

The Budget and the Cabinet Crisis

THE welcome which Mr. Gaitskell's budget received in the City of London is sufficient indication that it is not a threat to the holders of wealth and capital despite the increases in income tax and distributed profits tax. The treatment of what are now known as the lower income groups" is by comparison niggardly and mean. The Chancellor made much of the increase in Old Age Pensions which, however, becomes more shabby and deceptive the more you look into it. Firstly, they have to wait until October for the extra four shillings a week; secondly, it applies only to pensioners over 70, although it is hard to see that life is any less difficult for those of 65 to 70 years of age. Thirdly, about half a million old age pensioners who have no other source of income have their money made up to a minimum, after payment of rent, of 43/6 a week by the National Assistance Board. The increase in the pension will be automatically cancelled out by a reduction of the N.A.B. payment, unless the scales of payment are increased. Fourthly, what about the other half-million people who are sup-

ported by the National Assistance Board (the chronically sick or unemployable)? Is not their plight equally hard as that of the pensioners? And, finally, with the rise in the cost of the bare necessities of life, can one possibly consider the four-shilling increase as enough to ensure the well-being of old people?

The charge on the National Health Service, for spectacles and false teeth is an attack on the whole much-vaunted principle behind the idea of the Service, and a cowardly attempt to appease the government's Tory critics. Mr. Gaitskell says it will save £25 million—an enormous sum, except when it is compared with the £1,500 million which is to be spent on re-armament.

The government's budget is a war budget because its policy is a war policy. And the more we discover about the nature of authority and government in general, the more we see the truth of the saying: "War is the trade of governments". There is no point in pontificating about the budget crisis unless this basic fact is grasped.

BEVAN OUT, ROBENS IN

POLITICIANS, like kings, are always easily replaceable. For, like kings, they are but figureheads and it only requires that the Press shall turn its spotlight from politician A. to politician B. for the former to enter the political wilderness and the latter to appear indispensable to our very lives. The artificial importance of politicians is surely proved by the fact that only a short time after their deaths or after the spotlight has been removed from them their names are completely forgotten.

We think this should be borne in mind in assessing the importance of the resignations of Mr. Bevan and Mr. Wilson from the Labour Government this week. For the next few days the incident will be hot news to be exploited by that very large section of the National Press which looks for such incidents to fill its headlines. But in a few weeks it will all be forgotten, the three Government posts will be duly filled and Mr. Bevan may or may not find himself in the political wilderness. Whatever party political warfare may ensue will be purely a mud-

slinging battle, and we can hardly share the *News Chronicle's* hysterical fear that we may expect a "crisis for the country" if the difficulties the Government has been thrown into by Mr. Bevan's "wrecking tactics" (note Moscow's influence on Fleet Street's vocabulary for denunciation) are exploited by the Opposition.

There may be something in the views Mr. Bevan's advisers put forward. But, in case Mr. Bevan should suddenly appear in the eyes of some as a revolutionary leader, it must be pointed out that he does not oppose the world armaments race *per se*; in his view we are not getting the best value for our money. And it must not be forgotten either that Mr. Bevan is a shrewd politician, and an able word spinner, and an ambitious man. Such characteristics, to our minds, convince us that Mr. Bevan's "sacrifice" is just a tactical move in the struggle for leadership of the Labour Party. He has no more intention of floundering in the political wilderness preaching revolutionary socialism than the anarchists have of standing for Parliament.

Ernest Bevin: A Political Realist

THE pioneers of what was so hopefully known in the eighties and nineties of the last century as the "new unionism", died in relative obscurity: John Burns, a vain and forgotten old man; Ben Tillett, a high-liver and deep-drinker; Tom Mann, a cardboard figurehead of the Communist Party. These were the men who in their youth built up the union organisations of "unskilled" and casual workers who lacked the bargaining power of the skilled men of the old craft unions. The next generation of trade union leaders was dominated by three men whose task was to consolidate the unions into the huge bureaucratic machines we know today, and to renounce, after the General Strike, any trace of the revolutionary syndicalist aspirations which animated

many of the unions at the time of the First World War. The two elder men, J. H. Thomas and J. R. Clynes, died forgotten and unlamented. The other, Ernest Bevin, when almost due to retire from his job as general secretary of the biggest union in the world, became this country's manpower dictator for five years and Foreign Secretary for five more.

When such a man dies, and glowing tributes are paid to his memory by the leaders of half the countries of the world it is natural to ask what are the achievements for which we must thank him. He won the title of "the Dockers' K.C." for his successful presentation of their case to the wage tribunal, but the case was prepared by others. He welded together 37 unions to form the Transport and General

Workers Union with its 1,300,000 members and reserves of £6,000,000, using the same techniques as those of the negotiators of mergers in the financial world of trust and combines. Was it worth it? Ask the dockers to-day their opinion of the union and its present secretary. Having made the T. & G.W.U., Bevin became its secretary and held the job from 1921 until 1940 when Winston Churchill appointed him to the Ministry of Labour. There he exercised his dictatorial powers so successfully that, the official historians tell us, Britain was more completely mobilised for war than any country in the world. Where has it got us?

The rise to power of Ernest Bevin symbolises that victory of "realism" over principle that is inevitable in a political movement as it approaches the chance of actually taking office. The famous incident at the Margate Conference in 1935 when he ousted George Lansbury from the leadership of the party, telling him that the party could not afford the luxury of wearing its conscience on its sleeve, epitomises this transition. In each of the three phases of his political career Bevin was convinced that he was working for the benefit of his class. His steamroller tactics with the left-wing, his bitter complaints of being "stabbed in the back", the continuous activity which undoubtedly hastened his death—all this he thought was furthering the interests of the workers. But, in fact, the mammoth union organisation which he built is merely a hindrance to those whose aim is economic freedom, his tenure of the Ministry of Labour laid the foundations for a totalitarian Britain, and his conduct of foreign affairs has served only to hasten and intensify the struggle between the rival imperialisms of east and west. These are the fruits of political "realism". C.W.

DOCKERS TRIAL: A Try-On

THE trial of the seven dockers at the Old Bailey ended in anti-climax. The dockers have been released and it is easy to claim a victory for the workers, for trades unionism or for British freedom (the *Daily Worker* modestly claims it as a victory for the *Daily Worker*), but sober consideration forces one to the conclusion that, although for the seven men themselves the result is very satisfactory, the legal ending is a stalemate.

Not that the trial has proved nothing. The vagueness of such regulations as 1305 has been demonstrated, the unrepresentative nature of trade union leadership has been exposed, the readiness of the Labour Government to use repressive legislation has been—once again—clearly shown, and the ease with which the best-laid plans of a clever lawyer can be upset by an ordinary jury has been asserted.

From the point of view of the Government, the trial has been a mistake from beginning to end. They have gained nothing and have lost a great deal. As a trial of strength—the only feasible reason, it seemed at the beginning for launching the action—it has been a flop, and militancy among the workers has had its biggest advertisement and encouragement for years. The solidarity expressed by the dockers, about 10,000 of whom in London alone stopped work on nine different occasions in token protest strikes, has set an example and inspiration to militants everywhere.

Why Prosecute Now?

We have already, in our issue of February 17th, described all the background to the strikes which led up to the prosecution, and the police methods used in snooping at dockers' meetings, obstructing pickets, and the strong-arm squad which turned up at the White Hart to arrest the men.

On looking back over these events and the whole conduct of the trial by the

THE CHARGES

The three alternative counts on which the men were charged are:

1 Between October 5, 1950 and February 8 this year they conspired together and with Christopher Kelly and other persons unknown to induce dock workers to take part in strikes in connection with trade disputes contrary to the provisions of Article 4 of the Conditions of Employment National Arbitration Order, 1949.

2 Between the same dates, otherwise than in contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute, conspired together with Christopher Kelly and other persons unknown to induce dock workers employed under, and in accordance with, the Dock Regulations Employment Order to absent themselves from their said employment without the consent of their employers before the terms of the contract for employment were completed.

3 Between the same dates, otherwise than in contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute, conspired together with Christopher Kelly and with other persons unknown without justification or excuse, to obstruct the employers of dock workers in the conduct of their business by inducing dock workers employed under, and in accordance with, the provisions of the Dock Employment Regulations to absent themselves from their said employment without the consent of their said employers and before the terms of their employment were completed, to the great damage to the said employers.

THE VERDICT

The jury were unable to arrive at a decision on count 1.

On count 2 they found the dockers "Guilty".

On their announcing this decision, the judge discharged the jury from considering further count 3.

* i.e., Regulation 1305.

Attorney-General, Sir Hartley Shawcross, it has become clear that it was a deliberate attempt at intimidation in order to establish Regulation 1305, which, although it had been on the Statute books for eleven years, had never been severely tested—simply because it had not been necessary before.

Since 1305 was quietly made law—for remember that it is not a law passed by Parliament in the full light of public debate, but a Defence Regulation passed in wartime by a State Department—hundreds of thousands of workers in every conceivable trade have engaged in unofficial strikes. If, as Shawcross attempted to prove, this was illegal, why has the State allowed these masses of workers to flout the law? Why should they suddenly, last November, prosecute striking gas workers, and this year, attack the dockers?

The answer is clearly one involving political and economic expediency. The "luxury", as some journalists have called it, of strike action can no longer be

allowed the workers, and in order to win back their lost middle-class support the Labour Government must show "the nation as a whole" that they can control the workers and not be controlled by them.

Rank-and-File Action

There is another reason. The Government and the trades unions have every reason to be alarmed at the rank-and-file movements now being created by workers dissatisfied with the trade union leadership. The sell-out by such figures as Arthur Deakin has been so blatant that the most ardent trade unionist is made painfully aware of the gulf that lies between his interests and those of his accredited representatives. The most significant and important move from the working-class viewpoint that we have seen for many years—one might almost say since the General Strike of 1926 has been the emergence of these rank-and-file committees, and the unofficial action from which they spring.

And of these committees, the most important and vocal so far have been the Port Workers' Committees on Merseyside and in London. Therein lies the reason for the Government's prosecution of the dockers and for the vicious nature of Shawcross's attack in court. Accusing the men of lies, blackmail, cajolery and "sickening sentimentality" (references by the men in their speeches to their wives and children), Shawcross attempted to cover up the poverty of his case by cheap abuse. Knowing so well the petty-bourgeois nature of the average jury, the Attorney-General made great play of terroristic clichés—of the men's intention to "strangle the nation" and so forth. The jury, it seems, were not at all convinced.

Case for the Defence

The defence, on the other hand was most restrained in approach, while remaining forceful and telling. We do not often have occasion to praise lawyers, but the Counsel for the Defence of the Birkenhead men, Miss Rose Heilbron, K.C., deserves nothing but praise for her final speech for the Defence. Lasting nearly three hours, she systematically destroyed the case for the prosecution while not compromising or apologising for one sentence from any of the many speeches quoted from the seven accused. The line the Defence took was that no dispute with the employers existed, the conflict being between the workers and the union. She pointed out how the Prosecution was out to get the men one way or another—that the first count applied if there was a trade dispute and if there was not—counts two and three were there to net the defendants.

Counsel for the London men, Mr. Roy Wilson, was content to underline most of Miss Heilbron's points, but showed

➔ TO PAGE FOUR

★ We Start Next Week!

THIS issue of "Freedom" marks a special occasion: it is the last number that will bear the sub-title "Anarchist Fortnightly", for as already announced the next issue will appear next week, date-lined May 5th, and will be the first issue of "Freedom" with the sub-title "The Anarchist Weekly".

In a country in which there are some 150 dailies and 5,000 local papers, weeklies, etc., this event will hardly be noticed. But we hope this will not deter those comrades and friends who share our view that every effort, however small it may at first appear in comparison with the mass-produced attempts to stifle independent thinking, is worth while will, during these coming months, redouble their efforts to introduce

"Freedom" to a wider public, thereby both ensuring the financial stability of the paper, as well as spreading anarchist ideas.

REVISED SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Owing to an increase of 50% in printed paper postal rates next month, we are obliged to revise "Freedom's" subscription rates to the following:

52 issues (1 year) 17/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)
26 issues (6 months) 8/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)
13 issues (3 months) 4/6 (U.S.A. \$0.75)

Elsewhere we announce a special offer of a fifteen-shilling cloth bound book to all new readers and to those who renew their subscriptions for a further year. We hope comrades will take advantage of this offer to secure new readers to "Freedom".

(continued on p. 4, col. 5)

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP
FOR AN INTERNATIONAL
AGAINST WAR

MAY DAY MEETING

at the
HOLBORN HALL

on
TUESDAY, 1st MAY, at 7.30 p.m.

Speakers:

MAT KAVANAGH. PHILIP SANSON
RITA MILTON ALBERT MELTZER

Chairman: JACK RUBIN.

Questions

Discussion

PIONEERS OF EDUCATION—6.

A MORE recent influence upon progressive education is that of Dr. Maria Montessori, who, at the age of 80, is still doing valuable work in her native Italy. In 1945, *Freedom* reported her release from internment in India, which she had suffered since 1940. Six years earlier, Mussolini had closed all the Montessori schools in Italy because of Dr. Maria's pacifist views. Since then she had worked abroad. Arriving in India at the outbreak of war she was interned by the British Government when Italy joined in. During her internment she conducted courses at Ahmedabad and trained about a thousand Indians in her system. After her release she returned to Italy where a few months ago she celebrated her eightieth birthday by lecturing at Perugia University.

It was from Rome that she started her career. After studying mathematics in order to become an engineer, she saw a beggar in the streets of Ancona, her native town, and determined to be a doctor. At the university of Rome in 1894 she became the first woman in all Italy to graduate in medicine. Specialising in the treatment of defective children, she became interested in the mentally defective after working in a psychiatric clinic. Here she came to the conclusion that they needed some form of education even more than medical treatment. A profound influence upon her at this time were the discoveries of the French physician, Dr.

Ségur, who it seemed had discovered the secret of the education of idiots, and following up his work she achieved remarkable results. She taught these children so successfully that they were able to pass the State examination in reading and writing at the same age as normal children.

Tenement Schools

For two years she ran a school for such children, working in it herself and training teachers at the same time. Her experience at this work led her to the belief that the methods which she had found most successful in dealing with feeble-minded children would be quite applicable to those who were normal and that ordinary schools needed just the kind of transformation which she had accomplished in her own special school.

At last there occurred an opportunity of putting her theories to the test. An association, which had been formed to deal with the housing problem in the more squalid parts of Rome, acquired tenements which were rebuilt on model lines and administered solely in the interests of the occupier. The care of these reconstructed tenements was given entirely to the tenants and the scheme worked perfectly except for the children. The young children under school age, left to themselves all day while their parents worked, caused a lot of damage to the property. So the association decided to gather to-

MARIA MONTESSORI (b. 1870)

gether in a large room all the little ones between the ages of three and seven belonging to the families living in the tenement house.

So came to be instituted the school in a tenement. It was thus a social need that brought about the institution of a new educational agency and it is a little ironic to think that a system of education originated for the children of the poor became for a time in its expatriation, a system reserved almost exclusively for the children of the rich. Dr. Montessori was invited to co-operate in the scheme and in 1906 was entrusted with the organisation of the schools in all the model tenements in Rome.

Training of the Senses

The method of education she adopted was determined by her training and previous experience and its success was due to the fact that she was dealing with normal children who were at a corresponding stage of development to that of the deficient. She came to the conclusion that the basis of all education is right training of the muscular system and the senses. Eventually she discovered that this is best effected by a carefully arranged sequence of exercises, with specially prepared didactic material, which should be carried through at the individual learner's own pace. In the training of the senses, Montessori believed in

isolating the sense wherever that is possible. It was suggested obviously by her experience in the education of mentally and physically defective children and possibly also by the striking success of the methods used by people like Laura Bridgman and Helen Keller. Actual exercises were given blind-fold and auditory exercises not only in silence but in darkness.

With the application of the method to normal children came several discoveries of considerable importance for the subsequent evolution of the method. One was that, given the right conditions, children were capable of a deep concentration of attention. She watched children who were completely wrapped up in a self-chosen task working endlessly with complete absorption and entirely unaffected by external distractions. She came to the conclusion that every activity which satisfies a need of the child's nature and comes at the right psychological moment, produces such a concentration. Henceforward she sought to define by actual trial the most helpful stimuli and their proper sequence and her test was the power of evoking this deeply satisfying response. In a Montessori school we may find a pupil working unremittingly at a self-imposed task for several days on end.

Auto-education

Like Ferrer, Montessori abolished both prizes and punishments. Such correction as is admitted comes from the material and not from the teacher. The didactic material contains within itself the control of errors, making auto-education possible to each child. This is the discipline of consequences of Rousseau, in which the child should meet with no obstacles other than the physical.

With this was connected the idea of freedom as a necessary condition of healthy mental growth. Montessori encountered a great deal of opposition from advocates of more orthodox methods who regarded her system as destructive of discipline. Her method was, as she said, "established upon one fundamental base, the liberty of the pupils in their spontaneous manifestations". In contrast to the schools where she saw "the children like butterflies mounted on pins fastened each to his place the desk", was her own school where "there are forty little beings from three to seven years old each one intent on his own work; one is going through one of the exercises for the senses, one is doing an arithmetical exercise, one is handling the letters, one is drawing, one is fastening and unfastening the

pieces of cloth on one of the wooden frames, still another is dusting. Some are seated at the tables, some on rugs on the floor".

The child is free to grow up in his own way and is not spoiled by the moulding process which so often happens in the ordinary system of education when grown-ups try to force children into their ways of life without regard to the children's own. Montessori finally came to see this tendency of the adult as an actual conflict with the child. "This is the conflict," she says, in her pamphlet *Peace Education*, "between the adult and the child, between the strong and the weak, we may even add between the blind and the seeing. The adult, in his dealings with the child, is indeed blind and the child is indeed a seer: he brings us the gift of a little flame to enlighten us. The adult and the child are engaged in an age-long warfare more acute than ever to-day because of our complex and depressing civilisation, a war between parents and children, between teachers and children. When the independent life of the child is not recognised with its own characteristics and its own ends, when the adult man interprets these characteristics and ends, which are different from his, as being errors in the child which he must make speed to correct, there arises between the strong and the weak a struggle which is fatal to mankind."

Exercises in Practical Life

One of the first talks in a Montessori school is to teach the children to take care of themselves. This, Montessori claims, is a training in liberty; for freedom does not consist in having others at one's command to perform the ordinary services but in being able to do these for oneself, in being independent of others. The children are taught from the earliest days to wash their hands, brush their hair, clean their teeth and otherwise care for their bodily and personal needs. The schoolroom is kept in order by the children themselves and even the serving of the school lunch is largely the work of the children. Exercises are also arranged on special apparatus to train the child in the movements necessary in dressing and undressing. In this connection, Dr. Montessori has always stressed that to the child the act of dressing is incomparably more important than the state of being dressed, the filling of a bucket with sand infinitely more satisfying than the possession of a full pail.

(Continued on page 3)

Anarchism and Organisation

I

MAY I express some perplexities about *Germinal's* essay on organization? (*Freedom*, 17/2/51).

It does not seem to me very illuminating to quote so large a definition as that of Alexander Berkman, "Organization is everything and everything is organization." Nor even to start from the platitudes of an ordinary dictionary, "To organize means to give a definite structure; to get up, arrange, put into working order." If we want to be clear and precise, to organize signifies to build or create an organism, i.e., a new unity whose elements cease to be individual beings (or objects) and become the organs of a whole.

For instance, when individual bricks cease to be autonomous, and become the functional elements of a wall, they may be called organized bricks, and the wall may be styled a brick-laid organization.

The same thing applies to living cells, or to the living units that constitute a polyp; and also to the half-nervous and half-mechanical structure of those great complexes of steel, concrete, paper and human flesh called a battalion, an army, a bank, a factory, a railway and so on.

Anarchists generally agree with the idea of building organisms with such passive elements as bricks, stones, steel, tubes, words, forms, colours, and the like. They have no objection to organize such elements for human purposes, i.e., to make them the functional part or organs of a house, an engine, a poem, a picture. . . . But they generally object to the idea of being organized into something inhuman or superhuman. They don't like to be mingled into a transcendent unity (for instance, a Church, a Nation, a Party, a Tribe, a Family, a Gang), whose constituent elements are reduced to ephemeral and unimportant cells, localised and hierarchised inside an immortal, permanent, divine organization.

Nor do they admit for themselves the right or duty of organizing other people. For them the human being is in itself, or at least potentially, the highest and most perfect of all organisms. The structure of an intelligent animal is probably a

million times more complex than the structure of the best Party, Church, State or industrial corporation. Biologically, the human individual acts, reacts, behaves at least as a higher vertebrate; the super-human monster acts, reacts, and behaves at best as a polyp, or hydra or jelly-fish of terrible proportions.

But what about self-organization? Self-organization is just voluntary organization, as suicide is voluntary death. You understand that, for me, the great question is not whether organization is voluntary or not, but whether it is degrading or not. Servitude is voluntary degradation. Perversity, according to Edgar Allan Poe's genial statement, is voluntary evil-doing to oneself—even when aggressiveness is apparently directed against others.

The great question is whether organization means humanization or dehumanization. "A virtuous and reasonable person" (as Godwin would put it), is psychologically an organism of the highest order. Let him associate with his equals, let him make contracts with them. But if he merges into a social body and becomes a permanent organ of it, he is nothing more, as such, than the pseudopod of an amoeba! This I call degradation.

For my part, I don't like the word organize to be applied to persons. I prefer to associate myself with other individuals in a federative way, i.e., a way which respects the larger part of my autonomy.

Paris. A.P.

2

D.P.'s letter (*Freedom*, 17/3/51) indicates that he (or she) has a shallow acquaintance with not only anarchist ideas, but also socialist thought in general.

He states that nature does not recognise equality. I was not aware that that somewhat mysterious thing 'nature' had the faculty of recognition. I was not dealing with nature; but with human society which very often finds it necessary to oppose nature and is furthermore arranged, partially at least, by the conscious effort of its members as opposed to the lower forms of life activity. Thus equality in my article I meant equality of social organisation, not of 'nature'. In any case his contentions are demonstrated illogical by the very example he uses—"I have not the same capacity for mathematical problems as Professor Einstein, therefore we are not equal." By what standard does he judge Einstein's superiority to him? When I wrote of equality in my article I meant equality with regard to the means of life and to liberty of actions, not intellectual or physical equality. In any case why should he consider Einstein superior? Einstein may be capable of formulating abstract mathematical formulae, but he would be in a queer position without those of his fellow members of society who, whilst not possessing the same capacity for mathematical problems as an Einstein, nevertheless possess the capacity (which Einstein may not) for understanding the processes of agriculture. There seems to be some sense in Berkman's statement that all part of a healthy organism (which would seem to rule out tonsillitis, does it not?) are equally valuable, after all.

D.P. has not apparently grasped that production to-day is social production. The designer in a motor factory would be valueless to the community without the mechanics capable of understanding and carrying out his designs (and of testing them in practice). One has only to consider the ideas of past thinkers (flying machines and submarines) who were unable to test them in practice because the means had not then been developed, to

realise this. Social production implies the equal value of all to the actual process of production.

D.P. cites that part of my quotation from Berkman which reads: "In the healthy organism all parts are equally valuable". He does not, however, cite the rest of this sentence which reads: ". . . and none is discriminated against". In this phrase is contained the key to the understanding of the concept of social equality, i.e., that each individual should have free access to the means of life without regard to his contribution to those means. That because he is a crossing sweeper from the Bronx, it does not follow that he should be forced to remain in the tenements whilst Einstein has the privilege of relaxing in his comfortable house. From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs. To quote Berkman once again:

"Do not make the mistake of identifying equality in liberty with the forced equality of the convict camp. True anarchist equality implies freedom, not quantity. It does not mean that everyone must eat, drink, or wear the same things, do the same work, or live in the same manner. Far from it; the very reverse, in fact.

"Individual needs and tastes differ, as appetites differ. It is equal opportunity to satisfy them that constitutes true equality."

(*ABC of Anarchism*, p. 36)

Equality in an anarchist society would mean that one section of its members would not be discriminated against in favour of another section, usually a minority, because they happen to be members of a class or caste that control the means of wealth and by virtue of that control receives a preferential share in the distribution of the products of these means. It would in fact be classless—the necessary prerequisite to social equality.

Now for this question of authority. D.P. claims that anarchists 'shie' away from this word and thus reveal a great weakness in their thought. We 'shie' away from this word precisely because in social philosophy it is invariably used to signify the existence in society of a man or (more usually) a body of men possessing the power (authority) to compel obedience to his or their wishes—government. He states that no organisation is possible without some form of authority, yet he also states that all must have the right to walk out of any project with which they do not agree, "for only so can an organisation be voluntary". So it would seem that he, too, thinks it possible to dispense with that authority which implies power to compel obedience to decisions—coercive authority, if one prefers that term—the authority that we argue against.

When anarchists talk of the negation of authority they mean the abolition of the coercive authority of one man over another. Under anarchy we envisage that the function of the technician, that D.P. seems to consider so valuable, would be a purely advisory one. He would be consulted with regard to that process of production he specialised in but he would not be able to dictate what actually is to be done. (That is in his position as a specialist. As a member of the production unit he would have the right with everyone else concerned to equal participation in decisions affecting him).

Anarchism implies the delegation of functions, not of authority. Individuals would be delegated to the function of working out the details of projects already decided upon in general by those concerned; they would not be given the authority to enforce their decisions, the implementation of which would depend on the free agreement of all concerned.

S. E. PARKER (*Germinal*).

RECENT AND FORTHCOMING BOOKS

TWO important novels with Soviet Communism as their background are *The Case of Comrade Tulayer*, by Victor Serge (Hamish Hamilton, 12/6), completed shortly before the author's death in Mexico in 1942 (see note on Serge in *Freedom* for 28/2/48), and Arthur Koestler's *The Age of Longing* (Collins, 12/6) which is set in Paris in the near future. A factual book of similar interest is Z. Stypulkowski's *Invitation to Moscow* (Thames and Hudson, 15/-), the story of a Polish socialist who was the sole defendant to plead not guilty at one of the Moscow trials.

Paul Blanchard's *Freedom and Catholic Power* (Secker and Warburg, 16/-) is an exposure of the political rôle of the Catholic Church in the United States. It can be usefully read in conjunction with *The Catholic Church Against the 20th Century*, by Avro Manhattan, of which a cheap edition was published last year (Watts, 5/-).

The Turnstile Press have just published Mark Holloway's *Heavens on Earth*, a study of Utopian communities in America from 1680 to 1880.

Three years ago a volume was published of selections from a classic of Victorian sociology, Mayhew's *London Labour and the London Poor* (see *Freedom*, 6/8/48). A further selection has now been made by Peter Quennell from Vol. IV of Mayhew's work, with the title *London's Underworld* (William Kimber, 18/-).

Charles Humana will be known to our readers as a contributor to these pages. His novel, *The House and the Fort*, will appear this Spring from the Hogarth Press.

Enthusiasts for *The Marx Brothers*, those anarchists of the screen, will welcome the biography of them by Kyle Crichton, published by Heinemann.

Warrior Without Weapons (Cape, 12/6) is a book of reminiscences of Abyssinia, Spain and Germany by Marcel Junod, organiser of the International Red Cross from 1935 till 1946.

A collection has been made of Graham Greene's essays from various magazines and reviews under the title *The Lost Childhood* (Eyre & Spottiswoode, 12/6). Those who heard Mr. Jack Isaacs' broad-

cast talks on *Twentieth Century Literature* last autumn will be pleased to hear that they are to be published next month (Secker & Warburg, 8/6). The second of these talks, apart from its literary significance, was a masterly condemnation of contemporary society.

Michael Graham has written "a discussion of the basic needs of men and women which society ought to fulfil, yet often, with disastrous results, frustrates." His book, *Human Needs*, is published by the Cresset Press at 15/-.

Zero, the story of terrorism, by Robert Payne (Wingate, 12/6), is described by the publishers as "a dispassionate account of the history of the dread philosophy. . ." Mr. Payne, in his dispassionate way, tells us (in capitals): "There must be war to the death against Nihilism."

Messrs. Basil Blackwell are publishing, at 42/-, *Strikes* by K. G. J. Knowles, who attempts to give us an understanding of the nature and mechanism of strikes.

A number of biographies of pioneers of political socialism are in preparation. Ian MacKay of the *News Chronicle* is writing a book about Ben Tillett, and Mr. Roger Morel is preparing one on E. D. Morel, while Raymond Postgate's 140,000-word *Life of George Lansbury* will appear in the autumn. Jonathan Cape will publish C. V. Wedgwood's *The Last of the Radicals*, a biography of Josiah C. Wedgwood, and there appeared recently *Robert Blatchford* by Laurence Thomson (Gollancz, 16/-).

The exiled Russian novelist, Ivan Bunin, now eighty years old, has written his *Memories and Portraits* (John Lehmann, 12/6) which includes studies of Leo Tolstoy, Chekhov, Gorki, Chaliapin, Alexei Tolstoy, Rachmaninov and Peter Kropotkin. Augustus John's autobiography, appropriately called *Many-Coloured Life* will be published by Jonathan Cape.

The new Freedom Press publications are Herbert Read's *Art and the Evolution of Man* (4/-), and Tony Gibson's *Youth for Freedom*. Both are described in the Freedom Press list of publications which is now available. The publishing plans of the Marie Louise Berneri Memorial Committee were described in the last issue of *Freedom*.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

WORKS BY WILHELM REICH

The Sexual Revolution 25/-
The Function of the Orgasm 45/-
Character Analysis 35/-
The Mass-Psychology of Fascism 37/6

★

The Accumulation of Capital
Rosa Luxemburg 35/-
The Shadow of the Gallows
Lord Templewood 8/6
The Case of Comrade Tuleyev
Victor Serge 12/6

The Age of Longing
Arthur Koestler 12/6

The House and the Fort
Charles Humana 9/6

Heavens on Earth Mark Holloway 15/-
(Utopian Communities in
America, 1680-1880)

★

Journal of Sex Education
Feb.-March 2/-
April-May 2/-

Please add for postage

Obtainable from
27 red lion st, london,
W.C.1

The Legacy of Franklin Roosevelt

AS a reformer and idealist, Franklin D. Roosevelt inspired personal sympathy and obtained the reputation of a sensitive, intelligent and well-meaning person. But the future student of the Second World War, approaching facts without prejudice or passion, from the side of general human interests, will probably describe the smiling President as the most nefarious man of his epoch.

I can't help thinking that he was scared of his failure and died in despair, like his democratic forerunner Woodrow Wilson. His fall, it seems, was pretty well the same. Being an idealist, he viewed the Second World War as one between Heaven and Hell and wanted to do his utmost on the side of the good ones. Being the leader of the first political and industrial power of the world, he managed to throw his people into the war, instead of stopping the war, as he had power to do.

F.D.R. wanted the unconditional surrender of Hell, without knowing that this would mean the end of the world.

Everybody acquainted with international affairs knows that since the end of December, 1942, the Axis played a losing part, and that American intervention was admitted to be the decisive factor by every *realpolitiker* of Germany, Italy and Japan.

To drop the Fascist adventure and to make peace on decent or even uncomfortable terms, was the well-known if not openly avowed desire of the military, naval, diplomatic, financial, industrial, professional, dynastic and bureaucratic circles of Rome, Berlin, Tokio, Madrid, etc. Roosevelt could not ignore it.

He was offered by the Japanese government the military evacuation of China, the denunciation of the Axis treaties and the support of the Japanese army, navy and air force in the Occident. He knew that the defection of Japan and the menace of American intervention on the side of Great Britain would have caused the immediate collapse of the Mussolini régime in Italy with fatal consequences for the Franco and Petain-Laval governments too. He knew that in case of such a crisis, the anti-Nazi elements of the Wehrmacht were prepared to hang or shoot the Hitler clique as soon as they could see the possibility of general negotiations with the Anglo-Saxons on the basis of a territorial *statu quo ante bellum*, or even return to the borders of 1935. The only thing to do was to accept the Japanese offers and the progressive disintegration of the totalitarian powers would occur.

This would have saved F.D.R. a great deal of trouble: Pearl Harbour, the disasters leading to the definitive loss of prestige of the white man in the East,

and its infinite consequences. This would have saved English and German towns from total war, Hiroshima and Nagasaki, thirty millions dead, innumerable ruins and sufferings in France, Italy, Greece and practically in the whole world.

A "white" peace, a peace of equilibrium, could have saved European civilisation.

It would have prevented the dropping of the Iron Curtain on the Balkan and Danubian countries and the annexation of east Europe to Asia.

The balance of power would have been secured between German and Russian forces on the Curzon lines, and between the Japanese and Chinese forces on the borderlines of Korea and Manchuria.

Of course, no utopian paradise would have been brought into existence. Conservative, even reactionary governments would have been put in office, but the basic civil liberties would have been restored, and the totalitarian demagogues exploded. Peace would have been possible for the present generation and the next one. The breakdown of a national-socialist dictatorship would have been proved a simple, *internal* affair. The field for free and tolerant thought would have been ploughed. The failure of any government to enjoy the glory and injustice of Victory would have been a fact.

But Roosevelt wanted to have it his own way: undisputable triumph of the good angels—unconditional surrender of evil!

In order to obtain that result, it was necessary to bring the American Democracy into totalitarian war against Germany. But the common people of the States were not prepared to make such war on a civilised people from which a considerable part of their own stock originated. They did not understand the necessity of political extermination between lily-white persons of Christian creed and very high standards, for the sake of a handful of Jews, slaves and Negroes. Their idea of war was very near to F.D.R.'s biblical idea, but still nearer to comic strip stories. Enemies ought to be treacherous mongrels, lustful

villains, cowardly and satanic multitudes of ugly monkeys, facing the righteous, invulnerable supermen of 100% American breed, armed with American super-weapons and protected by the American standards of morals, virtue, efficiency, Christianity and chivalry. The women's clubs of Middletown agreed only with that sort of war, and the women's clubs of Middletown are the decisive element of public opinion in any democratic country.

GOD'S CHOSEN PEOPLE (New Version)

PRESIDENT Truman, laying the cornerstone of a Presbyterian church in Washington, said that he felt God had created America to help preserve peace in the world.

"It is given to us to defend the spiritual values—the moral code—against the vast forces of evil that seek to destroy them.

"Without a firm moral foundation, freedom degenerates quickly into selfishness and licence," President Truman said. "Unless men exercise their freedom in a just and honest way, within moral restraint, a free society can degenerate into anarchy. Then there will be freedom only for the rapacious and those who are stronger and more unscrupulous than the rank and file of the people.

If one accepts Mr. Truman's definition of anarchy, then it would appear that the whole world—with perhaps the exception of the Tonga islands and a few other isolated communities and primitive tribes—has gone anarchic. For who can deny that capitalism—state or private—is based on society being divided into the haves and have-nots?

And now to the many queer things attributed to "God" is that of creating America. It is a responsibility which no-one—not even God—should be saddled with.

FRENCH ELECTORAL REFORMS

The French Government at Work

FRENCH "democracy" is a curious system, and most of the political parties have made a curious use of it. If you imagine an unlucky gambler who changes most of the rules so as to be sure of winning, you will get an idea of the electoral cookery which is in progress.

A tradition seems to have grown up, of government by the bloc of centre parties [Radicals and Moderates, Socialists, Christian Democrats (M.R.P.)], while the Gaullist extreme right and the Communist extreme left (*sic*) have been excluded. The game of "representation" in the National Assembly, is such that this procedure is the only possible one, if they want on the one hand to continue the boycott of the Communists, and on the other, to get the majority necessary for the formation of a government. This is what M. Queuille, President of the Council, meant when he said: "We must unite together, or perish together."

"We must unite"—that's fine. Or it would be if that unity could be constructive, but it never is. The Socialists, based on an electorate of state employees want controls, the Radicals and Moderates, based on capital, are resolutely against governmental controls. The Socialists and Radicals are the defenders of secular education, while the M.R.P. demands subsidies for the Church schools. We could multiply examples which show that with the relative strength of the parties in the last few years, it is practically impossible to make a decision without breaking up the government. We could, consequently, complete M. Queuille's declaration thus: "We must unite together . . . that is to say, do nothing." This policy, too, is becoming traditional; it has been given the name *Immobilism*. And this policy (or absence

of policy), is mirrored in the downfall of successive ministries, with, let it be noted, the return of the same men to power.

All this grotesque comedy of impotence has been exploited demagogically by the Communists and the Gaullists, to bring into disrepute the régime which has proved its incapacity in the face of social and economic problems. It follows that if new elections were held to-day under the old electoral law, we would see such a relative strengthening of the opposition that the "democrats" would be in peril. From this observation to the idea of legally "fixing" the coming elections is a very short step. The democratic parties, accustomed to losing face, have quickly taken this step. And the discussion of the proposed changes in the electoral law can be nothing but an anticipatory division of the spoils.

The proposals are based on the system of "alliances", that is to say, the individual lists of candidates (generally those of the Communists and Gaullists), will find themselves faced by a bloc of the parties of the present majority which, if they obtain 50% of the votes, will hold between them all the seats. As an example, assume that the Gaullists in any particular Department, gain 19 1/4% of the votes. If the candidates on the lists of the government bloc win 50%, they will be elected. This is not all—suppose that the Socialist candidates within the government bloc get 5%, they will be elected, while the Gaullists with 19 1/4% get no seats—that is the system. Our example is purely imaginary, but by no means impossible.

But it is not enough to have raised electoral trickery to the level of a legal institution—it is still necessary to "trick

As a political idealist, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, had to make a totalitarian war for the unconditional surrender of the Germans acceptable to the naive idealists. He soon discovered that the only way was to ignore the Japanese offers and to arrange a good brawl between the treacherous Japs and the American supermen of Middletown, U.S.A.—to begin with.

He had to wage war against the devils of the East, in order to have war with the arch-devil of the West, Adolf Hitler and his host. Instead of Germany and Japan, two blanks on the map! This is the biblical way, the idealist way to get rid of the Evil One.

How dangerous the Japs could be was soon known by the loss of the American fleet in Pearl Harbour, the disaster of Singapore and the yellow "invasion" of an immense area previously ruled by the White Men.

Three years of struggle were necessary to bring again the "monkeys" to their starting position, and to obtain the nearly unconditional surrender. It must be added that the diplomatic surrender of Japan was already a fact when Truman, Roosevelt's best disciple, ordered the atomic bomb to be dropped on innocent Japanese populations. The result was a sentiment of universal horror against the States and the occupation of Manchuria by the Russians.

As for Germany, unconditional surrender politics encouraged the desperate German people to stand with the Führer up to the bloody end of Berlin. But the refusal of any terms of capitulation proposed by the Wehrmacht generals to the western powers only secured the military triumph of the Red Army in Europe. Roosevelt at Yalta did not see in Stalin another Hitler, but a good arch-angel of the Divine Host. The result was that, instead of being stopped by German forces on the German frontiers, 250 divisions of Generalissimo Stalin—fully equipped with Russian, German and American material—became the only existing forces in Europe (and practically in the whole world, after the rapid reconversion of American industry

and the dispersal of the war material. American people are homesick wherever they go and no amount of material comfort brought from home can make up for the absence of the spiritual "American way of living" in other countries. It is not so with the Russians. They seem to prefer the most devastated place of occupation to their native paradise, and wherever they go, they only feel anxious to go farther. The reason why they did not occupy Frankfurt, Brussels, Amsterdam, Copenhagen, Stockholm, Paris, London, Dublin, Rome, etc., is still unknown. Perhaps Stalin feared for his men in the corrupting influence of real western tradition, our remains of civilian life and the atmosphere of countries with free labour, some butter and no kolkhozes. (Of course, they could have put that right in no time with the help of the Communist Parties!) But the fact is that they stopped at Prague.

To-day, one half of the world is engaged anew into an immense effort of re-arming, and with no other purpose than to recover, at the probable cost of a new catastrophe during the next twenty years, the geopolitical positions that President Roosevelt could have won, without a shot, by ending the Second World War three years sooner.

ANDRE PRUNIER.

Editors Comment:

WE find our correspondent's point of view most interesting. His analysis of Roosevelt's motives is probably correct, but we think that his picture of the situation if F.D.R. had not regarded himself as God's lieutenant, is overdrawn. Would the conflict of rival imperialisms really have resolved itself so simply? What the article does illustrate is the fantastic irresponsibility and capriciousness of political leaders. The Times Literary Supplement in reviewing Alex Comfort's Authority and Delinquency recently, observed that "it takes a statesman to raise the devil", and concluded that "one is tempted to wonder whether the machinery of government is not the most dangerous of all the machines which man has invented for his own destruction".

One thing that strikes us is that our correspondent's analysis would find support from those American critics of the Roosevelt régime who condemn it for the support it gave to Russia and who now urge the re-arming of Germany and Japan as allies in the fight against a new anti-Christ, Stalin this time. An article by Raymond Moley in Newsweek (18/12/50) entitled "Army Japan Now," says: The creation of a Japanese army is a matter so obviously in the interest of the United States and the free world that the average rational person might wonder why it has been so long neglected."

And an American bankers' paper, the Monetary Times (Nov. 1949) said: "peace suits U.S.S.R. too well. Russia will not start a war. We shall have to start it, by creating an incident, somewhere—perhaps in Berlin . . ."

If Franklin D. Roosevelt thought he had a divine mission, Harry S. Truman believes that God created America to rid the world of Communism. And, of course, Joseph V. Stalin is so convinced of his historic task that he does not even need to invoke God. The question is: how much longer will the peoples of all countries surrender their lives to these self-appointed Messiahs?—Eds.

MARIA MONTESSORI

(Continued from page 2)

When the sense of training of early childhood is nearing an end, the Montessori pupils turn to reading and writing by methods developing out of their previous exercises. And then is seen a new phenomenon, the "explosion" into reading and writing when the children plodding along the path marked out for them suddenly find themselves with these wonderful abilities. The description, in *The Montessori Method*, of this phenomenon taking place in her own school when what has been called a pedagogical Pentecost possessed the children, makes some of the most moving and exciting reading in the whole of educational literature.

Her Books

One wonders what Montessori would think of some of the contemporary progressive schools. She would almost certainly be shocked by Summerhill. Yet what a lot they all owe to her and what a lot their teachers could still learn from her. The four most important books which sum up her work are *The Montessori Method*, *The Advanced Montessori Method*, *Pedagogical Anthropology* and *Dr. Montessori's Own Handbook*. There is much, of course, with which many readers of *Freedom* would disagree. That they would disagree violently is not surprising when one discovers that Montessori is a Roman Catholic. Religious teaching was not stressed in her earlier books, but she more than made up for it later with *The Child in the Church*, which she subtitled, "Essays on the religious education of children and the training of character," and especially with *The Mass Explained to Children*, which could be a highly dangerous book if in fact any children ever see it.

It would be unwise, however, for anyone interested in the freedom schools to try to dismiss this genius of education because of her religion or because of any limitations in her method. But it is impossible for anyone to dismiss Montessori, and it was State school inspector, Dr. Ballard, who said that her system "revolutionised the work of the infant schools in a dozen years". Her memorial will not be the pure Montessori schools which are now to be found in every part of the world but the fact that her inspiration and influence have coloured every aspect of work among young children everywhere bringing light and joy into the dark and desolate places.

TOM EARLEY.

Plight of Refugees in W. Germany

WHILE the famine in India provides a dramatic example of the failure of the modern world to solve the most basic of all problems of human existence—that of adequate food supply—an appalling situation has developed for millions in Europe also.

In Hanover recently, the International Red Cross held a conference to discuss the plight of ten million refugees in Western Germany. A member of the Federal German Ministry for Refugees, Herr Middelmann, said that a deterioration in living conditions was inevitable for these people if measures of relief were not effectively instituted at once. At least 900,000, he said, were exposed to "the dangers of complete deterioration through neglect. According to the *Manchester Guardian*, "five hundred thousand of these lived in dilapidated and isolated camps where a normal existence was impossible. The remaining four hundred thousand live in complete families in crowded and unwholesome quarters."

Relief measures suggested suffer from the usual disadvantages. To deal with

the matter radically would require that the established economic procedures of capitalism be completely cut across. Radical measures are therefore, in the present political, social and economic contexts, "unrealistic". "Realistic measures", are those which "take into account"—that is, respect—current capitalist procedures; inevitably they are hopelessly mean-spirited, wholly inadequate, and mostly ineffectual. Their chief use is to lull the public conscience and the public indignation into the comforting feeling that "something is being done for these poor people". In the era of the Welfare State, relief measures are still largely a matter of uneasy conscience; it requires a revolutionary attitude and a revolutionary procedure to achieve a radical attack on such problems in a way that utilises to anything like the full extent the scientific means at hand and the experience already available. At present practical relief measures are hamstrung by the old economic and social structures—which are, of course, also largely the cause of the evils to be cured.

the tricksters", if we can express it thus. For it has been found that in two Departments—*Seine* and *Seine et Oise*, the Gaullists would still stand to win the election and in their turn, to benefit from the swindle. For this reason *Seine* and *Seine et Oise* will not be included in the system of alliances. Finally, to complete the cookery, it has been decided to split the Department of *Gironde* into two.

We have, accordingly, reached a purely arbitrary régime which does not even take the trouble to disguise itself under the veil of democratic purity. The proposals have not yet been definitely adopted, but probably will be, by a small majority, to a background of haggling of shameless bargaining and political blackmail. This in France to-day is known as "government".

RENÉ MICHEL.

On the Cold War Fronts

• WEST LEAD IN STEEL RACE

According to the quarterly bulletin of the United Nations' Economic Commission for Europe published in Geneva last month, the Western countries produced 136,670,000 tons of crude steel in 1950, compared with 32,288,000 tons by Russia and her five steel-producing satellites. Of the Western total the United States produced 87,723,000 tons and Western Europe 51,947,000 tons.

In spite of the fact that it is stated in Moscow that Russia's steel production for 1950 exceeds the five-year plan target figure fixed in 1946, by some two million tons, the shortage of steel is such that the collection of iron scrap in Russia has now been elevated to "A Task of Great State Importance".

• RUSSIAN COAL PRODUCTION EXCEEDS BRITAIN'S

Actually the five-year plan was completed in the best Stalinist tradition in four years and three months, and among other new records to Russia's credit is that of replacing Britain as the world's second largest coal producer.

The successful plan has been hailed as "a mighty victory for the Soviet people". How monotonous the politicians' slogans can become, and with small variations they are the same throughout the world. And equally meaningless or downright lies!

• MEXICO'S ARMY ON WAR FOOTING

One would have thought they had more useful things to do in Mexico than play at soldiers, but instead the War Ministry announced at the beginning of the month

"a streamlining of the army high command" and that, in the words of the Minister, General Gilberto Limon, Mexico's 2 million regular troops, reservists and National Guardsmen would be readied "by continuous training" for any eventuality.

He went to great trouble to explain that his order to "apply war principles in times of peace" was not the result of present international tension. Who, we wonder, did he expect to believe him?

• EVER-YOUNGER CANNON FODDER IN AUSTRALIA

The Australian Army Minister, Mr. Josiah Francis, announced last month that the government has reduced the minimum enlistment age for the regular army to 17 years. The previous minimum was 18.

• WHO PAYS FOR EGYPT'S ARMAMENT PROGRAMME?

The poor Egyptian fellaheen can go on starving, but there are no shortages when it comes to wasting millions on armaments. Egypt's Defence Minister, Mustafa Nosrat Bey has submitted to the Cabinet a plan to spend £400 millions in five years to equip the Egyptian Army and establish a munitions industry.

• U.S. AND BRITAIN FINANCE YUGOSLAV REARMAMENT

President Truman last week notified Congress that he had authorised the use of \$29 million (£10,357,000) of Government funds to enable Yugoslavia to obtain "critically needed" raw materials for her armed forces. Britain followed suit a few days later with a £4 million credit.

THE ANNUAL CONGRESS OF THE NATIONAL UNION OF STUDENTS Listens but does not Answer the Anarchist Case

(From a correspondent)

LEEDS, April.

IT is always encouraging, in political discussion, to encounter that apparently thoughtful pause which indicates that one's listeners cannot find a suitable answering cliché. It is encouraging because it often leads to the revival, if only temporarily, of rational thought.

This Prolonged Polemical Pause was an interesting feature of the Annual Congress of the National Union of Students (Leeds University, March 29th to April 7th). It was the first post-war student conference—and perhaps the first in N.U.S. history—at which the anarchist point of view has been seriously presented, and the results were remarkable.

We were in the overwhelming minority of three to three hundred, which was a fair match: of the three main aims of Congress, Alcohol, Sex, and Politics, most students are far more interested in the first two, and the party-political boys and girls are always hard put to it to scrape up an original thought between them. Even so, the lack of opposition was surprising. Communists and Conservatives alike were forced on to the defensive; some even claimed us as allies, on the grounds that we stood for "the withering away of the State" or for "freedom of the individual". There were even complaints that we were being unfair by attacking from impregnable positions!

Criticism was generally confused: "But you can't run a modern state without a government"; "You'll never win an election, you know"; "Well, it's all right as an ideal, but . . ."

But . . . no serious opposition! And it was certainly invited . . .

Mr. James Callaghan, M.P., warned that re-arming should not become too great a burden, or there would be "undesirable political reactions." He seemed slightly peeved when it was pointed out that he had given the game away, by implying that re-arming would be intensified unless there were "undesirable political reactions".

Mr. T. Deedes, M.P., speaking on "Peace", claimed to support the Individual against Authority. Asked for his credentials, Mr. Deedes was not prepared to go to such extreme lengths as allowing individuals to "contract out" of conscription.

Mr. Palme Dutt was strong in attack, but made the usual Communist mistake of trying to defend the actions of the Soviet Government. In Russia, it seems, only the masses have freedom: individuals are only ones, and so unimportant. Mr. Dutt was aroused to wrath by criticism of the reactionary Soviet marriage laws and the restriction of information on contraception, and denounced "this desire to impose the bourgeois, decadent, Hollywood-way-of-life on the free (sic) peoples of the Soviet Union."

Meetings and Announcements

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP
OPEN AIR MEETINGS — HYDE PARK
Every Sunday at 3.30 p.m.

Regular Sunday evening meetings will be held in future at 7.30 p.m., at
THE PORCUPINE PUBLIC HOUSE

corner Charing Cross Rd. and Gt. Newport St., next Leicester Square Underground Stn.
APRIL 29th Mat Kavanagh
"THE BATTLE OF SIDNEY STREET"

MAY DAY RALLY
(see displayed advertisement on p. 1)

MAY 6th Tony Gibson
"CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTION—ITS SOCIAL SIGNIFICANCE"

MAY 13th Whitsun—No Meeting
MAY 20th John Hewetson
"IRISH COMMUNE"

MAY 27th Ernest Silverman
"THE MENTAL DEFICIENCY ACT"

NORTH-EAST LONDON GROUP
Discussion Meetings fortnightly, 7.30 p.m.
Enquiries c/o Freedom Press.

MAY 1st Len Watson
"CHRISTIANITY AND CRISES"

SOUTH LONDON LIBERTARIAN DISCUSSION GROUP

Fortnightly meetings, sponsored by the S. London Anarchist Group, are held on alternate Tuesdays, at 7.30 p.m., at the Kentish Drovers Public House, Peckham (corner of High Street and Rye Lane).

MAY 8th Philip Sansom
ANARCHISM TODAY

MAY 12nd S. E. Parker
"ANARCHISM versus SOCIALISM"

GLASGOW ANARCHIST GROUP

OUTDOOR MEETINGS
At MAXWELL STREET
EVERY SUNDAY

with
Frank Leach, John Gaffney, Eddie Shaw,
J. Raeside

Mr. R. W. G. Mackay, M.P., speaking on "World Federal Government", was naive enough to believe (or to expect us to believe!) that its establishment would "eliminate the struggle for power", although his assertion that "it would be impossible to fight against a World Government which controlled all armed forces" has (unfortunately) much truth in it. The State was a power which stepped in to settle disputes, said Mr. Mackay. True, true . . . And if one's dispute is with the State, what then? But Mr. Mackay could not reply.

Mr. Andrew Rothstein gave facts and figures to show the superiority of education in Russia over that in Britain, and how false was Mr. Herbert Morrison's speech in Cambridge on that subject. But Mr. Rothstein gave no statistics on the desirability or otherwise of what Russian education teaches. His attempt to "put over" some invalid inferences by juggling with percentages was duly exposed.

Dr. C. E. M. Joad came along to patronise us with his ideas on Animal Welfare, but, to his annoyance, found himself out-patronised. His equanimity was sadly disturbed by the suggestion that cruelty to animals being largely due to perverted sexual impulses, it was better to change the sexual lives of society than to start Cat's Homes.

Due attention was also given to the Full

Supporting Programme. The National Student Peace Council supporters were bluntly told that pleading for Five-Power Conferences and the like served more to soothe their troubled consciences than to advance the cause of Peace: the most practical action against war was that which the State declared to be illegal. Communists (Peace-Fighters one and all) who wanted to know how Russia could fight a war after campaigning for peace were advised to read Orwell's 1984 and his exposure of Double-Think.

But . . . no opposition! We were not denounced as trouble-makers and potential criminals by the Callaghanies; no Duttites or Rothsteiners emulated the righteous wrath of their leaders; the Deedesans were kindness itself; the Mackaytians could not even summon up a feeble protest against the maligning of their mighty ideal.

So the Pause lasted all week, and the reply never came. Party members remained puzzled and uncertain: what could one say to an anarchist? Some even looked thoughtful. Many colonial students confessed a sneaking sympathy with the anarchist appeal. So until suitable rejoinders to our arguments are hammered out and passed around, the outlook for anarchism in the student world is "Set fair". It wouldn't be surprising if the next Congress saw as much as a 100% increase in our numbers!

SPECIAL FREE OFFER!

To mark the occasion of "Freedom" becoming a weekly journal we are offering to the first thousand new readers who send a year's subscription 17/- (U.S.A. \$3.00), or readers who renew (or extend) their subscription to "Freedom" for a further year (52 issues) a copy of

**"A HUNDRED YEARS OF REVOLUTION
1848 and after"**

Edited by George Woodcock

286 pages

Published at 15s.

FREE OF CHARGE

One can recommend this beautifully produced book if only for John Hewetson's essay on Proudhon, George Woodcock's masterly introduction and the many valuable documents which occupy the second half of the volume.

Make sure that you are one of the 1,000 "Freedom" readers to secure this fifteen shilling book free of charge. And tell your political friends of this special offer to new readers.

DOCKERS STRIKE: A Try-on

FROM PAGE ONE

what is from our point of view the limitation of all lawyers by saying, "We in this country value our system of law. Only by the rule of law can anarchy be prevented and our freedom preserved." Surely the fact that this prosecution could be brought by the law showed that the freedom—of the dockers at least—is not preserved, but threatened, by it!

A Queer Verdict

The result of the jury's deliberations was indeed a strange one. By disagreeing on Count 1 they admitted being unable to decide as to whether a trade dispute existed or not. By finding "Guilty" on Count 2 they admitted having decided that no trade dispute existed! Perhaps, as Sir Hartley Shawcross said: "It seems that the jury thought these defendants should be found guilty of something, but were not quite sure what!"

Anyway, as far as the State is concerned, the whole, thing has been a costly failure. The law has been made to look ridiculous, Shawcross to look foolish, and the only real villain of the piece to emerge from all the evidence has been Mr. Arthur Deakin.

Some months ago we headed an article "Deakin Must Go". The proceedings at the Old Bailey last week have provided plenty of evidence as to why.

No Complacency

But no complacency should be felt by the workers over this result. The warning came from the Attorney-General when withdrawing the case on the last day, that 1305 is still the law. Prosecutions can still be brought against striking

Note for Freedom's Women Readers

IN a recent issue of the *Evening Standard* three people answer the question "What does it Cost a Woman to Dress Well?"

Mrs. Barr, advertising Executive's wife, answers "£500 a year". Miss Mary Reynell, secretary, says "£2 a week—My job entails lots of interviews, so I must always look smart."

"£12 a month is the male view. It comes from Civil Servant Peter McPherson. 'That's what I can afford to give my wife Helen for herself and she always looks good to me'."

And to think there are still people who begrudge the Railwaymen a £5 minimum wage, and the Docker his 25/- a day!

workers. It would be wrong according to the law to suggest that the dockers' demonstrations of solidarity affected the jury, but everybody knew what would have been the result if a heavy penalty had been imposed on those seven.

This case has been a try-on by the State. It failed. But it would be foolish to imagine that another jury would bring a similar result. 1305 must go, and the prosecutions made possible by its existence made impossible. To do this the workers must become even more militant—merely to maintain our standards of living we must become more militant. And to the dockers we say—now forward to the realisation of the Dockers' Charter, not as an end but as the beginning of the full use of their strength—which will find its end in the establishment of workers' control and the end of the State and its coercion. P.S.

Wool Prices & Unemployment

WE owe an apology to our readers for an inaccuracy in the article "The Economic Situation" in the last issue.

We were writing prematurely when we wrote: "Already the ability to pay inflated prices for wool is forcing smaller manufacturers in Yorkshire to close down. As more shortages in textiles develop, widespread unemployment will ensue."

Apparently such is not—the case. Our correspondent in Bradford (centre of the Yorkshire wool trade) corrects us, and says:

"I remember we talked of wool, and I told you I had discussed it with an ex-wool weaver who was glad he had transferred his attention to rayon, as there was imminent danger of smaller manufacturers having to close down owing to the shortage of wool. But I have come across no instance of any actual closing down because of prices yet."

"The American buyers have now largely stopped buying wool, with the result that, though wool is still short owing to the tremendous quantities they have bought for America, the price is gradually dropping."

"The block withdrawal from sales by American buyers may have sinister implications, but they are mostly, after all, working for army mills, making uniforms, and an army proclamation could send the telegrams from all the uniform manufacturers to their agents."

ANARCHISTS & POWER

FOR the benefit of those readers of *Freedom* who are not anarchists but who attended Edgar Priddy's lecture on the "Group and the Individual", and who may be confused by the use of the word *power* commented on by Leah Feldman in her letter (*Freedom*, April 14th), I venture to clear up the point raised.

The comrade who raised the question of power (and incidentally it was not the speaker) made his point very clear when he said that what the individual needed was more power over his own life, not less. Meaning that it was the *powerlessness* of the majority of people which allowed a few individuals *with* power to run their lives for them.

No mention was made of power in the political sense, or power over other individuals but if all individuals were powerful instead of just a few, no one could exploit anyone else. R.M.

CONSCIOUS EGOISM AGAIN

DEAR COMRADES,

From time to time, items in *Freedom* advocate egoism as a philosophy, stressing that the basis of man's actions should be conscious self-interest. It is maintained that when man pursues his own self-interest he does little harm to others, and the adoption of this attitude would lead to results desired by anarchists. This point of view is supported by the fact that man's support of ideologies and religions has led to wars and intolerance generally. In a moderate form this has I believe been advocated by Bertrand Russell as enlightened self-interest. In the abstract the case appears sound, but when applied to people it does depend upon a person's interpretation of the word *enlightened*. After all it is admitted that people do already act in their own self-interest, but as they see it, and their support of ideologies and religions could be described as mistaken self-interest. It is implied in the philosophy that it is the individual who decides what is his own self-interest and so it must be as no egoist would be prepared to accept its definition by a particular group of individuals however well-meaning they might be. Therefore it a man believes that murder, rape, war, or any of the minor anti-social acts are in his own self-interest as well he might, however wrong anarchists may believe him to be, then he is justified according to this philosophy. The point which I don't remember having seen made, is that the practice of self-interest leads to social good only in those cases where the individual believes that his own self-interest is best realised through mutual aid and acts accordingly. Anarchy is only possible through the application of principles such as mutual aid and we are thus forced to recognise a principle, probably biological, which is external and greater than any one individual. One has not destroyed the "god" idea by making oneself a god any more than by making truth and freedom into gods. Patriotism, freedom and truth pursued as ideals have often led to wars and destruction, and so may the pursuit of self-interest by a group of people. These ideals stand condemned not in themselves but only when they lead to anti-social acts as defined by the community as a whole. We can only try to educate the community to our point of view as to what is anti-social. The desire to practice mutual aid although inherent in man will not automatically be realised through

Letters to the Editors

(see also page 2)

self-interest as it operates biologically alongside the principle of struggle; and either may be transcendent at any one time or in any one individual. In conclusion, I believe that to base anarchism on a philosophy of self-interest is to accept, in the eyes of the world, the acts of may anti-social individuals and to distract people from our main contention, that it is through the practice of mutual aid that man can live in a free non-authoritarian society. It is, of course, in my opinion, in man's own self-interest to do so.

Yours fraternally,
HAROLD H. SCULTHORPE.

CORRECTION

DEAR EDITORS,

Could you possibly find room for a correction in my reported speech? In the following sentence the words in italics were inadvertently dropped: "the war against Germany showed that . . . the most unlikely people are willing to die for their opinions, but they are not willing to die for a blunder, a swindle, etc." This rather reverses the meaning, as well as leading me to appear to insult the anti-Nazi Resistance, which is the last thing I want to do!

ALEX COMFORT.

WE START NEXT WEEK

OUTDOOR SELLING

Comrades who have tried selling "Freedom" at public meetings and in the streets have met with considerable success. In London we need more sellers at Marble Arch on Sundays. Thanks to our Speakers and one or two Sellers, sales of the paper there have been steadily increasing. Any offers to help in this important work will be most welcome.

★

OUTSTANDING ACCOUNTS

At the end of this month we shall send out statements of accounts to all those comrades and groups who receive bundles of "Freedom" every issue, and hope the response will be greater than it was to our earlier attempt at the end of March when bills totalling no less than £300 were sent out. With the weekly, promptness in settling accounts will be absolutely essential if we are to carry on, and we ask the comrades concerned to make a point of settling their literature accounts every month.

★ ★ ★

OUR APPEALS

A valued comrade has drawn our attention to the last appeal which he thought was so irritable as to be valueless as a money-raiser. Perhaps we feel a little battered by the various stone walls we have come up against in the course of writing appeals for funds during the past fifteen years! What about readers interested in "Freedom's" work writing the appeals for us during the coming months? Or, better still, what about making it unnecessary for us to publish appeals, by sending subscriptions, however small, regularly? It will certainly brighten up the appearance of our contribution list below!

Freedom — Weekly

Special Appeal

April 6th to 20th:

Madison, Wis.: Anon £3/10/0; Edgware: L.A.P. 5/-; Llanelli: L.W. 2/6; London: N.C.R. 6/3; Bradford: D.R. 2/6; Anon* 2/6; Victoria: J.N.P. 3/-; London: Anon 2/-; Wooler: J.R.* 2/6; Bradford: D.R. 1/-; Ince: E.H. 2/6; Melbourne: D.G. 16/-; London: K.L. 5/-; Cambridge: A.N.S. 2/10; London: D.P. £1; Bishops Stortford: M.J.S. 3/6; London: J.P.B.* 2/6.

Total	£7 16 7
Previously acknowledged	£116 15 0
1951 TOTAL TO DATE	£124 11 7

GIFTS OF BOOKS: M.K.: C.W.

FREEDOM
Anarchist Fortnightly
Price 3d.
Please Turn to page 1 column 5
for details

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 8354.