"It is difficult to free fools

from the chains they bear."

VOLTAIRE

Vol. 12, No. 36

November 3rd, 1951

Threepence

ARE OVER, THE NEW

AT a cost of some £2,000,000, of electors, who at present vote for addressing and canvassing, several elections. hundred tons of valuable paper; of newspapers which for weeks have been unreadable; of some nervous breakdowns and broken friendships ... we have learned that the balance of voting power in the British Isles rested with a handful of Liberals who, deprived of Liberal candidates in all but 100 constituencies, when they voted gave their crosses to Conservative candidates in greater number than to Labour candidates with the result that in seats held by Labour in the 1950 elections with small majorities, the Liberal vote was sufficient to turn the scales.

We have also learned that in spite of all the grumbling by the housewives, the despair of the househunters and the despondency of the "down-trodden middle classes" they still consider the Labour Party the lesser of the two political evils. For the Labour vote was 600,000 more than in 1950. [The fact that the Labour Party polled more votes than the Conservatives and won 26 fewer seats is a question we leave to the "government by the majority" supporters to explain away.]

We have also learned that the general public is quite impervious to all the cajoling, the threats, the promises and assurances that are given by the parties at election time. The attitude, often consciously expressed, is that whoever "gets in" life will go on, more or less as before. Yet West Ham would find it just as unthinkable not to continue returning its Labour candidate to the House with a majority of 30,000 as would Westmorland not to return a Conservative with a large majority. With two solid immovable blocs voting Labour and Conservative respectively at every election, the political parties to end the deadlock which otherwise may result in a breakdown of the existing parliamentary system must either introduce some form of Proportional Representation or seek to eliminate the liberal vote altogether by absorbing it as well as finding ways and means of inducing the 6 million

millions of hours of envelope neither side, to take part in future

FOR the Anarchists, their course is clear. They must continue to work to place before the general public the only alternative to government: no government. It is a slow process, for the conditioning forces at work to keep the people subservient and to inculcate in them the acceptance of the idea that there must always be the rulers and the ruled—even in the most "democratic" countries—are powerful and all-embracing. Beginning with the family, the Church, the School, the Employer and the State, we are faced with authority at every turn. Yet ours is not a hopeless task for however slowly the anti-authoritarian ideas may progress they are at least in the right direction (which is more than can be said for the reformers who in wanting to patch up the existing system to make it palatable, are travelling in circles, their ultimate fate being that of the Liberals). And there are signs of some progress in the relations between parents and children; of open criticism and scepticism with regard to the authority and dogmas of the Church; and quite visible progress in the attitude to education and discipline in our schools compared with only twenty-five years

ANARCHISTS are not dreamers. Dreamers are those who, with the experience of many Governments of differing hues and broken promises, still hope that their problems can be solved satisfactorily by politicians and by governments. The Anarchists are realists because they have broken through that vicious circle, and are not afraid to face the problems of life.

We are told, "If you have no Government, there will be chaos" and because most of us have never been allowed to grow up (and no person who is not responsible for running his life and being himself has grown up) we are haunted by the unknown the moment central authority

collapses. Yet, it is in such periods in history where the ordinary man and women, left to his or her own devices, has proved the creative powers and sense of responsibility which we all possess. That the ruling classes, the employers of labour, and the parasites of society do not recognise this is understandable; it would be against their interests to do so. But to us the wage earners, the cannon fodder, the silent masses who are directed first here then there, who are one day told that black is white and the next that white is black, it is in our interests to grow up and learn to "walk" without the aid of the evergrowing number of "knowing" hands which are offered to us, all of which lead us away from the direction we would want to take.

We Anarchists are not afraid of the unknown. Nor are we afraid that once freed from the bonds of authority our fellow beings will become raving lunatics bent on cutting one another's throats. Man's real interests lie in co-operation with his fellow beings. It is in our present society that the "law of the jungle"

#### TORY LAWYERS CHAMPION CIVIL LIBERTIES?

ON October 8th, the administrative law sub-committee of the Inns of Court Conservative and Unionist Society issued a report on the growth of the power of the Executive and on problems of administrative law in England.

During the past twenty or thirty years the liberty of the individual has been gradually whittled down, and practices which, a generation ago, would have horrified our fathers, are to-day accepted as normal. It is therefore gratifying to see a protest coming from the lawyers themselves.

The report stated that during the past 50 years, for various reasons, the power of the Executive has tended to expand so that there is to-day a real danger that it will overtop the other functions of the administration and will be beyond the control of the Legislature or the Judiciary. It was clear that the attempt to protect administrative decisions from the scrutiny of the Judiciary was a threat to the liberty of the subject.

The principal Ministers of the Crown were to-day in the possession of the powers which enabled them to requisition the property of any subject without the right of appeal. They compel service in the armed forces, restrict entrance to or exit from the country, and even control how or when the subject was to earn his daily bread.

Those enormous powers were conferred by the legislature as a result of the war, and were prolonged by the Labour Government in the Supplies and Services Act, 1945. The report says that law sub-committee's report?

there was no doubt that these powers were lawful, but it was doubtful if the legislature had realised how extensive they were.

The real and growing evil, say the Conservative lawyers, is the existence of ministerial autocracy, and they propose the following remedies:

(1) Legislation to remove existing clauses in Acts of Parliament which at present hamper the free exercise of the juridiction of the courts;

(2) Legislation to provide a right of appeal to the courts on points of law in all cases;

(3) Administrative tribunals to be made independent of the department interested, their establishment and procedure to come under the Lord Chancellor; and

(4) The establishment of a committee or commission of three under a High Court judge to review the procedure and constitution of administrative tribunals and make recommendations.

Now it is not difficult to see in these recommendations a main concern for the property rights of individuals faced-for example, with compulsory purchase by some Ministry or other. Nevertheless, the right, upheld in the past, for a private citizen to go to law against the government ought to be upheld in the general struggle against bureaucratic encroachment.

This report appeared two and a half weeks before the General Election.

The Conservative Party itself has been vociferously attacking Socialist bureaucratic trends. Mr. Churchill has appointed two eminent lawyers to non-legal ministerial positions. Will it be asking too much of political good faith to hope that the Tories will take notice of the

#### Mr. Churchill Re-enter

"I am no flatterer-you've supped full of flattery; They say you like it, too-'tis no great

wonder. He whose whole life has been assault

and battery,

At last may get a little tired of thunder;

And, swallowing eulogy much more than satire, he

May like being praised for every lucky

Called 'Saviour of the Nations' not yet

And 'Europe's Liberator'-still en-

-Byron on the Duke of Wellington.

MR. Churchill has on a few occasions pointed out that he had no personal ambitions in seeking office since the wildest daydreams of his youth had been fully surpassed. The coy admission leads one to speculate on what Mr. Churchill's youthful daydreams might have been, but certainly he could never have expected the fates-or the Press?-to have been so kind to him in his old age. There are more fulsome tributes paid to Stalin, of course, but the build-ups received by Mr. Churchill are all the more flattering because the journalists who wrote them did not have to do so and got nothing in return but good story

material. When the young Mr. Churchill came home from the South African War, his exploits were popularised in the press, and he played well up to the rôle assigned him by the journalists of the time. It facilitated his entry into politics, where for the first time he encountered real opposition, the envy of fellow-Liberals and the sneers of the Conservatives. When he crossed the floor of the House and became a Tory, he became the most reactionary of the Tories, and in office and out continued on the road to higher office yet, until suddenly he found decisively he was out. The Conservative Party had never really welcomed him; it might be all very well thinking in terms of the sinner who comes to repentance, but not when the bishoprics are being handed out. . . .

As an independent Conservative it was possible to stand out against some of the crimes and blunders of the party. While the advocacy of Edward VIII did not come off, and left Mr. Churchill lonelier than ever, it was possible for him to stand out against the Chamberlain policy of appeasing the dictators. Mr. Churchill had been in his day an extreme admirer of them; it was never in the nature of the Churchill family to stay

too long supporting somebody else, however, and when the fascist powers began to menace the security of the British Empire, and when, too, an independent body of Conservatives dissociated itself from Munich, Mr. Churchill came back into the limelight once more. The sequel is known: when Chamberlain had to step down in 1940 and the Munich leaders fell with France, in came Mr. C. to lead the Government.

There can be no doubt that the effusive compliments he was paid then and has been paid ever since, both by his professional admirers and by the Press, have been exceedingly welcome to one whose whole life was "assault and battery"-in the political rather than the military sense. The Duke of Wellington fell for the same line of talk; he too did his best to live up to it, and in the same way our new Prime Minister-although not even a soldier-came to believe that he was "the man who won the war". Recently he reproached those who called him a warmonger with the claim that they were "ungrateful". The full implications of the remark are staggering.

Byron remarked of the Iron Duke: "There is no doubt that you deserve your ration,

But pray give back a little to the How grateful the nation might well be

to Mr. Churchill if he really had "won the war" and they had been out of it! But by and large it has never swallowed the Churchili myth. It has swallowed many incredible stories about the war, but not the oddly pacifistic belief that one unarmed old man saved England in its darkest hour. . . . It would, however, be heresy to say otherwise in Fleet Street, the Carlton Club and-possible-Transport House.

The parallel with Wellington is close enough, however, because one may legitimately consider how much he did as well. Tolstoy, writing of Napoleon, remarked that after all, these so-called great men were only the tickets of history, and he sought the cause of the war not so much in Napoleon as in some French corporal who signed on again for a further term in order to get a bounty. The legends about Churchill are growing and whether or not they will pass into history depends solely on how accurate a history of our times is compiled. Already we can see that Labour politicians and supporters referred to Mr. C. as a warmonger. One is inclined to agree with his reply that "the finger on the trigger" for the next world war might be American or Russian or

Chinese, but it would not be British, and we must add to that the statement that it matters exactly as much whether the British Prime Minister is inclined to warmongering as it does whether the Czechoslovakian Prime Minister is or

The truth is that once again a saviour has been hailed of nations which have not been saved. Europe has passed into its worst enslavement since the day of the Holy Roman Empire, and yet the Press keeps hailing its Liberator. The worst Mr. C. did as Prime Minister was not to cause war by imperialist provocation, but to skip garly from capital to capital, more blithely than Chamberlain ever did, and hand over whole countries and territories, whose lives and liberties were sold to one despot in return for his support against another. Having sold out Eastern Europe to the new aggressor. Western Europe is delivered in a neat bundle to United States capitalism. The crowning glory of the Churchill administration in wartime was Yalta and Potsdam when-despite the fact that Stalin had very little bargaining power in those days-the present situation was created. Since the war he has gained in popularity amongst Continental statesmen who want a Marshall Aid featherbed by his advocacy of such schemes as Strasbourg. If there is war, it will be Yalta versus

For all that, the gentleman who steps back into No. 10-with a small majority that baffles the pollsters and Press, who did not realise the Labour vote would not fall because it still gets the workingclass district votes-still persuades himself and others that he is consistent and lets himself be persuaded that he is one of our greatest Prime Ministers. When Disraeli became Prime Minister at 64, he murmured ruefully that it cametoo late. In this respect, Mr. Churchill prefers to think with Gladstone. In his dotage that gentleman came out determined on his mission to pacify Ireland, which was rather more difficult than a mission to-day to pacify the remnants of the Liberal Party. But the comparison must rest with the old Iron Duke, who survived Waterloo to become Prime Minister and whose rigid Torvism in the post-war years soon destroyed the legend that he had been tough with the French -he became a little too tough for the British, and eventually London crowds turned to breaking his windows. Nowadays only high-spirited Young Tory sons of gentlemen creep out at nights and break windows of Cabinet Ministers, of course, but while his windows may remain intact, a little fresh air may soon blow into the Churchill museum erected with such care in the minds of readerss of the Press. INTERNATIONALIST.

#### Firemen's Boycott

FIREMEN throughout the country have been carrying out a boycott against all duties except fire-fighting.

Traditionally, the Fire Brigade was paid the same wages as the police force, but following a recent increase for policemen, the firemen have fallen behind. Repeated demands and negotiations through the union have failed and the men have now turned to direct action.

Because of the special responsibility towards life and property invested in the Fire Service, however, the men have seen the irresponsibility of a normal strike, and so have staged boycotts of all cleaning and polishing, drill, lectures, and training duties in general.

The movement has been widespread. In London, the Midlands, Yorkshire and South Wales, 48-hour boycotts have been called, with 100 per cent. supportand even with the sympathy of the Fire Brigades' Union itself. It is an effective way of drawing attention to their grievances, showing their determination,

without alienating the sympathy of the public.

It is perhaps a surprise to the general public to realise that in such an essential service the men are forced to take action like this. Of course, the general public probably think the police force is an essential service—and so it is for the maintenance of State power, and the domination of property relationships.

But the police are an essentially repressive force; their existence is bound up with a repressive form of society, and they are the hirelings who protect that society, and are its first line of defence.

In a free society, the police would be redundant. But in any society, some form of organisation would have to be maintained to deal with the emergency of fire. Firemen, who perform dangerous and arduous work, often risking their lives to save the lives of others, should not have to fight for rewards equal to that given to the unproductive and officious copper.

It is only that the State sees that, for its existence, the police are more essential and therefore must be bought at a higher price. But for society and its safety, firemen are far more essential.

#### LET'S JOIN THE HUMAN RACE, by Stringfellow Barr. (Bureau of Current Affairs, 9d.)

THIS is one of the last pamphlets to be issued by the Bureau of Current Affairs (which closes this month through lack of finance). It was originally published by the University of Chicago Press and was intended for an American audience.

Mr. Barr tells his readers that in terms of food to eat and clothes to wear and houses to live in, the United States "is a rich suburb, surrounded by slums". In order that they may understand the actual problems of the human race, he tells them something of "the two billion human beings who are not Americans", and asks them to imagine themselves among the 200,000 or more babies who are born each day all over the world. "Let's try to estimate," he suggests, "your chances of living a happy, healthy, decent, and useful life."

"You will have less than one chance in twenty of being born in the United States. Your chance of being born in the Soviet Union will be not much better. These countries may be heavily armed, but most people just don't live in them. Your chances of being born white this vear are not more than one in three. Your chances of being Chinese are one in four; of being born in India, better than one in nine. . . .

"If you are born coloured, you will probably be born either among people who have recently revolted and thrown out the white folks who used to govern them or else in a country that is still trying to throw the white folks out. If your are born in Africa, you are likely to learn the maxim: 'Never trust a white man!' . . .

"If you are born in the United Statesand, remember, that's quite an if-you will probably live longer than a year. But if you are born in India, which is more likely, you have only a little better than a one-to-four chance of living more than a year. But cheer up! Your chances in some places would be worse; and, besides, even if you survive babyhood in India, you have only a fifty-fifty chance of growing to maturity. . . .

"If you are born coloured, the chances are overwehlming that you will be chronically sick all your life-from malaria, or intestinal parasites, or tuberculosis, or maybe even leprosy. And even if you are not chronically sick, you are likely to be weak from hunger. You have about a two-to-one chance of suffering from malnutrition, either from too little food or from food that is not a balanced or nourishing diet. You have a reasonably good chance of experiencing real famine-to the point where you will be glad to eat the bark off a tree. But this chance is extremely hard to calculate. . . .

"Again, if you are born coloured, you have only a one-to-four chance of learning to read. And since you almost certainly will not own a radio, you will be pretty well cut off from that part of the human family that has enough to eat and that is reasonably healthy. You will most likely live in a mud hut, with a dirt floor and no chimney, its roof thatched with straw. You will almost certainly work on the land, and most of what you raise will go to the landlord. In addition, you are likely to be deeply in debt to the local moneylender, and you may have to pay him annual interest of anywhere from 30 to 100 per cent."

#### FEWER SCHOOLS

Sunderland Education Committee last night decided to protest to the Northeast Council of Education Authorities against the Minister of Education's decision to cut its 1952-3 school-building programme by more than 50 per cent.

The original programme provided for the construction of five new schools and additional classrooms at three others. The Minister, however, has authorised the building of only two schools.

Manchester Guardian, 28/9/51.

The Young Shelley K. N. Cameron 21/-A documented defence of Shelley as a serious radical thinker.

Rain on the Pavements Robert Camberton 10/6 A novel of Hackney.

Nikolaus Pevsner 3/6 Middlesex The third in the new Penguin series, THE BUILDINGS OF

ENGLAND. The Writer and Politics

George Woodcock 3/6 This 250 pages volume of essays includes studies of Proudhon, Herzen, Kropotkin, George Orwell, Graham Greene, Ignazio Silone, Arthur Koestler, Franz Kafka, and Rex Warner.

The price in Britain of the new issue of Retort is 2/6, and not 2/- as announced last week.

. . . Obtainable from 27 red lion st, london,

W.C.1

#### REVIEWOF WORLD PROBLEMS

"But," continues Mr. Barr, "enough of this 'Let's pretend', No need to be quaint about it. What I am describing is the actual condition of mankind in the middle of the twentieth century. To explain how it got there would involve a good deal of history for which we have no time here. The point is, that is where we have got. Many millions of these sick, hungry, illiterate, and oppressed people belong to 'the free nations' we propose to lead in a crusade against communism. We had better take a good look at the real world we live in before we lead much further. We had better base American foreign policy on

"When we Americans look at Russia, all that we see is tyranny. When millions of these wreteched outcasts look at her, what they see is liberation from the landlord and the money-lender and the planned reconstruction of their country on the basis of modern machinery. They see a possible end to a kind of misery and despair which most Americans have never seen. Tyranny known anything else. We had better stop shouting slogans at them long enough to try with all our might to imagine their misery."

Mr. Barr goes on to discuss the fate of President Truman's "Point Four" proposed in his Inaugural Address of January 20, 1949, for a "bold new propramme for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas", and the vast disparity between the amounts considered sufficient by Senator Brien McMahon and Mr. Walter Reuther to put this proposal into effect, and the amounts voted by the Senate. He then turns to what he sees as the false assumptions behind American thinking on this problem. The False Asssumption Num-One, says Mr. Barr, is the belief, "That Russia is all that stands between mankind and a stable peace".

"Our glance at the actual condition of mankind to-day should convince us that, if all the Russians in the world obligingly died this evening, and if all the Communists of whatever race were so kind as to commit suicide to-morrow at noon sharp, the world revolution for equality would not stop. We should does not frighten them: they have never remember that the 'backward' peoples Bonds. "I should like to see the face are not only hungry and sick and desperate; they now know that modern science and modern techniques make their hunger and sickness unnecessary.

If they find that all the Communists have suddenly and unaccountably died, they will follow whoever else will promise to do something about it. The Asians and Africans will go on fighting or planning to throw the white folks out. The hungry will go on fighting or planning to eat. These peoples are in motion. You and I want peace and quiet, so we can enjoy our unbelievable standard of living. They have nothing to enjoy; so they want change.

"In these circumstances, to suppose that these people would obligingly settle down, if we could just make Russia behave, is to live in an unreal world, not in the world that exists to-day. To think, therefore, that we can get a stable world by frightening or defeating Russia is absurd."

What the author proposes is a World Development Authority on the analogy of the Tennessee Valley Authority in the United States, and a People's World Assembly as suggested by Mr. Reuther, which issues long-term World Peace of the bond declare that the only 'interest' the bond paid was the interest of all of us-world peace. I believe the human race would invest."

"The funds thus raised," he thinks, "would allow the Peoples' World Assembly to make loans to the Development Authority without waiting for the U.N. and the national governments it now depends on-even for the salaries of its own personnel. I think men and women everywhere would heave a sigh of relief that they had an agency of their own choosing, able to use their own money, to tackle the human problem which national governments are so slow to tackle. If we did these things, I think the national governments would find out which way the wind is really blowing; they would quickly fall in line."

We may think Mr. Barr's proposal naïve and we should not imagine that he believes in by-passing government (he is, in fact, president of the Foundation for World Government). All the same, he does state the real problem, and most people don't even realise its existence. The concluding words of his very thoughtful pamphlet are: -

"But let's be frank with ourselves. We have of late been forming habits of fear, not hope. We may go on as we have gone: arming, taxing ourselves, crying that the godless are at our gates. If we do, I think that all mankind will be heavily punished, the guiltless with the guilty. Part of our punishment will be that, refusing to see the world's oneness or our common destiny, we shall suffer each in his separate nation. A further collapse in the world economy would bring famine to India but not to us. It would bring us unemployment instead, and on a vast scale—poverty in the midst of plenty. We would have sent our sons all over the globe to put down revolution, and we would probably be rewarded in the long run by revolution at home. I have not urged this as the reason for acting, because I do not believe that the best reason for health is to escape the painful symptoms of disease. The best reason for health is this: a healthy man is a complete and proper man.

"But we insist on treating symptoms. I think that mankind—and particularly that little portion of it called Americais in for very rough weather. Perhaps a third World War may be needed to teach us. If so, when it is over, we may still arise and act. The tools to work with may by then have been nearly destroyed and the work may by that time be much harder to do. But there is a chance that we may have more wisdom, too. And wisdom, armed with simple tools, might succeed where rich folly had failed."

# Family and Free Love in Russia

Some Aspects of Soviet Family Policy. Lewis A. Coser. Reprinted from The American Journal of Sociology, Vol. LVI, No. 5, March,

Changing Patterns in the U.S.S.R.: The Family. Rudolf Schlesinger. Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1949.

IT has for long ben recognised that the pattern of family life exerts a profound effect on social patterns and ways of thought. This must be so since infants and children receive their first impressions and instruction within the family circle, so that the unconscious (and for that reason, all the more compelling) springs of conduct and character are grounded in this pattern. And to the extent that the family life conforms to an overall pattern in a given society, the character and conduct so inculcated will tend to be uniform.

Governments have always recognised the relationship between authoritarian patterns and the family and have encouraged certain trends often, significantly, termed official morality. But it is only with the advent of totalitarian systems that a conscious attempt has been made to manipulate family patterns and morality to suit the ends of the ruling group.

#### State and Family

The theme of Lewis A. Coser's study is that such an attempt reveals irreconcilable contradictions which may briefly be stated thus: the State demands the loyalty and obedience of every individual, and encourages the authoritarian family as a nursery of obedience. But it also resents the completion of the head of the family as a rival for loyalty. Coser goes on to show that legislation designed to bolster up the State by bolstering up the family, in fact results in an increase in extramarital sexuality and the development of "a 'private sphere' outside of legislative and police control . . ." thus "weakening one of the keystones of totalitarian' structure".

The germ of the contradiction is seen in the remark of Max Horkeimer that: "Although [the National Socialists] exalted the family in ideology as indispensable to a society based on the 'blood' principle, in reality they suspected and attacked the family as a shelter against mass society". (Autorität und Familie: Paris, 1936: quoted by

Coser.)

Much more clearly than in the Nazi régime, the relationship of family structure to government can be studied in Soviet Russia, particularly from a historical viewpoint.

In the early years of the Bolshevik régime the authoritarian family was regarded as the repository and transmitter of the ideas of Tsarist Russia, the stronghold of conservatism. Hence the Bolsheviks attacked the family and sought to disrupt the authority of parents. "In the early years of the régime, the authority of the State and of the party decidedly took the side of the young against the old generation. Children were commended for denouncing the 'counterrevolutionary tendencies' of their parents; parades of children against excessive drinking and other 'anti-social' behaviour of their fathers were common occurrences. The Communist movement fought the family as an enemy of the new social order, a bulwark against change, a seedbed for anti-state activities" (Coser).

Schlesinger quotes many of the official decrees regarding marriage, relationship of children to their parents and to the State, and so on. His book is a veritable mine of documents for a study of the social history of the Soviet Union. It is unfortunately, marred by a somewhat partisan attempt to justify every change of policy on the part of the Russian Government.

But even while the earlier decrees on ! marriage and similar subjects were being

Bolshevik leaders were suspicious and hostile to "free love", that is to say, to regarding such matters as solely for the decision of the individual. Lenin and others gave expression to this fear, and it becomes clear that they were hostile to the family as a breeder of loyalty to the old régime, but were not unaware that it could be used to breed loyalty to their own régime. Coser quotes W. H. Chamberlin as writing in 1929: "Despite these occasional admonitions from comrades of the older generation, 'free love' is still the rule rather than the exception among the city youth. Sex in Russia is a matter-of-fact affair, equally removed from the traditional sanctities and inhibitions of monogamous marriage and from artificial voluptuousness." (Soviet Russia, 1931.)

Coser describes the change: "However, since the middle thirties, all media of mass communication in Russia try to instil strict sex mores. Russian spokesmen stress that 'love is an act very different from simple biological relation-

ship. Free love is a revolting practise, unworthy of Soviet society. "Variety" must be provided by the wife herself, not by changing partners. Promiscuity leads to degradation. The monogamous family has a better chance under socialism than under capitalism. Successful physical relationships between partners are not the most important thing. Under Communism, the family will even grow stronger and more stable . . . The sanctity of family ties is a fundamental bond which knits society into an invisible whole . . . Sound society is unthinkable without a sound, economically secure

"Free love not only creates fortuitious association which, by their very nature, are not subject to police control; it may also foster spontaneity in human relationships and human personality which is incompatible with the discipline demanded in a totalitarian society."

In a succeeding article the change will be considered in more detail.

#### Contribution to a Perennial Discussion Character and Environment

This thought-provoking article appeared in the feature "Children and Ourselves" of an American magazine Manas (Los Angeles) for 19th September.

TT may, at first glance, seem to be wandering far afield from educational problems to discuss psychiatric case histories, especially when they have to do with adults. But apparently one fact of fundamental educational importance is beginning to emerge from such studies, namely, that we are still far from the core of the human being when we discuss his environmental conditioning, traumatic shocks, complexes, and neuroses. There is so much persuasive evidence that the child's character is not necessarily determined by adverse home and societal surroundings. As Dr. Jean MacFarlane of the University of California puts it:

"One of the most provocative questions which has arisen from our twentyyear study of cross-section families, and one on which further research must be done, is why many persons have become wise, steady, mature and tolerant, and have avoided flights into delinquency or neuroticism which anyone of professional competence reviewing their disturbing life histories would reasonably have predicted for them."

The foregoing was quoted by Erling Eng in an article in the Summer Antioch Review, "The Sceptical Psychologist". Eng is concerned with showing how carefully the modern psychologist must guard against pat formulations when trying to select the "determining factors" of human behaviour. One of his best illustrations for arguing that there is often something about the nature of a child which is beyond the reach of either adverse or favourable circumstances is also derived from the work of Dr. MacFarlane, who has been associated with "one of the oldest child development studies in the country". Dr. MacFarlane tells of one woman, now fifty-two, who is

". . . of great strength, understanding, compassion and affection, whose children have unusual stability, independence, a sense of personal and social responsibility and an easy adult relationship to her. She is extremely well-read, an accomplishment attained late at night promulgated, it is significant that the after her double job of supporting the

family and managing the home. She writes substantial poetry and enjoys music and art, a taste acquired through trying to give her children the aesthetic satisfactions she had missed as a child."

But this woman's childhood was such as to make one expect a completely warped and neurotic personality:

"Her father died before she was three, and from an age of three to ten she and her brother lived separated from their mother in the home of a fanatically religious and sadistic grandmother who gave them no affection and beat them whenever they smiled, on the theory that they smiled only when thinking sinful thoughts. She beat them and terrified them with vivid accounts of hell fires and tortures when their undernourished bodies were unable to effect with competence tasks which were beyond their strength and skills. Our mother lived in in a rural community and attended school less than three months of the year, walking four miles each way, many times in sub-zero weather for

which she was inadequately clothed. "At ten she returned to her mother, married now to an alcoholic who did not support the family and, when drunk, beat his wife and stepchildren who were torn between hiding out to protect themselves and risking themselves to protect their mother. The girl escaped before she was sixteen, and married an itinerant worker by whom she immediately became pregnant and in quick succession bore five children."

Mr. Eng then turns to the records of another veteran psychologist, Dr. Anne

"If you found in a clinic a girl whose father had been the town drunk, her mother a paranoid schizophrenic, her first few years practically a classic of everything that shouldn't happen to a child, then a few years of extremely poor institutional care, followed by a life in a foster home with pleasant but inadequate foster fathers (the first one died) and a psychopathic foster mother who turned on her, you would not be surprised that she needed a psychologist. A history like that has been accepted as the explanation of practically any disorder you can mention, and as a sufficient explanation, whether you rely on constitutional or environmental factors. But I can show you the record of a girl with this history who got a good education for herself over her foster mother's opposition, got and held a good job, and is now happily married and an adequate

person. She does have some somatic complaints but they are not important. How did she do it?

"I can show you the test records of more than one superior adult normal . . . which would occasion no surprise if taken in a psychiatric clinic. This is a point whose importance cannot be overstressed. Given a high degree of clinical maladjustment, how does it happen that in some persons it is translated into social maladjustment and in others it is not-what holds these people together? I can guess sometimes, but sometimes I can't even guess."

What do these facts mean? First, that each human individual is more of an individual than we usually give him credit or blame for.

We once heard an honestly confused professor confess to his class that, although he had desired for twenty years to believe that the character of human beings is developed through conditioning, he could not honestly deny a growing conviction that each child is born with something of his own-some unique factor of individuality. The extent to which we give credence to such a view perhaps determines also the extent to which we are willing to treat children as distinct individuals, from the start. And if we were to reflect further we might decide never to have any sort of theory about "how to educate children", as a sort of species, but only theories of what we must refrain from doing "to" any human being.

A second implication of these considerations is that the greatest help we can give a child may be by affording him an atmosphere of inspiration, by learning how to be inspired people ourselves. An inspired person leaves others free to pursue their own course, treats them as companions or equals rather than as prized possessions or as representing obligations. Third, if our children should happen to develop characteristics we consider bad, we might do well to refrain from tying ourselves into psychological knots from thinking it is our "fault". Responsibilities we do have, but they are definable and understandable, and we may overrate their importance when we feel that we are fully and finally responsible for our children. We can wish them well on their way, and do them the honour of treating them as human beings of dignity and promise—but perhaps they will actually mould themselves through their relationships, out of some hidden source of their own individuality.

Vol. 12, No. 36 November 3, 1951

### TOM PAINE OR JOHN LOCKE?

TOM PAINE was by no means an anarchist, but he had a poor opinion of governments. He once wrote to the effect that society arises from men's wants, government from their wickedness, and he often stressed the fact—obvious enough, though usually overlooked--that society, mutual association between men, existed before there was ever any thought of government.

Pursuing his remark that government arises from men's wickedness, he placed it in the rather contemptuous category of "at best, a necessary evil". Nevertheless, it can be seen that he did not envisage as a practical possibility the total extinction of the institution and idea of government.

With a Conservative government once more in power we may do well to remember the remark of the Conservative philosopher, John Locke, who wrote at the beginning of the eighteenth century, nearly a hundred years before Tom Paine, that "the great and chief end of men putting themselves under government is the preservation of their property."

Tom Paine's work for the American revolution, his devotion to the early ideals of the French Revolution and his outspoken opposition to their decline (he pleaded against the execution of the king), his rationalisation—all make him a sympathetic figure. But we are bound to say that John Locke's estimate of government seems to us more practical.

FREEDOM had many occasions during the last six years to point out that the Labour Party took good care of property, and that though an industry were nationalised the position of the workers (and, we might add, the consumers) remained unchanged. The respect for property, the according to it of more importance than to human needs and feelings, has been denounced by many a great writer since the Industrial Revolution. Nevertheless, it remains the guiding principle of administration.

Yet Paine's view of government is essentially the common view today—that without it we should be at the mercy of men's evil impulses. It semes likely that this is still the main conscious prop for the idea of government, which is still regarded as a necessary evil.

Anarchists regard it as an unnecessary evil. Life under government means, life deprived of social responsibility to a very great extent (this extent is increased in the welfare state where the well-being of one's fellow-man ceases to be one's own direct concern—it is looked after by this or that welfare department). Where the men do not have to take care of social responsibilities, is it surprising that they act irresponsibly? Governments not only arise from wickedness, they encourage it.

Society, the mutual aggregations of men and women with common interests or common living territory, by contrast encourages responsibility. The removal of authority from above, far from releasing men's wickedness, will release also their social instincts and aspirations. We have no doubt that these are far the more powerful.

"I place no reliance upon any old party, nor upon any new party. Suppose one to be formed with the noblest intentions, how long will it remain so? . . . As soon as it becomes successful, and there are offices to be bestowed, the politicians leave the unsuccessful parties and rush toward it, and it ripens and rots with the rest."

WALT WHITMAN.

# U.S. IMPERIALISM

THE American pacifist organisation recently sent a deputation to Puerto Rico, in the knowledge, they say, "that Puerto Ricans have suffered greatly under 35 years of colonial rule by the United States," and as a result of the clash between the Insular Government and the Nationalists (who do not recognise the presence of the United States in Puerto Rico), the arrest and imprisonment of Ruth Reynolds (American pacifist in Puerto Rico working for independence), and the stories that civil liberties in Puerto Rico were reaching a new low ebb.

One of the three-man Peacemaker mission, Ernest R. Bromley, reports in the October issue of the Catholic Worker (New York) on their visit.

The trial of Ruth Reynolds, who is a pacifist of long standing who had previously worked for Indian independence began on the day of the mission's arrival. The charges against her were:

(1) "Being a leader and active member of an organisation known as 'The Nationalist Party of Puerto Rico" she did "illegally, criminally, maliciously, wilfully, and knowingly . . . promote, advocate, advise and preach the overthrowing and subverting of the Insular Government of Puerto Rico . . . by force and violence". Under this count it was alleged that she did these things at an assembly on December 18, 1949, by pledging to give "life and fortune to insure the overthrowing, paralizing and subverting of the Insular Government" through armed revolution, "which movement culminated in a revolt that started in Puerto Rico on or about October 30, 1950". (2) "On or about October 26 and 27, 1950" she was riding in an automobile which carried "firearms and incendiary bombs" (this also referred to the three young men of the Nationalist Party whe were on trial with her).

Mr. Bromley reports that:

"She was haggard and emaciated, and we hardly knew her when we saw her come into court . . . She had been arrested on November 2, and held on \$2,500 bail for nine months until trial. She went to Puerto Rico this last time in 1948 at the time of the student strikes in the University of Puerto Rico over the issues of academic freedom and civil liberties. Numbers of students were expelled, some were jailed, and several professors were fired. She held public hearings on these events, and investigated many other phases, making the stories part of a book she was writing.

#### MANIFESTO

The release of our Peacemakers Manifesto to the Puerto Rican People was given good attention in El Mundo, largest paper on the island. It read: "This statement of 1,400 words expresses repentance for the continuous aggression of the U.S. against the people of Puerto Rico, saying, 'We call upon the United States to pull clear out of Puerto Rico'." It went on to say that our statement called upon both Puerto Ricans and Americans to resist the tyranny of the United States, and quoted our words, "To consent to the exploitation of oneself is immoral. To consent to the exploitation of others is just as immoral." The paper then referred to our defining the real violence as imperialism itself, and the overt violence which had broken out as only a manifestation of that continuous violence. "We are not," it quoted us, "recommending the nonviolence of the weak-those who would come to terms with the oppressor at all costs. We are recommending the nonviolence of the strong-those who refuse to accept any lower status, who will not co-operate in their oppression, who will not obey any law that is immoral, who will face danger without flinching, and bitterness or even blows without retaliation or resentment."

#### A POLICE STATE

Ruth Reynolds overhead talk from the jail office below her on the morning that we were to arrive, learned we were coming, and heard a discussion on whether it would not be wise to arrest us immediately upon alighting from the plane. The intelligence service of the Insular Government is an elaborate affair, and we came to understand how such things as our coming were learned. Though we were not at any time arrested, we often realised we were being watched and followed. People who attended court were searched for weapons. On the first day the police took numerous photographs of the packed courtroom, coming close to where we were sitting a couple of times to get close-ups of us. After a strong dissent by the defence, the pictures ceased, but never again during the trial (lasting nearly three weeks) was the can't afford to take the chance," was

the reply we got from those who were frank about why they didn't attend.

#### THE TERROR

We came to learn that in the round-up of "subversives" in early November, hundreds of Independentists (young, but growing, opposition party) were arrested -all without warrants. It was manifestly an occasion used by the officials in power to arrest opponents of all kinds. Munoz Marin gave a message which went round the world that the Communists were behind the revolt of October 30. He said this not because it was true, but because it was the easiest and most effective way to smear the factions who are in favour of independence. As a matter of fact no Communist in Puerto Rico was charged with any act occurring on October 30, though a number were arrested. So wild was the rampage of arrests that Giegel Polanco, Attorney-General of Puerto Rico during that period, and now editor of El Diario de Nueva York, told us on our return that he went to the jails and found members of the Popular Party there. Officials had seized the opportunity to imprison political opponents even in their own party.

All the arrests we learned of occurred at night, between the hours of two and

three a.m. Ruth Reynolds reported that she was gotten out of bed by forty men, some with machine guns, and taken to jail, though no warant for her arrest was thought necessary. All her personal belonging were confiscated, and she was held in jail for nearly two months before charges were conjured up. Stories of others were very similar.

PUERTO

Seventeen witnesses appeared against Ruth, taking two weeks to show evidence, mostly sub-machine guns, dynamite, rifles, revolvers, etc., seized at different parts of the island. There was no attempt to link them with Ruth, the purpose being only to try to get the jury to associate them with her.

She was convicted on the first count only, and given a sentence of six years hard labour ("two to six years" was the technical sentence).

#### AFRAID TO MEET

Though the people who we sought out were glad to talk with us personally. they did not, for the most part try to to get a group for us to speak before, off-shore, twenty-three miles long and Their personal involvement in something like that would be a little too much. At one point some students of the university did try to schedule an informal meeting on the campus When we

arrived at the meeting place on the green, there were detectives waiting instead of students. That night we learned that the President had been informed, and that he had called the police. The students didn't dare appear and hoped we wouldn't.

Through a friend, Ralph Templin was invited to speak in the Methodist Church in San Juan. But before Sunday the engagement was cancelled. He went and sat in the audience. Embarrassment was so great that he was invited to speak anyhow.

We went for a visit to the island of Vieques, off the east coast of Puerto Rico. We were there only a few hours, talked in the Methodist Mission Sunday School and were invited back before we left Puerto Rico. This engagement was also cancelled, the supervisor telling us later that our brief stay- in Vieques caused great agitation in the military, and that it would not be well for us to return.

Vieques is an island twenty-two miles three miles wide, hilly and fertile. It has recently been expropriated by the U.S. Government for its most eastern "defence" in the Atlantic, and it is to be

Continued on p. 4

## THE RIGHT TO DIFFER

Mr. Justice Douglas: If this were a case where those who claimed protection under the First Amendment were teaching the techniques of sabotage, the assassination of the President, the filching of documents from public files, the planting of bombs, the art of streetwarfare, and the like, I would have no doubts. The freedom to speak is not absolute; the teaching of methods of terror and other seditious conduct should be beyond the pale along with obscenity and immorality. This case was argued as if those were the facts. The argument imported much seditious conduct into the record. That is easy and it has popular appeal, for the activities of Communists in plotting and scheming against the free world are common knowledge. But the fact is that no such evidence was introduced at the trial. There is a statute which makes a seditious conspiracy unlawful. Petitioners, however, were not charged with a "conspiracy to overthrow" the Government. They were charged with a con-

IN July last, the U.S. Supreme Court confirmed the conviction of 11 Communist leaders under the Smith Act which makes it a crime to "knowingly or wilfully advocate, abet, advise or teach the duty, necessity, desirability or propriety of overthrowing or destroying any Government in the United States by force or violence, or by assassination of any officer of any such Government." Our New York correspondent com-

mented on some of "the less obvious implications of these prosecution" (FREE-DOM, 4/8/51). Below we publish a document whoh has received little or no publicity in this country. It consists of the dissenting views of two members of the Supreme Court which, to our mind. are important statements on the serious violation of the Freedom of Speech and of the Press that the conviction of the American Communists represents.

spiracy to form a party and groups and assemblies of people who teach and advocate the overthrow of our Government by force or violence and with a conspiracy to advocate and teach its overthrow by force and violence. It may well be that indoctrination in the techniques of terror to destroy the Government would be indictable under either statute. But the teaching which is condemned here is of a different character.

So far as the present record is concerned, what petitioners did was to organise people to teach and themselves teach the Marxist-Leninist doctrine contained chiefly in four books: Foundations of Leninism by Stalin (1924); The Communist Manifesto by Marx and Engels (1848); State and Revolution by Lenin (1917); History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (B) (1939).

Those books are to Soviet Communism what Mein Kampf was to Nazism. If they are understood, the ugliness of Communism is revealed, its deceit and cunning are exposed, the nature of its activities becomes apparent, and the chances of its success less likely. That is not, of course, the reason why petitioners chose these books for their classrooms. They are fervent Communists to whom these volumes are gospel. They preached the creed with the hope that some day it would be acted upon.

The opinion of the Court does not outlaw these texts nor condemn them to the fire, as the Communists do literature offensive to their creed. But if the books themselves are not outlawed, if they can lawfully remain on library shelves, by what reasoning does their use in a classroom become a crime? It would not be a crime under the Act to introduce these books to a class, though that would be teaching what the creed of violent overthrow of the government is. The Act, as construed, requires the element of intent-that those who teach the creed believe in it. The crime then depends not on what is taught but on who the teacher is. That is to make freedom of speech turn not on what is said, but on the intent with which it is said. Once we start on that road we enter territory dangerous to the liberties of every citizen.

Mr. Justice Black: Here again, as in Breard v. Alexandria, decided this day, my basic disagreement with the Court is not as to how we should explain or reconcile what was said in prior decisions but springs from a fundamental difference in constitutional approach. Consequently, it would serve no useful purpose to state my position at length.

At the outset I want to emphasise what the crime involved in this case is, and what it is not. These petitioners were not charged with an attempt to overthrow the Government. They were not charged with non-verbal acts of any kind designed to overthrow the Government. They were not even charged with saying anything or writing anything designed to overthrow the Government. The charge was that they agreed to assemble and to talk and publish certain ideas at a later date: and to use speech or newspapers and other publications in

First Amednment forbids. I would hole Par. 3 of the Smith Act authorising this prior restraint unconstitutional on its face and as applied.

But let us assume, contrary to al. constitutional ideas of fair criminal procedure, that petitioners although not indicted for the crime of actual advocacy, may be punished for it. Even on this radical assumption, the only way to affirm these convictions, as the dissent of Mr. Justice Douglas shows, is to qualify drastically or wholly repudiate the established "clear and present danger" rule. This the Court does in a way which greatly restricts the protections afforded by the First Amendment. The opinions for affirmance show that the chief reason for jettisoning the rule is the expressed fear that advocacy of Communist doctrine endangers the safety of the Republic Undoubtedly, a government policy of unfettered communication of ideas does entail dangers. To the Founders of the Nation, however, the benefits derived from free expression were worth the risk. They embodied this philosophy in the First Amendment's command that Congress "shall have no law abridging . . . the freedom of speech, or of the press . . ." I have always believed that the First Amendment is the keystone of our Government, that the freedom it guarantees provide the best insurance against destruction of all freedom. At least as to speech in the realm of public matters, I believe that the "clear and present danger" test does not "mark the furthermost constitutional boundaries of protected expression" but does "no more than recognise a minimum compulsion of the Bill of Rights." Bridges v. California, 314, U.S. 252,263.

So long as this court exercises the power of judicial review of legislation, I cannot agree that the First Amendment permits us to sustain laws suppressing freedom of speech and press on the basis of Congress' or our own notions of mere "reasonableness". Such a doctrine waters down the First Amendment so that it amounts to little more than an admonition to Congress. The Amendment as so construed is not likely to protect any but those "safe" or orthodox views which rarely need its protection. I must also express my objection to the holding because, as Mr. Justice Douglas' dissent shows, it sanctions the determination of a crucial issue of fact by the judge rather than by the jury. Nor can I let this opportunity pass without expressing my objection to the severely limited grant of certiorari in this case which precluded consideration here of at least two other reasons for reversing these convictions: (1) the record shows a discriminatory selection of the jury panel which prevented trial before a representative cross-section of the community, (2) the record shows that one member of the trial jury was violently hostile to petitioners before and during the

Public opinion being what it now it few will protest the conviction of the Communist petitioners. There is hope, however, that in calmer times, when the future to teach and advocate the present pressures, passions and fears forcible overthrow of the Government. subside, this or some later Court will No matter how it is worded, this is a Restore the First Amendment liberties virulent form of prior censorship of to the high preferred place where they speech and press, which I believe the belong in a free society.

ERRICO MALATESTA: Anarchy.

Vote-What For? 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.

PETER KROPOTKIN: The State: Its Historic Rôle. The Wage System. Revolutionary Government. Organised Vengeance Called Justice.

JOHN HEWETSON: Ill-Health, Poverty and the State. cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.

M. L. BERNERI: Workers in Stalin's Russia. GEORGE WOODCOCK: Anarchy or Chaos. 2s. 6d. New Life to the Land.

Railways and Society. Homes or Hovels? What is Anarchism? The Basis of Communal Living. 1s. WILLIAM GODWIN:

Selections from Political Justice. 3d. On Law. F. A. RIDLEY: The Roman Catholic Church and

the Modern Age.

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. courtroom full, or even half full. "I

#### LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

## THE NEW SOCIETY

IN the bringing about of The New Society (FREEDOM, 20/10/51), the anarchist approach and realisation of this ideal could be attained but for one important item which the author has apparently overlooked—the psychological factor. For anyone not only to think, but successfully apply these principles must more or less be completely free from repression, hate, greed, and the concomitant ramifications.

We are all agreed on the system of obtaining our daily bread, or appreciating art, but are we all agreed on matters of say, child and adolescent sexuality or religion, salient points to be remembered in the achievement of this new society, considering the diversity of views held in our present-day "way of life". Am I to assume that the people will have attained a new orientation on these matters, that there are no powerseekers, or sexually-repressed and antilife elements among the workers, and that the primary task is the overthrow of the few who control our lives by the perpetuation of these methods?

We are given no intimation as to the length of time this "Objective Freedom" is going to take; surely the mass mind could not accept it and put it into practice now. We are not told that the functional thinking that must accompany anarchism can only be realised when the 'slavish instincts' are prevented from permeating and rotting the mind, by 'free education'.

It is folly to talk of people removing the effects of the state charactermoulding as if it could be done by taking an aspirin. To accomplish the unanimity of 'free thought' or free working ideals among the workers, among society, is a

#### DEMON SEX!

SEX is a raging torrent which instruction, per se, is impotent to stem. We all know what we ought to do; our problem, constituted as we are, is how to do it. And the way of hope only dawns for a boy or girl when, along with instruction, their conscience is awakened as their guiding factor through life when their conscience is further reinforced by way of prayer.

-H. GRESFORD JONES (Assistant Bishop of Liverpool) in Picture Post, 6/9/51.

#### ON THE LIST

When four Newcastle booksellers were summoned yesterday for selling books and magazines alleged to be obscene, police said they had been working to a Home Office list.

The prosecution said that in July Newcastie police seized 2,099 books. There were 127 different ttiles. The court was asked to deal with each title separately. News Chronicle, 29/9/51.

#### ARE WORKERS HUMAN?

There is a story about a pyschologist sent down by the Government to a certain factory during the war. The managing director received him rather ungraciously, and told him bluntly: "I don't need a psychologist to tell me what are the motives which make men work: there are only two, greed and fear."

"Oh, yes," said the psychologist agreeably, "and which applies in your case?"

> -From Are Workers Human? by Gordon Rattray Taylor.

long-term operation that entails a much wider field of approach and application, beginning in the educational field.

Sheffield.

Peter Lee.

[We are in agreement with the general tenor of this letter. Not only is education necessary, but its scope must be widened to include the problems Peter Lee mentions. But we by no means are driven by the magnitude of the task into thinking that the desired revolution must be deferred into the indefinite future. Present institutions and ways of life provide the chief obstacles to the spread

of desirable ideas. Their spread will be facilitated by the breakdown of such institutions. Revolutionary upheavals will occur whether we want them or not, whether the "people" are "ready" for them or not. But such upheavals can provide occasions for the very rapid advance of revolutionary conceptions. These will be the more profound the more spade work we have done now, so that we come back to the necessity of pressing our ideas here and now as vigorously as possible, without being too oppressed by the magnitude of the task.—EDS.]

## Anarchism and Pacifism

THINK that anarchism and nonviolence are identical, that is, what is not non-violent cannot be anarchism and vice versa. If the means are violent, the ends will be violence. What makes anarchism logical is that anarchists do not want double standards like political governmentalists-whose violence is holier than their opponents' violence, or at least "less violent" and "better" in the interests of the vast mass of people. No doubt, violence would be resorted to by all opponents of anarchism. But the work of the anarchists is to make the violence of political parties (all of them will combine to break up solidarity!) as little as possible. Of course, the anarchists alone will not be able to fight the combination of all political parties and overthrow them. Unless the producing workers in factories and fields are ready to conduct production and distribution themselves without handing over political government to others, even to the labour élite, or managerialists and technocrats, they cannot overthrow dictatorship and exploitation through the wage-system.

The anarchists can only help the producing workers to run production and distribution without taking over the responsibility in the name of producing workers—as political parties and trade union bosses do; they cannot alone run production and distribution even if they are offered and asked to do so. It is the workers who have to do it themselves and the anarchists can only help them to prevent the parasites from becoming masters as in Russia. If the workers do not want to take any responsibility for production and distribution, the anarchists can do nothing.

The anarchists must make a difference between producing workers and those who are the adjuncts of bureaucrats and parasites. For example, those who work in banks, insurance and advertising cannot be considered as "workers" because their living is paid out of the producing workers, i.e., through the wage-price system wherein the cost of these unnecessary, useless and parasitic activities is put on the prices of products. The cost of army and police is also put on the products. The anarchists must point out that this makes the lives of workers hell, but that is necessary and inevitable if they give away their products to any élite, apart from the parasitism of élite making economy bankrupt and impossible.

Unless the workers take over all industry, agriculture and transport from the very beginning themselves and run production, distribution and transport themselves, they cannot do any good to themselves.

If they do it, i.e., if they take away the economic fangs of private capitalists and political parties of even labour élites, then the violence of these will become impossible or at least be minimised: they

can simply be starved into submission to join them in useful work. Let the parasites keep all the money they like but they will not then get water or service or anything in exchange for it. If taking over all things by mass, direct and economic action is violence, it is. But it is counter-violence.

Anarchism is the anti-thesis of all systems which erect political government which is another name for parasitism and violence. Bolshevism is the last rampart of capitalism—not the anti-thesis of capitalism. It is intensified capitalism. If people don't want violence, then there is no other way than to establish a non-governed society. All other societies will and must have givers who have first to take charge from others before they give!

Bombay, 21/9/51. M. P. T. ACHARYA.

#### BOUQUETS ...

". . I have very much enjoyed the issues received so far and what was, for me a completely new approach to affairs in general, I find most absorbing

"A sane approach to world events seems to be becoming much more difficult and I look forward to FREEDOM each week for that reason. I like immensely its entirely independent attitude."

Worthing.

B.D.B.

"... I for one shall be very sorry if it should be that FREEDOM should fail to continue to be published. It is to my mind one glimpse of sanity at a mad world."

London. W.H.T.

"I acknowledge with thanks the copy of A Hundred Years of Revolution, which I shall have great pleasure in reading. I hope your subscriptions will continue to roll in and give your excellent paper the support it should have."

Margate.

T.L.

"... By the way, this makes the second subscription I have landed for FREEDOM by handing out my copy after I have read it ... I am now working on another man for a subscription and I have my eye on several prospects whom I speak with occasionally."

Chicago. W.G.

#### ... and a Reminder

There are still a number of readers who have not renewed their subscriptions which are now overdue.

They will save us unnecessary work and expense in sending further reminders by sending their subscriptions without further delay

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP AND SOCIALIST PARTY OF GT. BRITAIN

A DEBATE
ANARCHISM OR SOCIALISM?

FOR ANARCHISM: E. SHAW
FOR SOCIALISM: T. TURNER

DENISON HOUSE
VAUXHALL BRIDGE RD.,
VICTORIA
(5 mins. Victoria Station)

SUNDAY, 25th NOVEMBER, 1951 at 7.30

# Exploding a Myth

ponents of better conditions for the slum dwellers was that they would eventually turn any house into a slum; that they would use the bath to store the coal and so on. The idea seems to be losing ground at least among sanitary inspectors (if not among the huntin' and shootin' fraternity) judging by the remarks of one of them at the conference of the Sanitary Inspectors Association, held at Margate recently, to the effect that some of the dirtiest tenants he had known in the slums, when once rehoused, gave no more trouble. "Just a little encouragement and a big proportion of the remainder would be satisfactory. The rest should be rehoused in sub-standard houses for a probationary period and they, too, would turn out all right."

The idea was also once current that it was a waste of time giving a proper education to workers because due to some hereditary weakness, which was apparently to be found only among the low grade workers, they would never be able to take advantage of an education. All these convenient views for a section of the community, have been hit on the head in no uncertain manner by the UNESCO report ("Mankind is One," FREEDOM 19/8/50) in which it was stated categorically by the world's most distinguished biologists that given the same

THE old argument used by the opponents of better conditions for the
be the intellectual equal of any white

One example of a worker who "made good" by his own efforts was reported last month from Ottawa. Frederick Gilbert Roe, left school at the age of eleven, a few years before his parents took him from his birthplace, Sheffield, to a farm in Alberta, but he continued it by steady reading. After farming till he was nearly thirty, he joined the service of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway (now part of the Canadian National system) as an engine wiper in 1909 and worked as a driver from 1918 until his retirement in 1943.

He spent his spare time in historical studies, and since 1934 the fruits of his researches have appeared at intervals in such publications as the Canadian Historical Review, the Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada, and the reports of the Canadian Historical Association. Since his retirement he has completed his first book, a history of the North American Buffalo, which is being published by the University of Toronto Press

In recognition of his work as an authority on the history of Western Canada, Mr. Roe, the retired engine driver has received from the University of Alberta the honourary degree of Doctor of Laws.

# Special Appeal

October 19th to October 25:

London: Anon 2/6; Belmont: M.R. £1/15/0; San Francisco: P.C. 7/-; P.P. £1/1/0; D.J. £1/15/0; A.F. 7/-; A.L. £1/15/0; C.S. £3/10/0; U.S.A.: Anon 19/3; Birkenhead: G.H.W. £1/7/6; London: W.E.C. 3/-; Anon\* 2/6; Sydney: L.P. 2/-; New Hampshire: B.M. 7/-; London: J.W. 1/6; London: V.T. 10/-; Suffern, U.S.A.: L.L. £3/10/0.

Total ... 17 15 3
Previously acknowledged ... 435 0 11
1945 TOTAL TO DATE ... £452 16 2

Readers who have undertaken to send regular monthly contributions.

# LONDON ANARCHISTS' ANTI-ELECTION CAMPAIGN

DURING the week preceding the General Election, the London Anarchist Group held a series of outdoor meetings throughout London in an attempt to bring before as many people as possible the Anarchist alternative to the political racket.

The attempt turned out a great success, and showed what a wealth of interest in the Anarchist case can be awakened among people who have never heard of it before. With our Comrade Eddie Shaw from Glasgow, meetings were held where Anarchists had not appeared before, or not for many years. Several hundred extra copies of FREEDOM were sold, several thousands of our anti-election leaflet were distributed, and valuable experience was gained in assessing the best pitches in London for outdoor meetings.

# THEY DID IT FOR

of Canterbury are to build their own social headquarters.

The Star, 21/10/51.

The parish council chairman and other councillors at Mundesley, Norfolk, the rector and the milkman, began planting 400 trees in a new park because the council has no money for the work.

Sunday Times, 28/10/51.

A theatre, dance hall and social centre is to be opened in Broadlands-avenue, Ponders End. When Councillor Tom Clarke bought the building in 1937 it was a barn used for storing farm equipment.

Now it has been converted at a cost of more than £1,000 into a community centre, with a 30-foot stage, parquet flooring for dancing, dressing rooms cloakrooms and buffet accommodation. It is equipped with modern heating and lighting. There will be seating accommodation for at least 500. No fewer than 27,000 wood blocks had to be cleaned, stripped and fitted to provide the flooring.

ago as 1938. They also had to clean lorry-loads of bricks.

The Star, 27/10/51.

#### PARENTS PROTEST

London parents seem disposed to rebellion about the removal of pedestrian
crossings outside or near schools. This
morning some "unknown persons"
painted white lines across a road in
Twickenham where a crossing used by
children had been taken away. Later, a
number of parents stood in a line across
the road displaying posters and banners.
Traffic was held up for a time. There
was another demonstration outside a
school at Chesham in Buckinghamshire.

Manchester Guardian, 5/10/51.

STERRING STREET

#### American Imperialism

Continued from p. 3 one of the largest bases in that area. The Navy claimed it is a natural base, and took four-fifths of it, giving the people 15 days to sell their animals and get out. The problem was most serious, for the dense population on Puerto Rico's sparse area has little enough land as it is. But for a seizure to be made of 26,000 acres (for a military base), and the people to be driven out into the already heavily populated territory is just what it sounds like-an act of war against them and all the inhabitants of Puerto Rico. 5,000 have already left the little island. The stories are sad ones. Admiral Barbey got his way in the very beginning, with such references to the

people as "savages living in the hills".

PACIFIST APOLOGISTS In these places we met many American pacifists. In fact we tried while in Puerto Rico to meet all the American pacifists to whom we had previously been referred, and of whom we learned while there. Almost without exception they were antagonistic to the contents of our manifesto, opposed to our support of Ruth Reynolds, our claiming that civil liberties in Puerto Rico were in a serious condition, etc. By and large we found American pacifists pro-Popular, and supporters of Munoz Marin's government. Their claim was there is "progressive reform". For example, one spoke enthusiastically about the "splendid penal system" on the island, another spoke of the "remarkable civil liberties" that obtain, another spoke of the degree of selfgovernment Puerto Ricans have, others defended Law 53, and nearly all spoke of the great aid that the U.S. has been to Puerto Rico.

Quite aside from the consideration which involved pacifism in the Ruth Reynolds case, we were shocked to find so many pacifists apparently blind to the system of human degeneration they are supporting in offering so much false and advance information that Ruth was guilty. In a situation like that, to find so many of the American pacifists casting their efforts strongly on the side of the oppressor, as against the individual, is indeed an upsetting experience.

We hired loud-speaker equipment and a car, but our experience showed us that in the better pitches, direct speaking is adequate, and indeed, preferable. We discovered working-class districts like Hammersmith and Camden Town to be "dead" in mid-week evenings, and at those places it was hard work to draw a crowd. On the other hand, at Charing Cross Road, Aldgate and Tower Hill (besides, of course, our regular pitch at Hyde Park), crowds readily gathered, were interested in what we had to say and eager to follow it up by asking questions and buying FREEDOM-and asking us to return.

One interesting feature of the week's work was the activity of the police, who seemed to turn up in strength wherever we set up our platform. And, of course, the time our car broke down and we found we were pushing it along a one-way street the wrong way, they immediately materialised!

The London Anarchist Group counts less than twenty active comrades. Our week's activity showed what can be done by a few when they are prepared to beactive. The Announcements column shows that we are continuing meetings where they were most successful.

# MEETINGS AND

#### LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP OPEN AIR MEETINGS

(Weather Permitting) at
HYDE PARK
Every Sunday at 3.30 p.m.
TOWER HILL
Every Thursday at 12.45 p.m.
MANETTE STREET
(by Foyle's, Charing Cross Road)
Every Saturday at 4.30 p.m.

#### INDOOR MEETINGS

at the

PORCUPINE, Charing Cross Rd.
(next Leicester Sq. Underground
Station)
Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.
NOV. 4—Bernard Gelstein on
PROBLEMS OF THE
REVOLUTION
NOV. 11—Arno Pomerans on
LOGIC AND ANARCHISM
NOV. 18—F. A. Ridley on
WHITHER MANKIND?

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

NOV. 14—Round Table Discussion OBJECTIONS TO ANARCHISM Enquiries c/o Freedom Press

### SOUTH LONDON Meetings suspended for

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 THRONG

### LIVERPOOL DISCUSSION MI

DISCUSSION MEETINGS at 101 Upper Parliament Street, Liverpool, 8
Every Sunday at 8 p.m.
NOV. 4—Rufus on THE FRUSTRATION OF ANARCHISM
NOV. 11—J. Noble on

THE PROBLEM OF SURVIVAL

#### GLASGOW

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

## FREEDOM

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.I England

Tel.: Chancery 8364

Printed by Express Printers, London, E.1. Published by Freedom Press, 27 Red Lion Street, London, W.C.1.