

If You Distrust the Politicians of All Parties, If You Want to Run
Your Own Life for a Change Then--

VOTE FOR YOURSELF

By Refusing to Vote Tory, Labour, Liberal or Anything Else

In five days' time more than 20 million fully-grown adults in the British Isles, will, by marking a piece of paper with a cross, indicate that they are prepared to have their lives ruled over by a Conservative or Labour administration. (The more sceptical may vote Liberal, Communist or I.L.P. since there is no chance from the start of these parties coming to power!)

Their decisions as to who their "cross" will be given will have been determined by a thousand and one different motives. There are, on both sides, that large bloc of electors who will proudly tell you that they have always voted Tory or Labour and no arguments will ever shift them from their mental dug-outs. But how many votes will be cast for or against the Tories on the issue of de-nationalisation of road transport and steel, according to which way such a change will affect the material interests of those concerned? How many people who have had their names for years on housing lists and who are still waiting, will, as an act of despair, vote Tory, as if a change in government may perhaps speed-up the housing programme? And how many housewives harassed by ration books and shortages will do likewise?

BUT features of this election are undoubtedly that there is little to choose, even on paper, between the party programmes and that there is considerable apathy among the public in general. Such apathy is occasioned partly by the feeling that the problems facing this country and the world are become so vast and complex that as individuals we just do not count. But apathy is also the result of the people's strong distrust of all politicians. Unfortunately, this is not accompanied by faith in themselves to run their own lives. So that instead of say-

ing, "We have had enough of politicians trying to run our lives for us. From now on we run our own lives" the general attitude is "All the politicians are rogues. But somebody has got to run the country, in which case it's our duty to vote for the lesser of the two evils. So I'm voting Labour (or Tory)." There is even a point of view, again based on despair and hopelessness, which suggests that the Labour Government has been in power for six years and it is time they had a rest and the Conservatives given a chance to try their hand! This view was put forward last week by Edward Hulton (whose gems of political naiveté find their way into print in *Picture Post* certainly not for their profundity but because the editor is employed by Mr. Hulton) in a whole-page article with the most original title: "Let's Change the Bowling." Mr. Hulton hastens to explain the title, for he does not want the reader to imagine that he thinks the General Election anything but a serious matter. But his cricketing analogy in dealing with the most "vital" election "that this old country of ours has ever fought" is much subtler than the reader would think at first sight. Mr. Hulton argues that if we believe in democracy and having elections at all, "it must be self-evident that we cannot always vote for the same party. For this would mean that we had, in practice, a one-party State—a kind of Communism, or Fascism—and there would quite obviously, be no point in having an election at all." Hence you change the bowler "not because you hate him, or because you are not grateful for any good he may have done to his side, but because you think that another, fresher, bowler is more likely to bowl out your enemies—in our present case, War and Bankruptcy or to give the present bowler a rest." The present government are "tired out", says Mr. Hulton, but "no doubt they will some day return to bowl again". "And why not?" he asks. And so he goes on until stumps are drawn after three long columns of this baby talk.

But it is not surprising that these people should talk down to the public as if they were addressing immature, innocent-eyed school-children. The politicians know that the people as a whole hold them in contempt. But they also know (since they have been largely res-

Continued on p. 4

"Parliament has neither the knowledge nor the will to perform the task which labour thinks to be the only one of importance. . . . The problems and concerns of the House of Commons are quite different from those which are the daily thoughts of 90 per cent. of the people of the country."—Ramsay MacDonald's pamphlet, prior to his "arrival" at Westminster.

"Politicians are a set of men who have interests aside from the interests of the people, and who, to say the most of them, are at least one long step removed from honest men. I say this with greater freedom, being a politician myself."—Abraham Lincoln 1809-65, President U.S.A., (Speeches).



"MUTTON WILL BE PLENTIFUL" - Ministry of Food.

The Real Rulers of Britain

IT is part of the Anarchist criticism of the system of democratic election of rulers, that the real rulers of the country are never elected anyway. They just don't come up for election.

In no constituency will the name of Sir Edward Bridges appear on a ballot paper; no voter will be able to mark with a cross his approval or otherwise of Sir William Strang, Sir Norman Brook, or Sir Frank Newsam.

These four men do not have the magic letters "M.P." after their names; they do not figure in Parliamentary debate, nor are they answerable to the people of Britain. And yet, "the Cabinet has little option but to go the way this quartet suggests", as we have just been told in an article in the *London Star* (11/10/51) by its Political Correspondent, John Carvel.

Obviously, neither Mr. Carvel nor the editor of the *Star* can see the implications of this article, entitled "Men Who Rule Behind the Scenes", which is, when one thinks of it, an astonishing title for an article on government in a democracy!

Surely the basic supposition in a democracy is that there is no "Government behind the Scenes"—that all decisions are made in the clear light of Parliamentary procedure, with the representatives of the people jealously watching over the interests of those who sent them there?

But who are these four men? How is it that they can assert such influence when Government Of The People, By The People, For The People is the cornerstone of the British way of life?

Well, as Anarchists have acutely pointed out before, there is a difference between Government and State, and although it can be argued that at election time we elect the Government, nothing is ever discussed—or even mentioned in polite society—about how the State got where it is to-day. And these four men, these Knights of

the Back Room, are the heads of the main State departments. As such, they are the effective rulers of Britain.

Sir Edward Bridges is the Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury and head of the Civil Service; Sir Norman Brook is Secretary to the Cabinet; Sir William Strang is Permanent Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs; and Sir Frank Newsam is Permanent Under-Secretary of State for Home Affairs.

What are we to think when, a fortnight before a General Election which, as Mr. Churchill tells us, is a decisive one for the history of our country, we read: "Cabinets come and go, but these men remain, always behind the scenes, advising and guiding the activities of Ministers, and their ideas are nearly always accepted"?

Is that calculated to make us believe that it matters very much about the label a politician gives himself, when he nearly always accepts the ideas of a permanent civil servant?

Note that word "Permanent". No suggestion there of having been elected for a specific period, to be judged by the people at the end and thrown out if found unsatisfactory. These men are permanent; they are the State, and we are told "the secret of their power is that they never reveal it."

Sir Edward Bridges, for example, "is the man who, every year, collects the material on which the Chancellor of the Exchequer bases his Budget. If he doesn't agree with a proposal of the Chancellor . . . he never says so. He produces facts and figures to show why, for financial or economic reasons, the proposal should not be adopted."

[Something springs to mind. At conference after conference, for years, the Labour Party has approved the principle of Equal Pay for Women. The Labour Government has approved it in principle. Can it be that Sir Edward Bridges has shown why "for financial and economic reasons" it cannot be established in practice?]

Sir Norman Brook attends all Cabinet meetings. "Sometimes the talk is so long and involved that next morning nobody is quite clear what was decided at the

meeting. Sir Norman tells them."

"At the moment the Foreign Office is the most important Government department of all, and here the chief man behind the scenes is Sir William Strang. Foreign Secretaries change, but he remains . . . When he gets his way, international conferences are held behind closed doors and nothing is said about what is going on until they are over."

Is it not clear that all this makes an absolute farce of politics, and hypocritical impudence of elections? What are we electing; what are we deciding?

The only real effect of the voting next week is that the electorate will choose whose names shall appear in the headlines for the next electoral period; whose signatures will appear on ministerial announcements; whose bottoms shall rest on ministerial chairs; which pompous asses will be told what they can and cannot do by the heads of the Civil Service.

"All are aloof from politics and all have scores of assistants who constitute the real backbone of State administration in Britain. . . . Without these men—and others—no administration, however talented, could last a week without chaos."

It all depends what you mean by chaos. . . . but if any read this who intend to vote—let them not be deluded that they are voting for social justice, for freedom, for greater equality, for peace in our time or even for houses. There are "financial and economic reasons" against these things, and the men who decide them, the "Men Who Rule Behind the Scenes" are permanent, and do not, in our democracy, present themselves for election.

Politicians come, and politicians go, but the State goes on. Not, we hope, for ever.

UNION OF ANARCHIST GROUPS

Our leaflet "Advice to those about to Vote" is now available. Price 1/- per 100, plus postage.

Anarchist Anti-Election Meetings

THE London Anarchist Group will be holding a series of outdoor meetings, with loud-speaker van, at various pitches throughout London.

Times and places:

HAMMERSMITH

FRI., Oct. 19th, at 7.30 p.m.
DOWN PLACE, off King Street.

STEPNEY

SAT., 20th., at 7.30
WINTERTON ST., opp. Palladium
Cinema, Commercial Rd.

BRIXTON

MON., 22nd, at 7.30
RUSHCROFT RD. (or nearby), off
Brixton Road.

CAMDEN TOWN

TUES., 23rd, at 7.30
DELANCY ST., off Camden High St.

EDMONTON GREEN

WED., 24th, at 7.30
Nr. Edmonton Town Hall.

Other platforms may be arranged. Above dates are definite. Anarchist support welcomed.

THE MEANING OF ANARCHISM

In 1905, Peter Kropotkin wrote the article on anarchism for the 11th edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica, with the intention of presenting a statement of the anarchist position for unfamiliar enquirers.

We reprint below the first page of his article. (The remaining pages described the historical development of anarchism and the theories of its principal exponents.)

2
ANARCHISM (from the Greek *an-* and *archia*, contrary to authority), the name given to a principle or theory of life and conduct under which society is conceived without government—harmony in such a society being obtained, not by submission to law, or by obedience to any authority, but by free agreements concluded between the various groups, territorial and professional, freely constituted for the sake of production and consumption, as also for the satisfaction of the infinite variety of needs and aspirations of a civilized being. In a society developed on these lines, the voluntary associations which already now begin to cover all the fields of human activity would take a still greater extension so as to substitute themselves for the state in all its functions. They would represent an interwoven network, composed of an infinite variety of groups and federations of all sizes and degrees, local, regional, national and international—temporary or more or less permanent—for all possible purposes: production, consumption and exchange, communications, sanitary arrangements, education, mutual protection, defence of the territory, and so on; and, on the other side, for the satisfaction of an ever-increasing number of scientific, artistic, literary and social needs. Moreover, such a society would represent nothing immutable. On the contrary—as is seen in organic life at large—harmony would (it is contended) result from an ever-changing adjustment and re-adjustment of equilibrium between the multitudes of forces and influences, and this adjustment would be the easier to obtain as none of the forces would enjoy

a special protection from the state. If, it is contended, society were organized on these principles, man would not be limited in the free exercise of his powers in productive work by a capitalist monopoly, maintained by the state; nor would he be limited in the exercise of his will by a fear of punishment, or by obedience towards individuals or metaphysical entities, which both lead to depression of initiative and servility of mind. He would be guided in his actions by his own understanding, which necessarily would bear the impression of a free action and reaction between his own self and the ethical conceptions of his surroundings. Man would thus be enabled to obtain the full development of all his faculties, intellectual, artistic and moral, without being hampered by overwork for the monopolists, or by the servility and inertia of mind of the great number. He would thus be able to reach full individualization, which is not possible either under the present system of individualism, or under any system of state-socialism in the so-called *Volkstaat* (popular state).

The Anarchist writers consider, moreover, that their conception is not a Utopia, constructed on the *a priori* method, after a few desiderata have been taken as postulates. It is derived, they

maintain, from an analysis of tendencies that are at work already, even though state socialism may find a temporary favour with the reformers. The progress of modern technics, which wonderfully simplifies the production of all the necessities of life; the growing spirit of independence, and the rapid spread of free initiative and free understanding in all branches of activity—including those which formerly were considered as the proper attribution of church and state—are steadily reinforcing the no-government tendency.

As to their economical conceptions, the Anarchists, in common with all Socialists, of whom they constitute the left wing, maintain that the now prevailing system of private ownership in land, and our capitalist production for the sake of profits, represent a monopoly which runs against both the principles of justice and the dictates of utility. They are the main obstacle which prevents the successes of modern technics from being brought into the service of all, so as to produce general well-being. The Anarchists consider the wage-system and capitalist production altogether as an obstacle to progress. But they point out also that the state was, and continues to be, the chief instrument for permitting the few to monopolize the

land, and the capitalists to appropriate for themselves a quite disproportionate share of the yearly accumulated surplus of production. Consequently, while combating the present monopolization of land, and capitalism altogether, the Anarchists combat with the same energy the state, as the main support of that system. Not this or that special form, but the state altogether, whether it be a monarchy or even a republic governed by means of the referendum.

The state organization, having always been, both in ancient and modern history (Macedonian empire, Roman empire, modern European states grown up on the ruins of the autonomous cities), the instrument for establishing monopolies in favour of the ruling minorities, cannot be made to work for the destruction of these monopolies. The Anarchists consider, therefore, that to hand over to the state all the main sources of economical life—the land, the mines, the railways, banking, insurance, and so on—as also the management of all the main branches of industry, in addition to all the functions already accumulated in its hands (education, state-supported religions, defence of the territory, &c.), would mean to create a new instrument of tyranny. State capitalism would only increase the powers of bureaucracy and capitalism. True progress lies in the direction of decentralization, both territorial and functional, in the development of the spirit of local and personal initiative, and of free federation from the simple to the com-

pound, in lieu of the present hierarchy from the centre to the periphery.

In common with most Socialists, the Anarchists recognize that, like all evolution in nature, the slow evolution of society is followed from time to time by periods of accelerated evolution which are called revolutions; and they think that the era of revolutions is not yet closed. Periods of rapid changes will follow the periods of slow evolution, and these periods must be taken advantage of—not for increasing and widening the powers of the state, but for reducing them, through the organization in every township or commune of the local groups of producers and consumers, as also the regional, and eventually the international, federations of these groups.

In virtue of the above principles the Anarchists refuse to be party to the present state organization and to support it by infusing fresh blood into it. They do not seek to constitute, and invite the working men not to constitute, political parties in the parliaments. Accordingly, since the foundation of the International Working Men's Association in 1864-1866, they have endeavoured to promote their ideas directly amongst the labour organizations and to induce those unions to a direct struggle against capital, without placing their faith in parliamentary legislation.

The conception of society just sketched, and the tendency which is its dynamic expression, have always existed in mankind, in opposition to the governing hierarchic conception and tendency—now the one and now the other taking the upper hand at different periods of history. To the former tendency we owe the evolution, by the masses themselves, of those institutions—the clan, the village community, the guild, the free medieval city—by means of which the masses resisted the encroachments of the conquerors and the power-seeking minorities. The same tendency asserted itself with great energy in the great religious movements of medieval times, especially in the early movements of the reform and its forerunners. At the same time it evidently found its expression in the writings of some thinkers, since the times of Lao-tsze, although, owing to its non-scholastic and popular origin, it obviously found less sympathy among the scholars than the opposed tendency.

The New Society

The article below is extracted from George Barrett's pamphlet, *The Anarchist Revolution*, published by Freedom Press in 1920, three years after its author's early death. George Barrett was, writes Mat Kavanagh, "one of the clearest thinkers and one of the most brilliant thinkers of his day."

"MASTER and man! Some up and some down! It always has been so and it always will be. You cannot alter human nature."

It is so easy to talk like that, and, if you are of a contented disposition, it is so comforting; but, of course, it is absolute nonsense. Man himself has developed from the lower animals, and surely there are few who would care to boast of any particular resemblance to the cave-dwellers of prehistoric days even. The fact is, human nature is never alike in two parts of the world or in two different ages. As to the master-and-man relationship, it has been so pulled about and buffeted in a comparatively short period of history that to-day many people seem to have a difficulty in recognising it to be the same thing as the more crude slavery of the past. Soon Time will so beat it out of shape that it will become the relationship of man-to-man. The last blow that will reforge it into this form will be the anarchist revolution.

What is this anarchist revolution? What can we do? Smash up the institutions of to-day, and what have we? Simply chaos until something similar is put in their place.

This is true in one sense, but it is an argument that cannot be used against us. It is true that the various institutions of slavery which exist to-day are there because people upon whom they depend are slavish in their thoughts. If, therefore, some great hurricane swept through the country, destroying all such institutions and their leaders, it is quite certain that the people who still believed in such things would set to work to rebuild them. On the contrary, if this "hurricane" took the form of a movement of the people themselves, who had outgrown their slavish attitude of mind, then there would be no restoration of the old, but a reconstruction on new and revolutionary lines.

"But what would those lines be?" is the natural question. It is no use knowing our power to overthrow and to build unless we have some idea of the structural outline of the new society.

The material out of which we must build the new society is that of the old. The institutions of to-day—our parliaments, town councils, factories, etc.—are all run on government principles. That element of government—a relic of the past—which enters into the composition of the whole thing, must be cut out. So far our mission is destructive, but we shall see that it is the necessary step to be taken for the construction of a truly social life.

Since, then, the new is to be but a development of the old, the easiest way to understand it will be to start, where the revolution will start, with existing institutions, and see what we intend doing with them. For example, we will take such an important matter as bread making and supplying. Let us examine this institution as it is to-day and as it will be after the revolution.

The baker who goes to his nightly task is probably making bread according to the recipe of another man. He may know such stuff is almost poison; but it is no business of his, he must do as he is told, and the responsibility rests elsewhere. Perhaps the conditions under which he works are ruining his health and are equally bad for the purity of the bread. It does not matter; the means of life belong to another, and if he would make use of them he must do as he is told. In addition to this, he is robbed of a portion of the fruits of his labour, which we have already agreed disappears as profits. The most striking fact of all, however, about this matter of the bread supply is that it is not suited to the needs of the people. There are many who actually lack this common necessity of life. Should they remedy this by taking a loaf, the present society can do nothing better or more relevant to their case than locking them up in prison.

Here, then, in one of the essential institutions of society we

have traced some of the evils due to the authoritarian form of its organisation.

What is the remedy? "Municipalisation, and put our men on the Council," say most of the Socialists and their friends. This, however, obviously does not fill the bill. At the best it would mean that the conditions of labour and the class and quantity of bread produced should be settled by the majority, while there seems no reason to believe that the Council would give up their profit any more willingly than the capitalist or any other dominating class has ever done. No; the revolutionary change must be brought about by an overthrow of the controlling power, not by changing its personnel. The future bread supply will spring up from below in direct response to the need for it. It will not be bossed from above.

What, then, will be the change which the Anarchist Revolution will bring into being? In a free society the baker must be allowed to bake what he believes to be good bread; he must be granted conditions that he judges to be fit for his work. Instead of being robbed of a portion of the fruits of his labour, he will enjoy the full benefits of social life. Finally, the bread supply must be of a nature that the needs and the tastes of all will be satisfied.

Let us imagine now that the great revolt of the workers has taken place, that their direct action has made them masters of the situation. Is it not easy to see that some man in a street that grew hungry would soon draw up a list of the loaves that were needed, and take it to the bakery where the strikers were in possession? Is there any difficulty in supposing that the necessary amount would then be baked according to this list? By this time the bakers would know what carts and delivery vans were needed to send the bread out to the people, and if they let the carters and vanmen know of this, would these not do their utmost to supply the vehicles, just as the bakers set to work to make the bread? If, as things settled down, more benches were needed on which to knead the bread, in just the same way is it not easy to see that the carpenters would supply them? If an intimation were given to the engineers that machinery were wanted, would they not see that this received their immediate attention? The engineers in their turn would apply to the draughtsmen for designs, and to the foundrymen for castings. In turn, again, the draughtsmen apply to the paper-makers, for paper, and to the workers in the pencil factories for pencils. The foundrymen, in the meantime, apply to the furnacemen, and these in their turn to the miners for more iron ore and coal. So the endless continuity goes on—a well-balanced interdependence of parts is guaranteed, because need is the motive force behind it all.

Who bosses, who regulates all this? No one! It starts from below, not from above. Like an organism, this free society grows into being, from the simple unit up to the complex structure. The need for bread, hunger—or, in other words, the individual struggle to live, in its most simple and elementary form—is, as we have seen, sufficient to set the whole complex social machinery in motion. Society is the result of the individual struggle for existence; it is not, as many suppose, opposed to it.

In the same way that each free individual has associated with his brothers to produce bread, machinery, and all that was necessary for life, driven by no other force than his desire for the full enjoyment of life so each institution is free and self-contained, and co-operates and enters into agreements with others because by so doing it extends its own possibilities. There is no centralised State exploiting or dictating, but the complete structure is supported because each part is dependent on the whole. The bakers, as we have seen, need the carpenters and engineers, and these would be no use if they were not supplied by other workers, who in their turn are just as dependent on yet another branch. What folly if the engineers should presume to dictate to the bakers the conditions of their labour, and it would be equally without reason if a committee, styling itself the Government, should become boss of all these industries and begin to control their production and interchange, which must in the nature of things already be well

Continued on p. 3

HUMAN nature is complex, even though it is in great part understandable. It includes all the motives which the various political parties over-emphasise; people are envious, greedy, anxious about their status, and do enjoy power and domination. They are also self-satisfied, generous, secure and co-operative. No political party, however, is necessary in order to enable these latter motives to be gratified."

—GEOFFREY GORER: Politics and Human Motives (*World Review*).

COMMENT

CLEM ON THE CARPET

I SETTLED back in my chair and looked at him over the top of my National Health specs. "Clem," I said, "what is all this nonsense about Anarchists in striped trousers voting Conservative? You know better than that, now, don't you?"

Clem shuffled and looked down at his feet.

"Because," I went on, "if you don't know better, it's high time you did. After all, your old pal, Harold Laski, who was your colleague when you were lecturers together at the London School of Economics (that was when you were still Major Attlee, wasn't it?) knew enough about Anarchism to be able to bring up-to-date in subsequent editions, the article on it in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* originally written by Peter Kropotkin, for the eleventh edition.

"Hugh Dalton was also lecturing at the L.S.E. at the same time as Harold and yourself, and I remember seeing a copy of Kropotkin's *Conquest of Bread* only recently with Hughie's signature on the fly-leaf.

"So, obviously, Clem, my boy, your two buddies knew the Anarchist position, even if they didn't accept it. Were you less well-informed than they? Was it that you were too busy preparing yourself for office to give thought to wider philosophies outside your narrow little party channels?"

Clem cleared his throat and made as if to speak.

"Now don't interrupt me, Attlee," I said, rather more sharply than I meant, for I find it difficult to be hard on the little chap, "because you really have made yourself look very silly—to those who know, and I can only suppose that you have been prepared to take advantage of the prevailing ignorance about Anarchism to make cheap cracks about it.

"Look at those reports of your Eastbourne speech. Because some Tory heckler demanded the abolition of controls, you let your hair down (very metaphorically speaking) and remarked: 'He is one of those cheerful anarchists. A great many people think an anarchist has a red tie and a bomb in his pocket. He is not like that you know. He usually has striped trousers and votes Conservative.'

"Now, really, Clem!" I protested, more in sorrow than in anger, "that is pretty stupid, isn't it?"

Clem squirmed. "Herbert Morrison, your very own present Foreign Secretary, was an Anarchist," I reminded him. "Was. And I'm sure he didn't begin to wear striped pants until long after he'd left the movement—

from which he parted, incidentally, for the valid reason that there were no jobs in it for him! And another member of your Cabinet, Griffiths, he too is an ex-Anarchist. Not, I fancy, that the Anarchist movement can be very proud of the one-time connection.

"No, Clem," I said, "you really know as well as I do that Anarchists are far too sensible to waste their time for anybody, let alone the Conservatives, who stand for everything the Anarchists detest. Now, why did you do it?"

Clem smoothed his striped trousers and looked up, sheepishly.

"Well," he sniffled, "I was only trying to be funny, and I know that even though I was insulting the Anarchists I wouldn't lose any votes, 'cos they're wise to our racket, anyway." He blinked, and then with a timid burst of defiance, blurted out: "And anyway, it's election time, isn't it?"

"Ah, yes," I murmured, "I suppose that is thought to excuse everything."

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

The Anarchist Prince

Woodcock & Avakumovic 21/-

This 460-page biography of Kropotkin covers the history of the European and Russian anarchist movement up to Kropotkin's death. It discusses in detail the development of his ideas and his writings, and describes the early years of *Freedom*.

Michael Bakunin & Karl Marx

K. J. Kenafick 6/-

The author aims to present Bakunin and his thought as they really were, seen neither through romantic nor through Marxist glasses, but giving Bakunin's opinions in his own words. There is probably no other great writer and thinker whose real opinions are so little known, and consequently, so much misunderstood.

The Roots of Prejudice

Arnold Rose 1/6

Race & Psychology Otto Klineberg 1/6

These two important pamphlets in the *Uterco* series on *The Race Question* in *Modern Science* were recently reviewed on this page.

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

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 12, No. 34 October 20, 1951

IRRESPONSIBLE WORM'S MEAT

"... A plague o' both your houses!
They have made worm's meat of me:
I have it, and soundly too:—
Your houses!"

THUS the dying Mercutio in *Romeo and Juliet*, wounded in the feud between Montagues and Capulets; and his phrase has since been echoed often enough by men tossed about by antagonistic factions. Not that it is the mere fact of party rivalry that makes worm's meat of the electors, for obviously the single party National Front is even more disastrous. The evil is that though both Labour and Tories claim to be the good guides of suffering British humanity, they are in fact both pernicious.

So absurd has the situation become indeed that they almost accept each others gibes as their programmes—the Conservatives advocating the "free" struggle with the best supposedly coming to the top—but without much mention of the devil taking the hindmost. While the Labour Party openly exalts controls and restriction of liberty as the saving grace.

Once again, however, they do not lack a certain common ground: both insist that it is our duty to vote, almost criminal irresponsibility to abstain. Apathy, they say, is fatal to democracy. The people must choose!

Now if you asked a blind man's opinion on the relative merits or demerits of two painters you would not think him irresponsible if he declined to give it on the grounds of incapacity. Conversely, when people offer their "considered" views on subjects of which they are patently ignorant, and even take practical decisions based on such ill-grounded opinion, we think them poltroons and hold them in low esteem.

Yet what subject is larger than social organisation and economics? How many voters have any knowledge of these subjects or are able effectively to assess the Labour apology or the Conservative claim? Surely the irresponsibility of voting on such poor information is only surpassed by the irresponsibility of those who make no bones about pretending to be able to administer the lives and welfare of millions!

When one has said all this, however, the fact still remains that there is a General Election and that universal franchise has given us all the vote. This alone is a more powerful counterbalance than the arguments and logic of the anarchists. Inevitably the question arises: "Is 'a plague on both your houses' really a true assessment? Is not one aspirant to power better than the other? In any case, is it not time, in Edward Hulton's elegant phrase, "to change the bowling"? Let us for a moment consider this question—forgetting the wretched batsmen, the people, for whom the wicket is permanently sticky and the bowling, too often, body-line. (Let us repress also our advice to hit the bowlers for six, and draw the stumps for good!)

Does it matter who governs us? the answer is, of course, that for certain people it does matter a lot—because the proposals of one or the other party damage or improve their business. But these are sectional interests and it is probably truer to say that for the majority it hardly matters at all.

The Welfare State & the Welfare of Gorbals

OVER 100 years ago, Max Stirner, German author and anarchist, in his book, *The Ego and His Own*, said: "The State is not sacred. The State's behaviour is violence, and it calls its violence 'law', but that of the individual, 'crime'. If I do not do what it wishes, then the State turns against me with all the force of its lion-paws and eagle-talons; for it is the king of beasts, it is lion and eagle. I am the mortal enemy of the State. . . . Every State is a despotism whether the despot be one or many."

The *Glasgow Daily Record* of 24/9/51 reported that: "Twenty families—ordered out of a condemned Gorbals tenement—stormed into Cowglen Military Hospital grounds last night (23rd September). They carried beds and furniture into two empty Nissen huts and occupied them for two hours before they were driven out by soldiers and police and packed off back to their crumbling homes. The men arrived first with the furniture stacked in a

hired lorry. Then came 40 women and children by Corporation bus. There were babies-in-arms and little girls carrying message baskets. The soldiers stood by with Alsatian dogs while a call went out to the Civil police. Patrol car crews and 'beat' men conferred with Army officers while in the huts children were put to bed. During the next few minutes there were scuffles in the doorways. A civilian and an Army sergeant fell, struggling, outside one hut. Children who had been carried out ran back inside screaming. Women ran shouting from one hut to the other. A big crowd watched others being escorted to buses as soldiers patrolled the woods with dogs in case any squatters stayed behind. Back in Cavendish Place, the lorry was unloaded again. Family groups outside discussed their Cowglen experience. Some of the squatters said that a young soldier who refused to help in the eviction was marched off to the guardroom."

The State's henchmen are as much the victims of Authority as are those upon whom they are commanded to execute the decrees of their paymasters. Inwardly they may detest and hate such odious tasks but the hammer of authority breaks down all outward expression of dissent. Oh! if such acts were perpetrated only by edicts of the rulers of Russia or China, or anywhere else on the face of the earth but in this boasted land of justice and freedom, then what a howl of rage and vituperation would go up from its benign rulers. "Violence? Silence! This is a case of law and order enforced upon the rabble."

Well, the Gorbals has had a swift taste of law and order, which may be well pondered there and elsewhere when next they are told that their welfare and security is the first interest of the State.

H.T.D.



DOES IT REALLY MATTER?

TRIGGER-HAPPY

Mr. Alfred Robens, Minister of Labour, said at Carlisle on Saturday:—"The real crux of this election is not housing, or food, or rations. It is going to be a fight for your lives. The international situation is very sensitive and very tense. We have had the problems of India, Burma, and Egypt. There have been many occasions when we have been within an ace of being in trouble."

"The policy of Mr. Attlee, who towers head and shoulders above Winston Churchill on this matter, has been consultation and discussion. What the people of this country have got to decide is—Whose finger do you want on the trigger? Mr. Churchill's or Mr. Attlee's?"

Glasgow Herald, 24/9/51.

Nevertheless, anarchists are not hypnotised by majorities. And in some elections—for example, where Communists or Fascists or anti-Semitic or anti-coloured parties are in the running for power—the outcome of a free election may well be very important indeed for large minorities.

Yet when we have conceded all this, the fact remains that the ballot box stands between direct action, direct administration, by socially coherent groups, of their own destinies and the basic surrendering of responsibility which is representative government. The choice ought not to be, this party or that party. It ought to be, to order our own lives or to continue to stagnate between intermittent wars? Elections thus sidetrack the main issue and block the progress that only freedom and responsibility can bring. They are more destructive as an institution in themselves, than in their particular outcome.

The general apathy and cynicism that have attended every election since the slump of 1929 is thus well-grounded. We should do well to listen to the voice within which says, "Elections are a shady, dishonest business"; and we should begin to act for ourselves before we are all worm's meat.

Alice in the Electoral Wonderland

"WELL, there you are," said the Red Queen happily. "It's all as simple as A B C. Now we can work out exactly what will happen in the general election—it's all a matter of a new law called Cube-Law."

"I thought it was a matter of voting," said Alice. "And anyway there can't be a new law because Parliament makes laws and there isn't any Parliament to make them at present."

"Ignorant and audacious child!" cried the Red Queen. "Laws are not only made by Parliament—they are also unearthed by the erudite researches of accomplished men of science and mathematicians, and the Cube-Law has now been rediscovered at the universities. Shall I tell you what it is?"

"By all means," said Alice politely.

"The Cube-Law states," said the Red Queen gravely, "that the ratio of seats won by the two parties is the cube of

the ratio of votes cast for them. Now what do you think about that for a clear and explicit statement?"

"Wizard, isn't it?" said Alice meekly. "But where do you get the ratio of votes cast for them from?"

"Well, of course, you could," admitted the Red Queen cautiously, "get it from the result of the polling. But you could also get it from a Gallup poll or any other reliable estimate in advance. So you'd better set to work with your Cube-Law as fast as you can."

"Thanks very much," said Alice, "but I think I'll wait for the polling. I shall then not only get the ratio of the votes cast but the ratio of the seats won—with cast-iron certainty and without doing any cubing at all."

"Idle and incorrigible!" announced the Red Queen. "I don't believe you'd know a cube if you met one!"

Manchester Guardian.

FREEDOM PRESS

- ERRICO MALATESTA :**
Anarchy, Vote—What For? 6d. 1d.
- M. BAKUNIN :**
Marxism, Freedom and the State, paper 2s. 6d., cloth 5s.
- HERBERT READ :**
Art and the Evolution of Man. 4s.
Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism. 3s. 6d.
Poetry and Anarchism. cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d.
The Philosophy of Anarchism. boards 2s. 6d., paper 1s.
The Education of Free Men. 1s.
- ALEX COMFORT :**
Barbarism & Sexual Freedom. paper 2s. 6d., stiff boards 3s. 6d.
- RUDOLF ROCKER :**
Nationalism and Culture. cloth 21s.
- ALEXANDER BERKMAN :**
ABC of Anarchism. 1s.
- PETER KROPOTKIN :**
The State: Its Historic Role. 1s.
The Wage System. 3d.
Revolutionary Government. 3d.
Organised Vengeance Called Justice. 2d.
- JOHN HEWETSON :**
Ill-Health, Poverty and the State. cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.
- M. L. BERNERI :**
Workers in Stalin's Russia. 1s.
- GEORGE WOODCOCK :**
Anarchy or Chaos. 2s. 6d.
New Life to the Land. 6d.
Railways and Society. 3d.
Homes orhovels? 6d.
What is Anarchism? 1d.
The Basis of Communal Living. 1s.
- WILLIAM GODWIN :**
Selections from Political Justice. 3d.
On Law. 1d.
- F. A. RIDLEY :**
The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age. 2d.
- ★
- Marie Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications :**
Marie Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute. cloth 5s.
Journey Through Utopia. cloth 16s. (U.S.A. \$2.50)
- ★
- K. J. KENAFICK :**
Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx. Paper 6s.
- 27, Red Lion Street, London, W.C.I.**

THE NEW SOCIETY

Continued from p. 2

adjusted and orderly. Those who control production in this manner are invariably those who enjoy the larger part of that which is produced; that is why the politicians try to insist upon necessity of such control. Alas! that they should be so tamely followed by so many workers who have not yet cleared their minds of the old slavish instincts.

The structure of this future society, then, must not be centralised; but, growing ever more closely bound together and interwoven by free and mutual agreements, it will be for the first time in human history a society of representative institutions, each of which is brought into being and grows or dies as a direct result of the need for it. It will be a society responsive to the wants of the people; it will supply their everyday needs as quickly as it will respond to their highest aspirations. Its changing forms will be the passing expressions of humanity.

Anarchism is often brushed aside by the politicians with the remark that it is a beautiful dream, but quite impossible. It is for this reason that I have taken here a purely practical view of it, and now, in order that we may be quite sure of meeting no insurmountable difficulties in running our new society, we must first examine it a little more in detail.

It may be said that, in taking bread-making as an example, I have chosen a subject about which there is little room for a difference of opinion. Everyone agrees on the necessity for bread, and practically everyone as to its method of manufacture. When you get to complex things about which people differ widely, how will you do without law or some form of control from above?

It may well be argued that man cannot live by bread alone, and unless our new form of society has room within it for the highest culture as well as the bare necessities, it is condemned. For these reasons I must be forgiven if the details given in the example here taken are followed far enough to be a little tedious.

It is doubly worth while to answer this difficulty, because, if the explanation is followed, the reader will see that it explains also how he can begin to apply his anarchist principles—for I am sure by this time he is an anarchist—to the workers' organisations.

Most of these, alas! while they claim to exist for the purpose of fighting Capitalism and authority, are themselves bossed and controlled exactly as a capitalist institution is. It is clear that the next step towards the revolution will be the reconstruction of these organisations, so that they will be as free from the control of "leaders" and executives as will be the free society they are out to build. This step is already being taken.

To return to my argument: as a contrast to bread-making, we will take art. About this subject few people think alike, and most people don't think at all. If, then, our principles of free agreement are capable of supplying some art institute that will

satisfy everyone, we need not fear but that it will hold out all right in simpler cases.

Let us take the thing as it exists to-day, and root out from it the influence of government. Art galleries are now generally run by the corporations of large cities. The money is raised by rates; that is to say, everyone is compelled to pay to buy and house pictures. While a great number absolutely care nothing for them, some may even object to them as being immoral. At the very outside, then, the institution is unrepresentative, and in its small way absolutely tyrannical.

In a free society the art institution, just as the bakeries, would grow into being in direct response to the desire for it. Those in a community who were interested in art would naturally meet together and discuss their plans. It would be their pleasure, and they would not compel anyone to help them who was not in sympathy with their ideas. In this way the size of the institution would exactly represent the amount of interest taken in it—it would represent the artistic element of the community.

Among artists, however, there are many different opinions as to what really is art. If our institution is to be one great affair, with majority rule inside, it is clear that there will be only one class of pictures on the walls, probably painted by popular Academicians, while the progressive section will not be represented in any way. If, on the other hand, we cut out altogether this idea of government, and allow liberty to obtain inside, just as it was liberty which brought our institution into being, we find that it will become representative in detail just as it was in bulk. When these artists meet together, those who are in the majority will not wish to dictate to the minority, but they will simply see that in the design of the building their needs are catered for. The minority, before it agrees to co-operate, will also see that room is made for its ideas.

If these two parties cannot agree to differ in this way, they would split apart entirely and have two separate buildings; but as this would pay neither of them, it is not likely to happen. It is clear also that with such a free method of organisation, not merely two opinions would be represented, but there would be as many different sorts of pictures as there were different ideas in art, except in those cases where two or more sections united in a compromise because they were not strong enough or sufficiently different from their neighbours to stand alone.

Here then, again, we have a truly representative institution. Just as we have seen above society growing into existence as the result of the individual need for bread, and just as we have found it impossible to suppose that starvation could exist when this need was used as the direct and only driving power behind the bakers and the bakery, so now, when we come to deal with man's higher needs, we find that these can be supplied simply and perfectly by rooting out the last relic of the old-fashioned ideas of authority, and substituting for master and man the equal liberty of all.

SOME THOUGHTS ON THE GENERAL ELECTION

It might well be news to some that the Labour movement was not built up by the speeches made by lawyers over the week-ends with a view to political advancement. However we might disagree with many of the socialist pioneers, it was long and arduous work by honest men, who braved the jeers of the apathetic drifting from the gin-shops to the meetings and back again, that built up the traditions on which the Labour movement is based. The weaknesses in political socialism have now been seen in action, and after six years of the Labour Party in office, with a working majority, socialism and the Labour movement is suffering heavy reverses. The trade union movement is seen to be subservient to the State machine; the political Labour movement a vehicle for political careerism, and no longer even working-class careism. It used to "liberate the working-class one by one"; now it picks up ready-made its lawyers and big-businessmen in the same way as the other parties.

In recognising this corruption of the Labour movement, which the working-class has striven over years to put into power, it is usually admitted that there is very little chance of doing anything about it, because "what alternative is there? To put the Tories back?" Although the newspapers have once more talked themselves into a Churchill victory (because of their own persistent, stubborn refusal to admit that Churchill is and always was unpopular, and that in the public eyes his war administration was disastrous and only ended in victory, there being no alternative when the Nazis collapsed, far too late for there to be any savour left in it), this is very far from being a certainty, and the old Labour carthorse will get its working-class votes once more without any real vital belief that there is anything to be gained in doing so (and indeed, it seems to be the modern idea of democratic "statesmanship" that you should resist popular demands).

If the Conservative Central Office would, indeed, like a surefire and totally dishonest way of winning a magnificent victory next time, which should be most attractive to them, I would suggest to them that they forget all the "Liberal" humbug, and instead of trying to cadge the few odd Liberal votes left over from the last generation with all the fancy "National Liberal", "Liberal National", "Conservative Liberal" and "Liberal Conservative claptrap, they revive the MacDonaldites and drop the Simonites, and come out with Socialist Conservative and Labour Conservative candidates, and make a determined bid for the working-class vote with some trade union candidates—they need not all be consigned to hopeless constituencies, and some could replace an odd millionaire in a safe seat. The Party funds would stand it, and it would be as genuine an act of altruism as could be expected. They would have the advantage that by that time the lawyers and journalists would have swamped the trade union bureaucrats in the Labour Party, and the Socialist Conservatives might be able to

label themselves the working-class party. When it came to positive social beliefs, the electorate would be hard put to it to find out which was the Left and which was the Right, and just as nobody knows to-day, for instance, just what Lady Violet Bonham Carter is supposed to be (if it matters), in 1956 we might all be puzzling as to whether industrialist Mr. Stoke was left or right of the trade union leader the Tories would be sure to find to oppose him.

If one is compelled to fall back on these somewhat flippant thoughts on the General Election, it is only because of the plain and undeniable fact that "democracy" has been reduced to a pitiful illusion, a complete farce of putting an "X" on a ballot paper once every few years, and we might well say that the hapless punter or citizen or whatever you like to call him stands as much chance with his one "X" on a ballot paper as he does with his eight "X"s on the treble chance. His chances of pulling off a big pool win may be (as has, I think, been calculated) as remote as those of being struck by lightning or becoming the father of triplets, but his chances of securing the government he desires are about as likely as both those events happening at once. The pools emancipate the citizens "one by one", too.

While to us democracy is something incomplete and hazy, there is something in the idea that is at any rate a step forward from excessive governmentalism, but parliamentary politics as we see them to-day are simply a great fantastic hoax played upon the citizen. It cannot even be said that we see the will of the majority, when all the voters are asked to do is to place an "X" against the candidate they desire to be elected, who is then under no compulsion whatever to do anything but that which his personal advancement (usually bound up with his party) dictates. The cinemas sometimes hold polls of this kind to elect the favourite film stars, and it may be that this in some way influences the films we eventually see. In no greater fashion do the voters elect a government of their own desires.

It is amazing how such a hoax can persist and take in so many people (as witness the number of people who do actually vote). Few working-men can now suppose that by "electing their own

"The ideal is that the people shall have reached such a standard of education that it will be useless and unprofitable to lie to them at elections. We have still a long way to go to reach this ideal."—Field-Marshal Earl Wavell in "The Triangle of forces in Civil Leadership."

"I am not a politician, but I think it is high time someone with perhaps more of a personal regard for telling the people the truth addressed audiences during elections."—Lord Milverton, ex-Socialist Peer at Dunfermline, 10/10/51, in support of National Liberal candidate. "Scottish Daily Record," 11/10/51.

VOTE FOR YOURSELF

Continued from p. 1

possible for conditioning them) that these same people have an equal contempt for their fellow workers, lack of faith in themselves as responsible and sensible people, able to run their own lives without interfering busybodies telling them what is good for them.

THE anarchists by refusing to vote will not affect the results of the General Election next Thursday. What we shall have done is to affirm that as individuals we consider ourselves fit persons to dispose of our lives as we think best and not at the behest of governments; and at the same time to assert our ability to live our lives to the full without infringing on the rights of all others to do likewise. This may sound academic to the "lesser-evil" advocates: yet, in fact, on their own admission, because the problems of the world to-day are beyond our control, we are simply the unwilling victims who have no say, whoever gets their vote. Politics is a racket and politicians are rogues. How can this vicious circle of the "lesser-evil" be broken, if not by the growth of a resistance movement to the whole concept of government—"democratic" or otherwise? It is a movement which does not look for "leaders", for each individual is his own leader. It is a movement which could number millions if only those men and women who

have "seen through" the political racket could shed their fears that, by withholding their vote from one group of rogues they were opening the road to even greater rogues. They will shed this fear only when they are convinced that both the lesser and greater evils are so evil that only by radical change in the whole social structure will the evils be halted.

The anarchists, therefore, by refusing to vote are not shirking their duties as members of the community. By refusing to vote they are declaring their resistance to the whole principle of the government of man by man, which they submit is responsible for the irresponsibility of, and apathy among, the peoples of the world to-day in face of the mass slaughter in progress and the threats of further destruction on an unparalleled scale.

Those 20 million men and women who next week will flock to the polling booths to put their crosses opposite the names of the politicians may think they are choosing their representatives. In reality, those crosses out of which will emerge some six hundred men who will shape our destinies, are the symbols of their enslavement. And as they emerge from the polling booths, far from having struck a blow for "democracy", they will have assumed the guise of sheep, branded with red or blue crosses, waiting their turn to be sent to the slaughter house!

representatives" (who become more bourgeois with each successive election) they achieve anything that is not to be obtained by militancy on the industrial field. On the contrary, when Labour was not politically organised every party competed for the labour vote; nowadays you may take careful note that the important thing is the "middle-class vote", and it is they who have to be wooed. (Perhaps it is not deliberate—politics being what it is, who can say?—but it is fortunate for the Labour Party that it has its "rebels", and that there is popularly supposed to be a split; without episodes like that of Aneurin Bevan recently, the working-class vote would soon disappear while the party was nursing the middle-classes). Of course, it is not to say that the working-class should not consider political questions; all questions concerning the management of society are capable of being decided by initiative and action on the industrial field. We see, however, that now there are working-class political "representatives" the working-class in general is dismissed as "safe-seat constituencies". What alternative is it when to put out the present Government we have to put the Tories in? The only reasonable arguments in favour of voting follow the lines of the "lesser evil": alas, who is to say which it is? Perhaps it is only a case of Tweedledum and Tweedledee.

There are few people mugs enough to disagree with the sound anarchist contention that politics is a racket; but unfortunately they go on to muddle up parliamentarism with democracy, or if you wish, one aspect of democracy with another. It is clearly absurd that in

putting an "X" against one rogue instead of the other scoundrel, or one fool instead of the other idiot, you are "fulfilling the duty of a citizen blah-blah-blah" or exercising any fundamental freedom. So little divides the basic contentions of the political parties that there might as well be, as in fascism or bolshevism, one candidate instead of two, three or (rarely now) four. People are prone to think that this is the safeguard of freedom—but history shows us otherwise, and one need look a very little way back to find examples on the Continent of Europe. The liberties we enjoy, limited as they are, do not hinge on the ballot box—though, of course, they may be impeded by one party as against another. One of them may seek to limit particular forms of liberty rather than others—for "laws are not liberties but their boundaries". Being able to write or say more or less as one pleases, subject to occasional legal interference; being able to strike, work where one can sell one's labour the highest or, if possible, where one chooses; being able to express opinions with a view to the transformation of society; these limited liberties which can exist in a democratic society have all been won by unceasing struggle and rarely obtained by voting. To treat the electoral machinery with the contempt it deserves does not mean that one has to surrender these hard-won gains. Governments take away these rights when they are able to do so, but faced with the sort of opposition that they could encounter if a people were sufficiently militant and concerned about such matters, they would be far less prone to do so. It

WORKERS' CONTROL

Won't come through Political Action

IN his election broadcast, the Lord Privy Seal, Mr. R. R. Stokes, proudly pointed to those nationalised enterprises which were making a profit, including the Bank of England, which could hardly help it! Himself a successful businessman, he stressed the point that there was plenty of room for private enterprise in the Labour conception of society.

In another party broadcast, Colonial Secretary, Mr. James Griffiths said: "We Socialists think that private enterprise is the right thing for some industries, just as nationalisation is the right thing for others... We must keep faith with the men. It's vital to get the men to do the work." Earlier he had said, "Can't the Tories see that if the young men are frightened from the pits, the whole of industry could be brought to a standstill? And then what would become of our defences?"

From these two leaders of the Labour Party, we can surely see clearly enough the poverty of the reformist attitude and the inevitable end of political action aimed at controlling the State. The Labour Party is to-day accepting the profit motive, their first concern is the re-armament programme, and like any other boss class, they have "to get the men to do the work."

We do not have to discuss the Conservatives. The vast majority of the industrial workers will still, for no other reason than sentimental loyalty, give their votes to Labour next week, and as far as they are concerned the Tories have permanently "had it".

PSYCHOLOGISTS ON POLITICS

CAPABLE of arousing convictions that are difficult to distinguish from the perfervid beliefs of religious converts and associated at the same time with every variety of hostile expression from plain insult to persecution and civil war, politics provide mankind with an arena in which their ideals can openly jostle with their prejudices, their reformist zeal struggle for place with their need to dominate and their revolutionary caprices conflict with devotion to rule of thumb. The fact that political parties range themselves in opposing camps and, when not preoccupied with their own virtues, are busy pointing out the wrongheadedness of their opponents, need not conceal from us that, regarded as a political animal, man is constantly at loggerheads with himself. There is in fact no stouter Tory than a revolutionary in power and in opposition, no greater revolutionary than a die-hard.

—EDWARD GLOVER: A Psychological Approach to Party Politics (Horizon).

What is necessary to state again, is the alternative to Parliamentary reformism, which has been shown, as Anarchists and Syndicalists always maintained, to be completely futile as a means even of genuine advancement, let alone of leading us towards the classless society.

It is necessary for the workers to-day to face up to the fact that both their industrial (Trade Union) and political (Labour Party) organisations have failed them hopelessly—but that fundamentally it is the workers who have failed themselves. When you give your power to somebody else, there is no point in moaning if they don't use it as you would wish.

What the workers must realise—what they are, in many cases even now beginning to realise—is that they must start again from scratch to organise themselves on totally different lines—and for different ends—from those they have so far used.

Instead of giving power to organisations outside their control it must be realised that it is only at the point of production that the workers have any strength, that there they are all-powerful, and that if they organise themselves at that point, for the purpose of taking over production, they will be invincible.

The Syndicalist methods provide the only means by which this organisation can be carried out and can bear fruit. Organised industrially instead of by craft, maintaining no permanent paid officials, using the methods of direct action, realising the identity of interest of workers everywhere and the unalterable antagonism between employers and workers, by these means and by these alone can the aim of Workers' Control be achieved.

Should Workers' Control be achieved? The answer is that it should and will be achieved if that is what workers want. We have had control by private owners; we have got control by the State, backed up by the trade unions, in some industries. The political parties in this election promise us nothing further, but it seems to us simple justice that the people who do the work should control it, quite apart from the fact that up to date the controllers of our economy have shown themselves completely unable to use it to the best advantage for the benefit of all.

This is because they are tied to capitalism and its methods. And no government can use any other methods. The way of the workers, however, who should be completely opposed to the systems which exploit them, is in the opposite direction: to struggle against all the forms of oppression—the wage system, militarism and war, the State in all its forms—and to achieve the co-operative commonwealth through workers' control of industry.

P.S.

FROM INDUSTRIAL TO POLITICAL TWISTING

Mr. Harry Earnshaw, secretary of the Beavers, Twisters and Drawers' Union, was elected chairman of the Labour Party last night.

Daily Herald, 3/10/51.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

OPEN-AIR MEETINGS at HYDE PARK
Every Sunday at 3.30 p.m.

NOTE: Sunday meetings will be resumed at the PORCUPINE, Charing Cross Rd. (next Leicester Sq. Underground Station)

Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.

OCT. 21—Eddie Shaw on VOTE FOR YOURSELF
OCT. 28—Philip Sansom on OUR LAST ELECTION?

DISCUSSION & SOCIAL MEETINGS

Every Wednesday at 7.30 at the BIRD IN HAND Long Acre, W.C.
Everybody welcome

NORTH-EAST LONDON DISCUSSION MEETINGS IN EAST HAM

at 7.30

OCT. 31—General Discussion on FUTURE GROUP ACTIVITY
Enquiries c/o Freedom Press

SOUTH LONDON

Meetings suspended for the time being. Readers interested in possible future activities, please contact S. E. Parker, c/o Freedom Press.

BRADFORD

At the MECHANICS INSTITUTE (Saloon)
Monday, Nov. 19th, at 7.30
Eddie Shaw on THE APATHETIC THROG

LIVERPOOL

DISCUSSION MEETINGS at 101 Upper Parliament Street, Liverpool, 8
Every Sunday at 8 p.m.
OCT. 21—D. Pude on ANARCHISM: THE MODERN OUTLOOK
OCT. 28—H. Sculthorpe on FREEDOM—IS IT A MYTH?

GLASGOW

INDOOR MEETINGS at CENTRAL HALL, BATH STREET
Every Sunday at 7 p.m.
With John Gaffney, Frank Leech, Jimmy Raeside, Eddie Shaw

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 Payee, and addressed to the publishers.

FREEDOM PRESS
27 Red Lion Street
London, W.C.1 England
Tel.: Chancery 8364