet."

"Oh, no, Comrade. We don't forbid it at all. Set it for a date after the holidays. We will inform the people who come to hear the lecture. That's all."

On this note we parted. I conferred with the local group and we decided to postpone the lecture until January 5, 1919. Accordingly we notified the Bolshevik Committee and the hall custodian. This change compelled me to delay my intended departure for Kharkov several days.

New posters were ordered. Beyond that, we decided, first, to let the Bolshevik authorities placate the public; and second, that I should remain in my hotel room that evening. For we surmised that a large crowd would demand, in spite of everything, that the lecture be given, and that finally, the Bolsheviks would feel obliged to yield. It was therefore necessary that the secretary of the group could summon me in case of need. Personally, I expected a great scandal, perhaps even a serious fracas.

The lecture had been scheduled for eight in the evening. Toward 8.30 I was called on the telephone. I heard the excited voice of the secretary say: "Comrade, the hall is literally besieged by a crowd which will listen to no explanations, and is demanding the lecture. The Bolsheviks are powerless to reason with them. Probably they will have to yield and the lecture will take place. Take a cab and come quickly."

A cab was at hand, and the trip was made speedily. From a distance I heard an extraordinary clamor in the street. Arriving at the scene, I saw a throng standing around the hall and cursing: "To the Devil with the dancing party! Enough of dancing parties! We are fed up with them. We want the lecture. We came for the lecture . . . Lecture! . . . Lecture . . . Lec-ture!"

The secretary, watching, hurried to meet me. With difficulty we pushed through the mass. The hall was being mobbed. At the top of the stairs I found "Comrade" Rynditch haranguing the crowd, which continually shouted: "Lecture! Lecture!"

"You did well to come," the Bolshevik committee head threw at me, angrily. "You see what is happening. This is your work."

Indignantly I said: "I warned you. You are responsible for all this. You took charge of arranging things. Well, go ahead! Fix things the way you want them. The best and simplest move would be to permit the lecture."

"No, no, no!" he shouted furiously. "Your lecture shall not take place, I guarantee."

I shrugged my shoulders.

Suddenly Rynditch said to me: "Look, Comrade: They won't listen to me. And I don't want to have to use force. You can arrange things. They'll listen to you. Explain the situation to them and persuade them to go away peacefully. Make them listen to reason. Tell them that your lecture has been postponed. It is your duty to do what I ask."

I felt that if the lecture did not take place then, it would never take place. Also I was sure that it was definitely forbidden.

"WE don't forbid your lecture, but—"

are publishing in these changes, is a study of the posthumous work of the Russian anarchist, Voline (better known in revolutionary circles by his pseudonym "Voline") which he completed a few months before his death. The complete work (volume of 690 pages) was first published in 1947, Les Années de Voline (Paris 1947) with the title "Révolution Inconnue, 1917-1921" (The Unknown Revolution, 1917-1921). An Italian translation of his work was published in 1950 (Gruppo Editoriale Napoletano). And it has recently been announced by C.N.T. press that a Spanish version will be issued sometime this year.

But what is we are sure of even greater interest to our English readers is the fact that the next month's English translation of the first half of this monumental work will be simultaneously published in New York and London by the *Libertarian Book Club* and *Libertarian Press* respectively, with the title "1917—The Revolution Betrayed".

Voline's work was conceived in three volumes. The first, most of which has been omitted from the present version, "The birth, growth and triumph of the revolution (1825-1917)", is a brief historical survey of the revolutionary events in Tsarist Russia from the uprising of the *Decabristi* in 1825 to the outbreak of the Revolution there in 1917. The second, "Bolshevism and the Revolution of 1917, the role played by the anarchists, and the betrayal of the revolution by the Bolshevik Party leaders, and is the subject of the volume of the English translation. The third volume, "The struggle for the real Social Revolution" in which he deals with the Kronstadt rebellion, the revolution in Russia and the Makhnovist movement, has already been translated into English. It is hoped that its publication will not long be delayed.

### WHO WAS VOLINE?\*

VOLINE was born on August 11, 1882 in the district of Voronezh in Great Russia. Both his parents were doctors living in comfortable circumstances which permitted them to engage foreign governesses, with the result that Voline and his brother were eventually able to speak and write French and German as fluently as their mother tongue. In 1905 Voline joined the Social Revolutionary Party and took an active part in the uprising of that year which nearly overthrew Romanov rule. After the bloody suppression of the insurrection he was arrested and in 1907 a Tsarist tribunal ordered his banishment. But he succeeded in escaping and made his way to France. There he was active in the revolutionary movements and made contact with the French anarchists and the small circle of Russian anarchists in Paris and under the influence of his new surroundings he gradually altered his political and social views, joining the anarchist movement in 1911.

1913 found him an active member of the Committee for International Action against War, and when war broke out the French government decided to put him in a concentration camp for the duration of the war. Warned in time of his impending arrest Voline was able to reach Bordeaux whence he managed to work his passage on a merchant ship bound for the United States.

In New York he joined the *Union of Russian Workers in the United States and Canada* a progressive organization with 10,000 members which offered a rich field for his activities. He was soon working on the editorial staff of *Golos Truda* (The Voice of Labour), the weekly organ of the Federation. But as soon as the revolution broke out in Russia in 1917 he and other members of the staff left America and transferred the journal to Petrograd, where it appeared as a weekly until the events of October 1917 when it became a daily.

During the months of comparative freedom in Russia Voline was active in many fields. He took part in the work of the Soviet Department for Public Education and Enlightenment of the People, and in 1918 helped

\*Summarised from Rudolf Rocker's biographical Introduction to the English edition of Voline's book.

# Freedom

No. 1. January 4, 1954

## THE APPEAL OF BROTHERHOOD

Looking for equality, for brotherhood is exceedingly deep in man despite the sceptics. Dividing activities of authority. Kropotkin showed just how deep a force this feeling had throughout human history (and how it lay at the basis of civilization and survival of man) in his delightful and absorbing book *Life and Activity of Man*. If the natural feeling for brotherhood is to-day side-tracked before in history it is as a result of its apparent supporters who pay it dutiful lip-service in reality maintaining a system of hierarchical structure and its avowed enemies. This is the main appeal of early

Christianity to the slave populations of the Roman Empire was just that of the rightness of equality—that all men, being children of god, were brothers. It seems likely that it was this revolutionary conception, together with the disrespect of the early Christians for property, which brought down on them the various persecutions.

But, characteristically, authority defeated these social aspects of Christianity by adopting it through the very symbol of inequality, the negation of brotherhood, in the Emperor (Constantine) himself. Since that time it is not brotherhood and contempt for riches which have been stressed by official Christendom, but submission and the deferring of social hopes to the hereafter. As to property, individual contempt for it is best shown by making it over to Holy Church.

Brotherhood . . . it still forms the powerful appeal of rulers, unmindful of the fact that there can be no brotherliness where one man is set above another, when one starves and another is wealthy. And so deeply embedded is this doublethink that it

is trotted out in all sincerity by hundreds of people, both by rulers and their dupes.

Thus at Christmas, the season of goodwill, (when are such feelings inappropriate, however?) the Queen of England drew on the emotional reserves the idea of brotherhood contains for millions of simple, sincere people. "The Commonwealth," she said, "bears no resemblance to the Empires of the past. It is an entirely new conception—built on the highest qualities of the spirit of man's friendship, loyalty, and the desire for freedom and peace. To that new conception of an equal partnership of nations and races I shall give myself heart and soul every day of my life."

And she went on to amplify the theme:

"I wished to speak of it . . . because we are celebrating the birth of the Prince of Peace, who preached the brotherhood of man. May that brotherhood be furthered by all our thoughts and deeds from year to year. In pursuit of that supreme ideal the Commonwealth is moving steadily towards greater harmony be-

tween its many creeds, colours, and races, in spite of the imperfections by which, like every human institution, it is beset . . ."

Now there is little point in discussing whether rulers are sincere when they speak in this vein. We believe they are 'sincere' in the sense that they honestly hold such views because they could not justify their rule except by a reference to such feelings. What is important is the appeal which such ideas hold for the Queen's listeners.

And yet much that she said in the above quotation is simply untrue. The Commonwealth, in fact, is just the same as the Empires of the past, like them it exploits territories and their indigenous populations for economic advantage regardless of the effect on the natives. We are not moving towards "greater harmony between creeds, colours and races" but exactly the opposite. Colour feeling is increasing, race tension rising.

These are the facts. But there is no doubting the profound emotional appeal of the idea of brotherhood.

## FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

OPEN 10 a.m. to 6.30: 5.0 SATURDAYS

- New Books . . .**
- The Free Child . . . A. S. Neill 9/6
  - England, Your England . . . George Orwell 12/6
  - Sexual Behaviour in the Human Female . . . 50/-
  - The Rebel . . . Albert Camus 18/-
  - Second-Hand . . .**
  - Hunger and Love . . . Lionel Britton 5/-
  - The Revolutionary Tradition in England . . . F. A. Ridley 7/6
  - The Conformist . . . Albert Moravia 3/-
  - After Many a Summer . . . Aldous Huxley 4/-
  - Wind, Sand and Stars . . . Antoine de Saint-Exupery 4/-
  - Spanish Testament . . . Arthur Koestler 3/6
  - Anti-Slavery and Reform Papers . . . H. D. Thoreau 2/6
- New Issues of Periodicals . . .**
- Libertarian, Vol. 2, No. 2. . . 3d.
  - Individual Action, December . . . 3d.

Obtainable from  
**27, RED LION STREET, LONDON, W.C.1**

## The Russian Revolution Betrayed

and that quite likely I would be arrested.

Unequivocally I refused to speak to the people who jammed the stairway. With a shake of my head, I told the committee head: "No, I will not speak. You wanted this. Get out of it yourself."

The crowd, aware of our dispute, cursed more loudly. Rynditch tried to yell something. Wasted effort. His voice was drowned in a tempest of shouting. The crowd felt itself strong. It was having a good time, closing ranks, packing the staircases even more tightly if that were possible, and the landing, and the foyer in front of the hall's closed doors.

Now Rynditch made desperate gestures and again appealed to me. "Speak to them, speak to them, or it will end badly."

An idea came to me. I signaled for silence to the people who surrounded us. Instantly they quieted down. Then, separately, spacing my words, I said:

"Comrades, the responsibility for this highly regrettable confusion belongs to the Bolshevik Committee of Kursk. We engaged the hall first for the lecture, two weeks in advance. Two days ago the committee, without even consulting us, took possession of the hall to hold a dance tonight. (Here the crowd demanded at the top of their lungs: "Down with the dance! Let's have the lecture!") That compelled us to postpone our lecture to a later date.

"However, I am the speaker and I am prepared to give the lecture right away. The Bolsheviks have formally forbidden it this evening. But you are the citizens of Kursk; you are the public. It is up to you to decide. I am entirely at your disposal. Choose, Comrades—either we postpone the lecture and go away peacefully and come back on January fifth, or if you want the lecture right now, if you are really determined, act, take possession of the hall."

Hardly had I spoken these last words when the crowd applauded joyfully and yelled: "Lecture, right away! Lecture! Lecture!"

And with irresistible force it pushed toward the hall. Rynditch was overwhelmed. The doors were opened. If not, they would have been forced. And the lights went on inside.

In a few moments the hall was filled. The audience, partly sitting, partly standing, calmed down. I had only to begin. But Rynditch climbed onto the platform. He addressed the audience: "Citizens, Comrades! Be patient for a few more minutes. The Bolshevik Committee is going to confer and make a final decision. They will communicate this to you directly. Probably the dance will not take place."

"Hurrah!" the crowd shouted, carried away with joy over its apparent victory. "Lecture! Long live the lecture!"

They applauded again, happily.

Now the Bolshevik Committee retired to a nearby room to confer. Meanwhile the doors of the hall were closed, the audience patiently awaiting the decision. We supposed that this little comedy was being played by the Bolsheviks to save face.

A quarter of an hour passed.

Then, abruptly, the hall doors were opened, and a strong detachment of Chekist soldiers (special troops, a sort of State police, blindly devoted to the Lenin régime), rifles in hand, entered. Everyone in the audience, stunned, remained frozen in their places. Quickly, in an impressive silence, the soldiers poured into the hall, sliding along the walls, and behind the seats. One group remained near the entrance, with its rifles pointed at the audience.

(Afterwards it was learned that the Bolshevik Committee had first called upon the city barracks, asking that a regular regiment intervene. But the soldiers wanted explanations—at that stage this was still possible—declared that they, too, would like to hear the lecture, and refused to come. It was then that the committee summoned the Chekist detachment, which had been ready for all emergencies.)

Directly the committee members reappeared in the hall. Rynditch announced their ruling from the platform in a triumphant voice.

"The decision of the committee has been made. The dance will not take place. Nor will the lecture. In any case, it is too late for either. I call upon this audience to leave the hall and the building with absolute calm and in perfect order. If not, the Chekists will intervene."

Indignant, but powerless, the people began to get up and leave the hall. "Even so," some muttered, "their party was spoiled . . . That wasn't bad."

Outside, a new surprise awaited them. At the exit, two armed Chekists searched each person and inspected his identity card. Several were arrested. Some were released next day. But others remained in jail.

I returned to the hotel. Next morning the telephone rang. Rynditch's voice: "Comrade Voline, come to see me at the committee's office. I want to speak to you about your lecture."

"The date is set for January fifth," I said. "The notices have been ordered. Have you any objection?"

"No, but come anyhow. I must talk with you."

When I got there [Rynditch was not in sight. Instead] I was received by a Bolshevik, amiable and smiling, who said: "Look, Comrade: The committee has decided that your lecture shall not take place. You yourself are responsible for this decision, because your attitude yesterday was arrogant and hostile. Also, the committee has decided that you cannot remain in Kursk. For the moment, you will remain here, in our quarters."

"Ah, am I arrested then?"

"Oh no, Comrade. You are not arrested. You will only be kept here for a few hours, until the train leaves for Moscow."

"For Moscow?" I shouted. "But I have absolutely nothing to do in Moscow. And I already have a ticket for Kharkov, where I am supposed to go after the Congress here. I have friends and work to do there."

After a short discussion on this point, the Bolshevik said: "That's all right. You can go to Kharkov. But the train doesn't leave until 1 a.m. You'll have to stay here all day."

"Can I go to the hotel and settle my bill and get my valise?"

"No, Comrade. We cannot permit that."

"I promise to go directly to the hotel . . . And moreover, someone can accompany me."

"It is impossible, Comrade, we regret. You can see that. The matter might get noised around. We don't want that. The order is formal. Give instructions to one of our comrades. He will go to the hotel and fetch your valise."

An armed Chekist guard already was stationed in front of my room door. I could do nothing.

A "comrade" brought the valise. Toward midnight another took me in a cab to the railway station and waited until I actually departed.

This unexpected journey was made under such painful circumstances that I fell sick *en route*. I was able to avoid pneumonia only because of the kindness of a fellow-passenger who put me up with friends in Soumy, a small Ukrainian city. There a competent doctor took good care of me. And a few days later I was in Kharkov.

On arrival, I wrote for our local weekly, *Nabud*—forbidden a little later by the Bolshevik authorities because of its growing success—an article entitled *Story of a Lecture Under the Dictatorship of the Proletariat*. In it I related in detail that whole unsavory adventure.

\*Kharkov is about 150 miles south of Kursk, while Moscow is some 300 miles north of the latter city.

of the Anarchist Federation of the Ukraine, which published a daily paper in Kursk as well as regional organs throughout the Ukraine. But permission of the Anarchists in 1919 all plans had to be abandoned. Voline joined the army of Makhno, where his principle rôle was that of social enlightenment, of preparing the people for a social order based on common ownership of land and tools. It was whilst on a mission that he was struck down with typhoid fever, and in January, 1920, he died. He was arrested by military agents of the government. Trotsky had already ordered his execution, but according to Voline he escaped death then.

Voline, in 1920, saw him taken to Moscow, and he was kept there until October, when he and many other prisoners were released by virtue of a treaty between the Soviet Union and Makhno's army. Voline then returned to Kharkov, resuming his old activities and partaking in continuing negotiations between the Lenin government and a delegation from Makhno's forces. An agreement reached by these contending parties was broken by the Bolsheviks in November. A month after their release, Voline and most of his comrades were arrested again and confined in the prison in Moscow.

There was nothing against them except their liberalism. Yet there can hardly be any doubt that a sudden turn of circumstance they all would have liquidated in one way or another like so many others. It was by a mere coincidence they were saved.

In the summer of 1921 the Red Trade Union International held a Congress in Moscow. The delegates included representatives of some Anarcho-Syndicalist groups in Spain, France, and other countries, who went to ascertain whether an alliance with this new international would be feasible or not. They arrived in Moscow just as the Anarchists in the Taganka prison were on a hunger strike which lasted more than ten days and was carried on to compel the authorities to explain why they had been jailed.

When these delegates heard what had been happening they voiced a vehement protest, demanding the liberation of their Russian comrades. But it was only after the affair became an open scandal in the Congress that the Government consented to release the hunger-strikers, on condition, however, that they leave Russia. It was the first time that political prisoners were deported from the vaunted Red Fatherland of the Proletariat.

Had the Soviet Government had the audacity to furnish these victims with passports taken from Czechoslovakian war prisoners, the route to their homeland, where the dispersion arrived at the German port of Stettin and where the authorities their real names and pointed out that the passports given to them by the Bolsheviks actually were not their. Fortunately for them, Germany at that time was in the midst of a revolutionary situation, when many things could be done which were later impossible.

Through the kindness of the port had no legal right to let the group of about twenty remain on German soil, he communicated with their clubs and permitted them to send two of their comrades to Berlin to see whether they could find a friendly organization which would assume responsibility for their maintenance and good behaviour.

That they found sympathy among the German comrades. Voline remained in Paris for two years playing no part in the activities of the movement and in directing attention to the persecution of the anarchists in Russia. After the liberation of the venerable French Anarchist Sébastien Faure, who was at the time engaged on the *Propaganda desobediencia*, he settled with his family in Paris. There he resumed his political work, writing and editing anarchist journals as well as contributing articles to the *Propaganda*. During the second world-war he went from one hiding place to another, managing to slip away to neutral ground. At the end of the war he returned to Paris, not only to enter a hospital afflicted with heart-disease, but also to enter a period of real intensity and peace.

The *Propaganda desobediencia* was started in 1929. It was considered only a short while before his death. It is his movement, and *Propaganda desobediencia* are proud to be able to make the English translation available to their readers in this country. It is an important work, on a scale of real intensity and peace.

# The Ethic of the Boycott

such a coercive weapon as the boycott? Let us first of all look at the situation in which it arises. If we accept the fact of a struggle taking place in society, between the rulers and the ruled, the haves and the have-nots, then we must recognise that pressure will be brought to bear upon one side and the other in that continual struggle. As long as class-divided society exists, the class struggle will exist, and that will entail the use of power. The employer uses the power that ownership gives him. The State backs him up with its coercive power—the police forces, prisons and the armed forces. Facing this the workers have their economic power, as reflected in the withdrawal of their labour, but this can only be effectively used, as can any other expression of disobedience, through the recognition that unity is strength.

## The Weak Link

The whole of working class organisation is based upon the acceptance of that fact. Alone, separate, workers are helpless. United they can find the strength to oppose authority. This makes the position of the blackleg a very important one. He becomes the weak link in the chain; he becomes the example held up by the boss and his spokesmen ("See—they are divided among themselves—their case is not so good after all. The strikers are only lazy trouble-makers, decent hard working citizens are perfectly contented."); he becomes, in a word, a traitor in the class war. The State has no compunction in dealing with its traitors in a harsh and brutal way. It doesn't simply call for social ostracism—it executes them. The working class way is far more humane. It does not use the cold machinery of the law to operate the bullet or the rope. It realises that it is not only a man's life that matters to him, but what he does with it. Not only his work—but who he works with. And it recognises that social relationships and the approval of one's fellows is a basic necessity for the human being. Man is a social animal, and in all his associations standards of behaviour become recognised. Anarchists recognise the validity of rational custom and functional habit. It is when these become perverted and codified into irrational and oppressive law that we oppose them.

Solidarity among workers, at all times but especially in time of dispute, is rational, necessary and functional—and social. He who breaks it acts in an anti-social way.

## Somebody Bound to Get Hurt

The boycott, sending to Coventry, simply means the withdrawal of social contact. The strikers after Dec. 2 decided against trying to get the blacklegs sacked. This may have been partly because of the difficulties of compelling the boss to sack a faithful servant, but also took account of the fact that a man's wife and children suffer if he loses his livelihood. But clearly, none of the strikers wanted to have any social contact with anyone who had broken the code of solidarity. So they left him his right to live and work, but expressed their contempt by refusing to speak to him.

This is so natural, that whether one approves of it in theory or not, it is bound to happen. It is practiced instinctively by children and adults in all societies, but it is when it is consciously organised on a social scale that it can become a social weapon in the class war.

In the waging of that war people are bound to get hurt. Militant workers are victimised by the boss—or victimisation is prevented only by solidarity and the threat of mass action in the defence of the few. The worker who sides with the boss cannot expect to be popular with those waging a common struggle (in which he stands to benefit) against the boss. If he is strong and convinced ("Sturdy and independent") he will be able to stand his ground and take what comes to him. If he is weak—as Allcock obviously was—the result can be tragic.

The Allcock case has been used by gutter journalists like John Gordon of the *Sunday Express* as a stick to beat the strikers with. When strikers come unstuck—as they frequently do—Gordon's attitude would be "it serves them right". We are not so callous about James Allcock. We only want to repeat that in the waging of a class war people are bound to get hurt, and the end to that can only be the establishment of a classless society.

But neither the gutter journalists, nor the employers, nor the blacklegs, seem to want that. P.S.

# A Readers View on Attitudes to "Blacklegs"

I WAS disappointed to read the words of support given by P.S. to the various boycotting measures used by certain groups of workers to deal with those "scabs" who refused to join the engineers' strike on Dec. 1. Although I definitely supported the strike, I had hoped that the workers would behave responsibly and not resort to silliness. However some sections have decided that anyone who does not fall in with the wishes of the majority shall invoke the solemn wrath of his fellows. This is extremely stupid and is not calculated to win the workers much sympathy from outside. It should have been obvious to you that if you want to win someone over to your side who disagrees with you, the way not to do it is to punish him for his disagreement. The result of such an action would be to lose him for ever. This has happened at Staveley. It is certain that Ron Hewitt will never join in a similar strike, for he will associate it with a kind of group dictatorship. I agree with you that the attitude of these recalcitrant blacklegs is not logical since they will accept resulting wage rises which they haven't fought for. Never-

theless some other way could have been found, instead of being nasty. Quite apart from the practical short-sightedness of this move there are deeper considerations. If anarchists can support ostracism as not being in conflict with their principles, I begin to wonder how unity and co-operation is to be achieved in an anarchist society. It seems that instead of open coercion, the attitude will be "If you do not co-operate with us, we will cut you off from social intercourse with your fellows". It is a particularly cruel thing to do, and a device which many children use as punishment before they learn to be responsible and recognise other points of view. If discipline under anarchy were to be obtained by compulsion or ostracism, then the society would forfeit its claim to be anarchic, because then mutual co-operation would have been replaced by mass psychology. When crowds become heated in emotional support of a point of view, they resort to antagonism towards those who differ from them. Group dictatorship and ostracism are neither of them humane ways of obtaining unity and it is distressing to see them supported by anarchists. I fully realise that if the workers are to struggle to better their conditions (which they want), and to overthrow economic power and establish workers' control (which they do not want) then unity among them must be achieved. But we must make sure that the methods we employ do not conflict with our principles. The methods we employ do not conflict with our principles. The methods must be libertarian, that is they must be based on a respect for human beings and an appreciation of their different ideas. Any action which seeks to establish conformity by means of threatened punishment is surely anti-individual. Our means as well as our ends must not conflict with our principles. These workers have unfortunately stooped to behave like children and have severely damaged their cause. I thought childish behaviour was one of the bad features of present mass society. It seems that not only politicians need anarchist education. *Thornton Heath, Dec. 24. A READER. [P.S. again deals with the question elsewhere in this issue, not in direct reply to our correspondent however, whose letter arrived after P.S.'s article on the Ethic of the Boycott had been written.—Ed.]*

# Society in Danger

BIO-MOLECULES that were formerly self-sufficient and independent were brought together by Eros to meet aggression from a common enemy, and first a cell, and later an organism resulted. But against Eros works a disruptive principle, a will in organic matter to return to the inorganic, and to this Freud gave the name of Death-instinct. Carried into psychology, this principle was held responsible for some psychoneuroses and psychoses, and Karl Menninger went as far as saying that all of them were forms of partial suicide.

"Freud considered his theory of instincts generally valid and also applicable to social organization". Franz Alexander, from whom we quote ("Fundamentals of psycho-analysis", p. 65), agrees that "an unorganized mass faced by a common foe will quickly organize, divide labor, and co-operate spontaneously" (p. 66), but he adds that "the disintegration of social groups can best be understood from a particularistic tendency of the constituent parts rather than from a universal death-instinct" (p. 65). He further explains that "individualism and the disinclination of each member to sacrifice his sovereignty are dynamic forces no different from the instinct of self-preservation, and are rather derivatives of it. In no existing group do the individual members completely abandon their individuality" (p. 67).

Freud's theory of the death-instinct never was very popular, even among psycho-analysts, but, curiously enough, it seems to be lodged at the back of many people's minds, when they react so violently and so sharply against individualistic affirmations or feel deeply disturbed by even the most innocent forms of eccentricity such as the growing of a beard. They truly feel, speak, and, sometimes, act as though an individual that departs in any way from familiar and accepted normality were the incarnation of a satanic will, and an agent of death within the social body, threatening not only their social life, but their life *tout court*.

It is for such people that anarchy is synonymous of chaos, and how chaos is somewhere in their mind can be gauged by the fact that they cannot understand how a social being can be an anarchist, and how a society can tolerate anarchists and fare none the worse for doing so. They think that anarchism is an attempted conspiracy aimed at the disruption of society for disruption's sake, and in some cases all their sense of insecurity and their quite justified fears and anxieties about the constantly threatened social stability crystallize into a hatred of anarchism and of the men who profess it.

By uniting in this hatred they feel society strengthened and enhanced, so true it is that a common sense of danger is one of the most potent factors in the formation and preservation of societies or, at least, of their defence apparatus for which society is commonly mistaken. Anarchism may be a danger to this apparatus, but not to society itself. The mistake is possible only as long as anarchists are a small and isolated minority. But if anarchism were to coincide, as it may well do, with the aspirations of a considerable majority, the identification of society with the State would be given the lie. As a matter of fact it is not anarchism as such that they fear and hate, but a situation in which State and society would be clearly shown as separate enti-

ties, that is a revolution. They hate and fear the thought that a revolution may make anarchists of them, too. This statement will not appear so gratuitous if I add that what is anti-social in a revolution is hated by anarchists as much as it is by those who fear a revolution, only more thoroughly and more clearly so.

A revolution takes place when the customs, institutions, modes of production and distribution of a society do no longer satisfy the great majority or the most socially-minded minority of its members. It is an ineluctable process or so it appears to the hind-sight of the historian. It can be compared to the process of moulting in a crab or a snake. It is usually sudden and violent, but it can also be slow and relatively pacific. It is of a traumatic nature, but generally beneficial. At any rate it is a social, and not an anti-social process. The anti-social danger of a revolution consists in its betrayal or its exploitation by a minority who, monopolizing the defence apparatus of a revolution turns it against society by restoring forms of oppression and exploitation, often more rigid and ruthless than those the revolution has destroyed.

Has it ever occurred to those who condemn a revolution as anti-social that they give all their allegiance and rely for the prevention or suppression of revolution on a government and institutions which in nine cases out of ten were born themselves out of a revolution? Anarchists have no other power than that of their ideas. Even supposing they had anti-social tendencies, can they be a greater social danger than other men who dispose of the manifold power of the State-machine? Is not the avowed aim of that modern social enemy, the dictator or the party, that of gaining control of this machine? And is not the function of this machine, at least potentially, that of enforcing oppression and exploitation the same as the function of an army is that of making war?

It will be answered that society cannot dispense with an army as long as there are other armies which can be used against it. In the light of this answer the State-machine will then appear as a support or extension of the army, equally aimed at the protection of society against external dangers. It will also appear, however, that external danger does not lie in the existence of other societies, but in the existence of other State-machines. So the anarchist objection to government will have to be seen in turn as an extension or support to the keen desire among all peoples of the world to abolish armaments and armies.

Now maybe the abolition of army and armaments is a risk and a luxury no society can afford at the present time. Yet, contrary to what is the case with incipient societies, external danger is today the greatest barrier to social happiness and development. The existence and plurality of State-machines is what prevents the unification of all mankind into one society for which most other conditions are ripe. Everybody, then, is aware of the enormous social progress that could be achieved in any country if the money and talents spent on defence or defensive aggression were directed to social ends. Social ends, for the anarchist, are simply unprivileged satisfaction of individual needs. There are no social needs over and above the needs of individuals. Sacrifices are necessary, and the anarchist is aware of them more than

anyone else. What he insists is that every sacrifice should be voluntary and never in *corpore vili*. The machine, instead, exists to impose sacrifices on people who are unwilling to make them. There are individuals who are not ready to make sacrifices that are socially necessary, and that is mostly due to parasitic propensities on their part. They are thereby a social danger, but should be obvious to anyone that individuals have a modicum of intelligence and are capable of patience will not resort to what is legally considered and punished as a crime, but take advantage of the State-machine, the economic system which give plenty of opportunities for the satisfaction of propensities, and, indeed, seem to there for this very purpose. By the limitation of anti-social instincts psychological analysis in many cases does not mean moral transformation but only adaptation to socio-political conditions. Hitler sublimized his Oedipus complex and signally succeeded in social adaptation with the sacrifice of thousands of Jewish lives. Most people would consider another Hitler the greatest danger. But anarchists hold that this would be relatively harmless were it for a State-machine, supposedly maintained for the defence of society, turning out in practice to be the one by which the greatest and most heinous crimes against humanity are perpetrated.

We may think that in this case we have devised a system by which it is never possible for a Hitler to come to power, and we sincerely wish it is so. As anarchists, however, we feel less apprehensive if there is no power which a Hitler could control. We are not a danger to society, we are not a disintegrating force, and if we individual development and satisfaction it is the deepest conviction that the inseparable from social development and satisfaction. We are knocking against reality, but it is the reality we are knocking against that is anti-social. We may forget the seriousness of the existing external danger, but we must not forget that the measures taken against it are socially crippling, and we hold that will always be an external danger, there is no faith in a society living and developing without external dangers, lack of faith, and nothing else, in our opinion, distinguishes the man in the street from the militant anarchist.

GIOVANNI BALDI

## MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENT

- LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP**  
OPEN AIR MEETINGS  
Weather Permitting  
HYDE PARK  
Sundays at 3.30 p.m.  
TOWER HILL  
Tuesdays at 12.30 p.m.
- NORTH-EAST LONDON**  
DISCUSSION MEETINGS  
IN EAST HAM  
Alternate Wednesdays  
at 7.30 p.m.
- GLASGOW**  
INDOOR MEETINGS  
every Friday  
at 7.30 p.m.  
at 200 Buchanan Street.  
Speakers: Mark Kramisch, Hugh McCutcheon and others.
- JAN. 8—Mark William Kramisch. ANARCHISM.
- JAN. 15—Hugh McCutcheon GODS.
- JAN. 22—Giovanni GROWING A BEARD.
- JAN. 29—Thomas Mullin EDUCATION OR DEVASTATION.
- WORKERS' OPEN FORUM**  
Renfrow Street, Glasgow  
SUNDAY, JAN. 3—  
NECESSITY FOR ANARCHISM  
Speaker: Mark Kramisch

# Diminished Production in the West

Continued from p. 1  
vision much sooner than expected, sales have fallen off sharply and production in consequence has been much curtailed. . . .  
"The output of steel last week dropped abruptly to 67 per cent. of capacity of mills—some 18 points below the output of the week before and 30 per cent. below that of a year ago. And with reduced Christmas week schedules and shutdowns for model change-overs automobile production declined from 97,434 cars and 25,808 trucks to 68,094 cars and 17,934 trucks. Still, even with this reduction, it is estimated there will have been produced this year 6,134,000 cars and 1,208,000 trucks. Only in 1950, when 6,658,510 cars and 1,343,923 trucks came off the assembly lines, was there any greater production. In both the steel and automobile industries the current low level of operations is expected to be only brief, and while there have been some lay-offs of workmen they have not been numerous. . . .  
"After eight months of a continuous, though small, rise the cost of living, as measured by the Bureau of Labour Statistics Index, declined slightly in November to 115 per cent. of the 1947-49

average, but it was almost wholly because of a drop of 1.4 per cent. in food prices. Rents and other housing costs, medical and personal care, reading and recreation, and miscellaneous goods and services all continued to advance."  
These are only symptoms of the economic system known as capitalism in the West and socialism in Russia, the system of production for a market, for equivalent exchange at prevailing values. These symptoms have to be seen against a world which is more than half starving and in which population increases faster than food production. It is against such a world, such a scene, such massive misery, that anarchists urge that production should be for need, untrammelled by exchange values, to say nothing of the financial maze of currency restrictions, etc. Production for need is only possible if a money system or any other system of representing exchange values (leaving aside questions of debt which still further hamper production) has been wholly abandoned. Yet production for need is so simple an idea that it is immediately grasped by simple people—even though it is dismissed by what Blake called "learned ignorance".

**VOLINE'S**  
**1917—THE RUSSIAN**  
**REVOLUTION**  
**BETRAYED**  
(272 pages) Demy 8vo.  
Cloth binding  
should be ordered by Freedom's American readers from:  
The Libertarian Book Club,  
G.P.O. Box 842,  
NEW YORK, N. Y.  
Freedom readers in all other countries should order from:  
Freedom Press,  
27 Red Lion Street,  
London, W.C.1.  
The American edition costs \$3.50. The English edition will sell at 12/6d., but readers sending orders with remittance before publication may have their copies for 10/6d post free.  
**ORDER NOW**

**FREEDOM**  
The Anarchist Weekly  
Postal Subscription Rates:  
12 months 17/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)  
6 months 8/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)  
3 months 4/6 (U.S.A. \$0.75)  
Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies  
12 months 27/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)  
6 months 13/6 (U.S.A. \$2.25)  
Cheques, P.O.'s and Money Orders should be made out to FREEDOM PRESS, crossed a/c Payne, and addressed to the publishers:  
**FREEDOM PRESS**  
27 Red Lion Street  
London, W.C.1 England  
Tel.: Chancery 8364.