

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"Humanity isn't condemned either to war or to servitude. But it can save itself from both only by a supreme effort of disobedience to the very small minority of mankind which is setting the pace to-day."  
 —ALEX COMFORT

## Derision and Disarmament

AT the recent general election, all parties scrambled to affirm their belief that the most important bulwark of world peace was the United Nations Organisation, but nothing could be more obvious than that the disarmament discussions in Paris are not even remotely sincere. Indeed, compared even with the League of Nations, which did secure from some a belief in its good intentions, UNO seems a completely cynical outfit. However, the political parties insist on declaring their belief in it, etc. . . .

Is it not time to pull off the paper masks which insult the intelligence of everyone in the countries involved? Could anything be more clear than that the Paris meeting was purely for propaganda? But what kind of half-wits do they imagine us to be that we are supposed to swallow all this stuff?

Russian propaganda has long claimed a monopoly of peace-mongering. So Truman offers reduction in atomic armaments, inspection of arms plants and so on. Vyshinsky, after laughing all night, offers abolition of atomic armaments, early world peace conferences

and the like.

### General Disbelief

Not anarchists, merely, but most newspapers, in effect, deride the proposals of both sides and the discussions themselves. The *Times* in a first leader blandly remarks, "The United Nations Assembly has very much the same effect on the conduct of diplomacy as a General Election has on the conduct of internal politics. In each case the competition for votes and the wish to outwit one's opponents tends to blur the distinction between what is desirable and what is possible."

Some American papers are even

less enthusiastic. The *New York Herald Tribune* remarks of the Western proposals contained in Truman's speech that "it scarcely seems to have been designed for acceptance . . . and could easily be regarded simply as a propaganda device to put the Russians and their 'peace offensive' in the wrong." The *Washington Post* is even more blank about it, and finds it "hard to escape the conclusion that the Western proposals were designed to put Soviet propagandists in a hole, that they were timed to blanket any fakery about disarmament that might come from the Kremlin and announced without the slightest hope of producing results."

As if to write us all off as a pack of ninnies, Mr. Eden pompously declares that Vyshinsky's laughter has brought sorrow, etc., etc.—when in fact we ought to be laughing the whole tribe of solemn clowns right off the stage for their shameless and indelicate farce playing on the desires of all of us for freedom from war.

### A Realistic Approach

Lord Beveridge recently declared that peace could only be secured by force—force which could compel national States to submit to a world government. All intended to be very realistic. But what intelligent man or woman believes that any nation—Russian or otherwise—would submit to inspection of armaments, or restriction to an "agreed"

quota. Who can swallow that kind of stuff when, in every dispute—at UNO or the Hague Court, for example—they accept what is favourable to their own policy and reject anything unfavourable. Lord Beveridge says we have to work together for world government. Like Vyshinsky, we might feel like laughing all night, if our sleep did not seem more important than this kind of tomfoolery.

Nor do any of them mention the real issue of armaments. The *Times* declares that "Nations arm when they fear that they will be attacked or will have to defend their vital interests and disarm only when they feel reasonably secure and when a balance of power has been established." Very measured, very balanced, very judicious, no doubt. But what nonsense! The nations arm when markets are insufficient and their economy requires that they turn to arms production to keep the wheels of industry turning, to absorb unemployment and so on. It is not physical insecurity, but the economic insecurity of the system of market economy—to which the Soviet Union also adheres—which makes rearmament necessary. In this paper, during the early days of the war, this pattern of war, peace, rearmament, war

and so on, was stressed and the present rearmament clearly foreseen.

It cannot be realistic to continue to support this farce, just as it is simply insulting to be led by the nose by these insincere politicians. The French President brings up another hoary old stale chestnut when he suggests that the heads of States should meet to work out a solution. This also we have heard too often before.

It is time to realise that these Trumans and Vyshinskys and their lesser counterparts are leading us not to peace but to war—not because they want it, but because they impotently operate a social and economic system which simply works that way. Realism demands that we grasp the truth that the decision on peace and war and every other outstanding problem of to-day has to be made not by "co-operation at a high level" but on the very lowest level of all—by every single individual himself.

Men and women can no longer relinquish responsibility in the hands of leaders whether democratic or autocratic. They must make up their own minds and carry out their own decisions in their own immediate lives. There can be no waiting for the other fellow; it is one's own responsibility and must not be side-stepped with excuses and fine phrases. Such an acceptance of responsibility "at a low level" would not only isolate the jugglers of UNO: it would alter the social system of leadership-irresponsibility which is permanently headed for war and poverty.

### Syndicalist Notebook

## CLYDESIDE WORKERS RESIST "STAGGERED" HOURS

IN their desire to avoid load-shedding, or power-cuts, the Electricity Authority have "zoned" industry in an attempt to get introduced a system of "staggered" working hours.

The attempt has been made on Clydeside—with mixed success. The managements have welcomed the plan, for obvious reasons. When electric power is cut, they lose, for men on the job on day or weekly wages have to be paid even if, through no fault of their own, it is impossible for them to work.

But for the men, staggering has meant the re-introduction of Saturday morning shifts, which disappeared with the winning of the five-day week.

Managements are trying to operate the scheme by getting the men to work a half-day sometime during the week from Monday to Friday, then coming in on Saturday morning to make up the week of 44 hours.

The mid-week half-days are timed to miss peak hours—from 10 a.m. to 2.30 p.m.—and would vary from week to week.

But at the William Denny shipyard at Dumbarton, token strikes have been held by 1,000 tradesmen who refused to turn up for their supposed mid-week half-day, and at the Elderslie dockyard of Barclay, Curle & Co., 1,500 men stayed away.

Protest meetings have been held at a number of ship-yards, and it seems that opposition to the new order will harden, rather than otherwise. Some men are refusing to work the staggered day, others stopping out on the Saturday morning.

We are reminded of the I.W.W. tactic during their fight for the 8-hour day in America. This was simply for the workers to do their 8 hours and then walk off the job. We are sure that the Clydeside workers could organise well enough for them all to do their five-day week as usual—4½ days if the boss insists!—but simply stay away on Saturday mornings as usual.

If, to save power cuts, the bosses wish to cut one day a week from 8½ hours to 4½ hours, surely no worker will object. But if they want to turn a five-day week into an arrangement which really means working on six days a week, then the workers will naturally object.

There is plenty of work on Clydeside at the moment. The bosses need the workers. If the shipyard men use their strength properly, they could turn this attack on their working week into a victory. Why not counter with a claim for the 40-hour week for a start? Four and a half days and no Saturdays at all. That would save the power cuts and is quite enough hard work for one week anyway!

### MINERS LEAVING THE INDUSTRY

ONCE again concern is being felt by those with reason to feel concern about the drift of miners away from the industry.

Although there are actually 7,000 more miners at work to-day than a year ago, there are 9,000 less than there were last April, when a peak figure of 703,400 was reached.

The drift of workers to and from the mines seems to fluctuate as the pay compares with other industries. Following a wage increase at the beginning of this year, man-power increased. Following wages increases in other industries, leaving mining behind, man-power fell.

A wage demand, calling for an increase in the minimum from £6 7s. to £7 10s., is now being considered by the Joint National Negotiating Committee. If this is granted, the drift from the mines will probably be checked and miners who have left to seek better pay elsewhere may return.

From this we see that miners, who are in the main proud of the tough work they do, are not prepared to do it for less reward than they can command elsewhere. And who can blame them? When money considerations do not come into it, however, they are willing to do the arduous and dangerous work.

### Italian Miners Still Barred

THE above argument points to the fact that the surest means to solve the man-power shortage in the mines is to offer really attractive wages.

This is probably behind the refusal by many miners' lodges to agree to the introduction of Italian labour into mines in this country.

The N.C.B. had hoped to see about 5,000 Italians at work here by the end of the year, but so far only a few more than 1,000 have arrived, only 400 of whom are at work and the remainder are learning English or are undergoing training in British methods.

Continued on p. 4

### And Yet More Derision

WE always thought that M. Vincent Auriol, the President of the French Republic was a fool. His opening address at the United Nations Assembly last week confirms our view. His words you may remember were:

"I will make bold to say that if the distinguished men towards whom all anxious eyes are now turned were to come here to attend this session, not, of course, to take part directly in your proceedings but to establish human contact with each other, to exchange ideas personally, to consider their differences without any agenda or public debate, and to try—within the scope and in keeping with the principles of the United Nations—jointly to reduce the disagreement which paralyses the world: if this should happen, we would welcome it with joy which, I am convinced, would become world-wide."

The French press states that the distinguished men he had in mind were Messrs. Stalin, Truman, Churchill, and Plevin. Now Mr. Stalin, though he is, needless to say, the doyen of Soviet philologists, doesn't speak English or French, and Mr. Truman and Mr. Churchill do not speak Russian (though Winston, to be fair, can say *da, nier, and vodka*). We don't know about M. Plevin, though we feel sure he was only included out of national pride. Even M. Auriol must know him too well to regard him as distinguished.

So the human contact, which would work such miracles, would have to be confined to an exchange of cigars and a kiss on both cheeks. M. Auriol's nonsense is, unfortunately, contagious, for the *Manchester Guardian* which has a reputation for honesty and common-sense, declares in a leading article headed "Man to Man" that "M. Auriol's idea of a meeting between Mr. Churchill, M. Plevin, Mr. Stalin, and M. Truman is attractive. He spoke no more than the truth."

We find more attractive, and certainly more truthful, the remark of Mr. John Nicholson, a former Mayor of Hull, who is reported in the same issue of the *Guardian* as saying that:

"It is not enough to say that war is something horrible and that we do not want it. Without workers to produce arms there can be no war, and so it is in the hands of the workers to prevent it."

We don't know anything about Mr. Nicholson. He may be a Tory, or he may be a 'fellow-traveller' (heaven preserve us) for all we know. But there is more truth in what he said than in all the inanities of M. Vincent Auriol and the speakers who followed him at the Sixth Session of the United Nations Assembly.

## Steel on the Nazi Pattern

WHEN the form that nationalisation of the steel industry was to take was first announced, we described it as "a framework for fascism".

This we based on the fact that the Labour Party announced its intention of nationalising only about one hundred of the largest steel plants, leaving the rest of the industry intact, and that even among the State-controlled section, competition was to be encouraged, in the interests of efficiency.

It has been left to the Tories, however, to give the industry the final twist. Their election policy for the steel industry was stated as simply de-nationalisation, but although most of the thought on the subject was around the financial aspects, the actual organisation of the industry is, naturally what has pre-occupied the leaders of both sides—the management and the unions.

And now we see that the Tories are, after all, not thinking in terms of simply handing the steel mills back to the private companies, but in terms of giving ownership into private hands, while leaving control in the hands of the State. Or, in other words, the policy and purpose of the industry shall be dictated by the State, while the profits go into private pockets.

Now, without being conversant with all the details of the organisation of industry in Germany under the Nazis, we must point out that although the Nazis gave the orders for industry, did not the profits go to their supporters who "owned" industry—the people like Krupp, for example?

Are we not, then, having the steel industry in this country organised in typically Nazi style—and for the same purpose as the Nazis: Guns before Butter?

Before the general election, the agitation aroused by the Conservatives made one think that the whole of the business world was unanimous in condemning State control of iron and steel in any shape or form. But now, according to Lord Kemsley's *Sunday Times*, the steel trade's idea of the new structure in the industry is: Public control but no politics.

Their preoccupation is to create, under Government leadership, a new body within which the generally accepted necessity for public control of policy will be reconciled with the superior efficiency and flexibility of private ownership, so effectively as to remove the industry for good from the sphere of political controversy.

"The project is not impracticable. On the one hand, there is a general acceptance on the part of management that Government control over a wide measure of policy is both necessary and desirable.

On the other hand there is the statement at the T.U.C. Congress by Mr. Lincoln Evans, general secretary of the union most vitally concerned, the Iron and Steel Trades Federation, that: "If the community can exercise control over industry without accepting the risks and liabilities of ownership, that is a matter which should have the serious concern of everybody."

It would seem, then, that managements had really agreed on public control all the time, but the Tories' real argument was over the fact that nationalisation had been introduced by the Labour Party, instead of the "rationalisation" by the good old non-political Conservatives.

But what of the statement by the union leader, Lincoln Evans? It is very clever to talk of "risks and liabilities", but in the profitable iron and steel industries—especially in a time of re-armament—there are not many risks, but plenty of profits, and Mr. Evans must know this. He must also know that that is the reason the Tories are so anxious to get their claws on the industry again, while they have made no comparable fight for the unprofitable mines and railways.

Mr. Evans, representative of the steel workers, therefore, is virtually blessing the handing back of the fat profits to the fat profiteers. What are the steel workers going to say, or do, about that?

The ease with which this shuffling of control and ownership can be carried out, by the way, shows the superficial nature of nationalisation. As we have so often pointed out, the changes go on at the top, the real structure of the industry remains the same, and the position of the workers—at the bottom—remains unchanged.

When this becomes clear to the steel workers, perhaps they will see both the uselessness and the anti-social nature of authoritarian organisation whether it is done for private profit, or reasons of State. They will perhaps realise that it is their responsibility to effect the change in their own industry, and that when they control the industry in their own interests and in the interests of the community of which they are part, the great resources of the iron and steel trades could be used for the benefit of the community instead of for the production of weapons of destruction. P.S.

### TRADE UNION FUNDS

A statistical summary published by the Stationery Office last week shows that registered trade unions in Great Britain had 7,947,535 members in 1950. Income from members decreased during 1950, when it was £15,721,000, compared with £15,885,000 in 1949. Political expenditure was £451,000. There was again an increase in the funds at the end of the year—a continuation of an unbroken trend since 1940. They amounted to £62,150,000.

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP  
 and  
 SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT  
 BRITAIN

**A DEBATE**  
 "ANARCHISM OR  
 SOCIALISM"

For Anarchism—EDDIE SHAW  
 For Socialism—TONY TURNER

at  
 DENISON HOUSE  
 Vauxhall Bridge Road, Victoria  
 NOVEMBER 25th, at 7.30 p.m.



# PROUDHON: A PROPHET FOR OUR TIME

## The Relevance of Proudhon

NOTHING will seem more remarkable to future students of this decade than the heavy fatalism that has weighed over all political thinkers, from the philosopher and the statesman to the ordinary man ruminating over his newspaper. For one reason or another, we all seem to be accepting as inevitable the coming of increasingly totalitarian states, of new Leviathans. Totalitarianism on the Nazi model will, we believe, be destroyed, but in Germany as in the Catholic countries new presbyter may well be old priest writ large. Totalitarianism on the model of the Bolsheviks and Kuomintang will, we think, survive, and in the small nations there must be co-ordination and concentration of power. In the great democracies themselves the expectation is of increased State control, not only over finance, commerce and industry, but over education, health and leisure activities as well. No one seems to regard these tendencies with much enthusiasm, but everyone seems to think them inevitable. Many people are appalled by the prospect of the bureaucracy which must be entailed by bigger units, political, economic and social, but no one believes in an alternative. Somehow, we say, the civil liberties, the dignity of the individual,

must be preserved in the new Leviathan, but how, we have no time to think. Perhaps, if the right people are in control, all will be well. Meanwhile there are more urgent matters on hand.

Liberalism, which might have been expected to give the world a lead in this matter, is on the defensive. Was it guilty of acquiescing in Privilege, in Unemployment? An uneasy conscience keeps its standards furled, or sends them out bearing a strange device (New Deal, Common Wealth) to join the Salvation Army procession towards State Socialism. Social Democracy, on the other hand, is nailed to its own mast. Its whole testament, from the gospels of Marx to the epistles of Lenin, insists on the extension of the power of the State. Not for nothing were the early Marxists called Authoritarians! not for nothing did the Webbs find their mecca in Moscow. All schools of Social Democracy from the Germans to the Fabians, have preached centralisation. Now, according to their own inevitable logic of history, they are due to get it.

But is it inevitable? Is there no alternative to the totalitarian State under one guise or another? If socialists look back in the history of their own movement they will find one. They will find

George Woodcock's article on the Proudhon revival in France (FREEDOM, 27/10/51) makes it appropriate for us to reprint this re-assessment of Proudhon by a non-anarchist, J. Hampden Jackson, the historian, which was widely circulated a few years ago, appearing in The Contemporary Review (May 1944), Synopsis (June, 1944), Why? (New York, Sept.-Oct. 1944), and Politics (New York, Oct. 1945).

a tradition known variously as libertarianism, individualism, self-government, mutualism, federalism, syndicalism: a tradition usually described as Anarchism, which fought its first fight with Marxism nearly one hundred years ago, and its latest, but not its last, in 1936, behind the lines of Republican Spain. They will find that this Anarchist (no-ruler) tradition was stronger than that of Marx in the First International, which Marx disbanded—or removed to New York, it comes to the same thing—because so many of the delegates were Anarchists. They will find that their

famous Paris Commune was the creation of men who called themselves mutualists or federalists and were no followers of Marx. They will find that the most radical section of the French working-class movement was composed of syndicalists who opposed socialism, both Marxist and parliamentary. They will find that the revolutionary workers who bore the heat and burden of the day in Switzerland, Italy, and Spain were Anarchists. And they may even find that the mass of the people of Russia in 1917 cast their vote against the Marxists and for the Social Revolutionaries who stood nearer to the Anarchist camp.

The father of this Anarchist tradition was Proudhon, who died in 1865, eighteen years before Marx. It was Proudhon's disciple Bakunin who led the majority in the First International; Proudhon's disciples—Beslay, Courbet and Gambier among them—who led the Paris Communards (the Manifesto of April 19th might have been drafted by Proudhon); Proudhon's follower, Sorel, whose teaching was responsible for the charter of the French C.G.T. adopted at Amiens in 1906. It was a book of Proudhon's that sowed the seeds of Anarchism in Catalonia and Andalusia,

and Proudhon's ideas, transplanted indirectly, that took root among the Social Revolutionaries in Russia.

It may well be that when our generation recovers from its fatalism and is disenchanted of its Etatism, Proudhon will come into his own as a prophet. The whole stress of his teaching was on Justice, which he defined as "respect, spontaneously felt and reciprocally guaranteed, for human dignity, in whatever person and whatever circumstances it finds itself manifested and at the cost of whatever risk its defence may expose us to." But this conception of Justice did not lead Proudhon into crude individualism. There is no dignity without liberty, no liberty without community, no community in a society of slaves, nor in a society divided into privileged and underprivileged, rulers and ruled. Society must be based on free association, of which marriage is the supreme institutional example. After the family comes the free union of co-operators, and after these mutualist units the federation. The movement must come from the bottom by contract, not from the top by decree. "I begin by Anarchy, the conclusion of my criticism of the idea of government, to end by federation as the necessary basis of European public law, and later on of the organization of all states. . . . No doubt we are far away from it, and it will take centuries to reach this ideal; but our Law is to advance in that direction." The great enemy was the appetite for power, which reaches its apotheosis in the centralised state. Writing before either the German Empire or the Italian Kingdom was cemented, Proudhon insisted on the necessity of "conserving European equilibrium by diminishing the Great Powers and multiplying the small, organising the latter in federations for defence."

Few writers have been more vulgarly misunderstood than Proudhon. He is most generally known as the author of the slogan "Property is Theft"; it is forgotten that he adds "Property is Liberty." (The landowner's rent is theft; the peasant's proprietorship may mean liberty.) He is commonly believed to be a Utopian; it is forgotten that he was the most outspoken opponent of the Saint-Simonians, Fourierists and other French Utopians of his day. He is frequently held to have been a starry-eyed rhetorician; it is forgotten that he wrote of February 24, 1848: "The Revolution must be given a direction, and already I see it perishing in a flood of speeches" and that he wrote this on February 25. He is thought of as a violent man; in fact, no more gentle creature ever used polemical language. He has been hailed alternatively as the Apostle of Counter-Revolution and as the Prophet of the Barricades.

Most of the misunderstanding of Proudhon can be traced back to Marx (who was jealous of him) and to one more respectable cause. Proudhon was both the progenitor and the critic of Socialism. He was attacking not only the very present enemy, Capitalism, but also its probable successor, State Socialism. Hence the apparent contradictions in his work. He was criticising both the

Continued on p. 3

## The Purpose of Marriage

SHOULD it ever be your ill fortune to fall victim to one of the numerous intelligence tests that float around a psychological laboratory, you may well find yourself confronted by the following profound conundrum: "What is the purpose of marriage?" Eager to score another mark, and so crawl out of the imbecile class, most candidates for a cerebral cortex will crack back one of the socially acceptable replies: "To protect both parties." "To protect the children." "To protect society." "So the State has a record." "To obtain the sanction of the Almighty."

And so another myth, foisted on each succeeding generation, is cemented a little more firmly into the wall of a suppurating cell. One more brick in the private jail society has taught you to construct for yourself. Your prison has many cells besides the one of sexual taboos. There is the authoritarian, or "Don't think of yourself" cell. There is the pseudo-religious, or "Jam to-morrow" cell. A cell for the patriot. Another for the racially superior moron. Two for the class-conscious—upper and lower departments. And one for old uncle Tom Cobby and all.

Merely as a matter of interest, and to demonstrate that I have read Freud; all these cells are part of your super-ego. That is what our naive forbears called a "Conscience". Super-ego is, of course, a much more efficient term, as it helps to lower the esoteric veil so appropriate to metaphysics.

But we must return to one cell, and to just one brick in it, if we are to find a method of loosening the mortar: the marriage cell.

It is of interest to speculate on the evolution of this peculiar custom. Going back far enough, say to paleolithic times, it is not unreasonable to suppose that a state of anarchy reigned, much as it does to-day among the lower species of animal life. Moreover we may be assured that the male, being the stronger, was more often the dominating party in any sub-human transactions.

Now it is of interest to consider which step came next; did a temporary form of monogamy, such as is favoured by many animals—the fox, for example—develop, and a gregarious form of society follow? Or did the herd pattern develop first, only to differentiate into family units? You may take your pick, of course, but the latter alternative

appears the more likely for various reasons, the most obvious of which is that although Man is not by nature monogamous, he seems unable to live happily without the stimulus of human contacts in the plural. Working on this hypothesis, it is next reasonable to ask why and how the differentiation took place. The transition from uninhibited sexual relations to the conflict-ridden, narrow state of monogamy appears as a large retrograde step. It could have come about only by several intermediate stages. In the anarchic herd, besides males being on the whole stronger than females, we should expect to find strength normally distributed among the males. Because the primitive side of Man's nature is both self-centred and bone-idle it follows that the stronger males tended to gather a harem of desirable females by right of conquest, thereby unwittingly instituting the idea of permanent ownership. While this must have been quite a satisfactory arrangement for the few virile males at the upper end of the muscular scale, it must have been a most frustrating business for the weak or adolescent, who had to fight like jackals over the rejects or alternatively accept the secondary satisfactions of auto-eroticism and homosexuality. Such an unstable state of affairs could not endure indefinitely. Possibly the weaker members of the tribe took concerted action to slay or dispossess particularly greedy aristocrats, and divide the spoils among themselves. This process would eventually lead to monogamy, or at least limited polygamy, sanctioned by tribal law. This, naturally, was only the outward form. Throughout all these developments in the social code, the polygamous nature of the human species remained unchanged. Whatever the current convention, we may rest assured that large numbers of illicit affairs occurred just as in contemporary society. The natural order reigns supreme whatever external form we may try to impose upon it.

The final step was the most subtle one. Alongside the marriage cell, Man had been building himself the religious cell. As the law was insufficient to support such an unnatural régime, the neurotic, self-righteous and authoritarian types, of which the system had inevitably produced a goodly number, saw that reinforcement of what was sanctioned by law could be achieved if it were also sanctified by religion. It is a unique characteristic of any social order that the unification of two cells allows less freedom of movement than either possesses independently. There is no space here to consider how such incidentals as the actual marriage ceremony developed, and the history of the religious cell would require an essay to itself. Sufficient to say, that the marriage system as we find it to-day is a product of primitive selfishness, laziness, and lack of imagination.

The religious thread is now so inextricably intertwined that we cannot hope to analyse the marriage system in our society without some reference to the Christian ethic. This, very laudably, advocates universal love, which is strangely inconsistent with its support of marriage. The alert Christian will reply, quite rightly, that there is a vast difference between "sex" and "love". Sex is a physiological drive, love is a rich emotion which has nothing to do with sex. The fact that two people, who feel a strong sense of sympathy for, and identify with one another, are of opposite sexes is purely coincidental on a fifty-fifty chance basis. All this is sound enough, but when we enquire why love should be universal and sex not, we find reason bowing to prejudice and superstition. The alert Christian, having made the distinction between sex and love, then proceeds to ignore it.

Sex, like hunger, is a state of tension of the organism in which the internal

metabolism is unbalanced, and tends to produce instinctive behaviour patterns for the relief of tension. In this way the organism is self-regulating and tends to a healthy equilibrium on the physiological level. No-one would suggest that there is any more morality attached to eating, than that one should eat with discrimination and restraint. Even the most rabid misery-monger would not suggest that we should eat alone or always with the same person. Eating alone usually descends to sheer hoggerly, whilst eating in varied company tends to mellow the mere animal lust and make of it an agreeable social function. Yet these very arguments apply with equal force to the satisfaction of the sexual drive. The man who professes universal love should not make a habit of eating always at the same table.

What, then, is the answer? That a restoration of freedom to the sexual, as with all other physiological drives, is not only desirable but workable is a matter of empirical fact.\* Without going into the pros and cons of the family as a social unit we may point with some

## ANARCHISM

WE should not be a mass; that is to say, we should not share the prejudices, the pre-occupations, the errors, the customs of the unthinking multitude. The mass has a firm belief in the necessity of a chief or leader who must be at their head, who must conduct them to their goal, bring them to tyranny or freedom, guide them by caresses, or by spitting in their faces, for good or for ill.

This habit, so rooted in the human being, is the fount of inexhaustible evils for the redemption of the race. Life, honour, welfare, the future, liberty—all are placed at the disposition of him who has been made chief. It is the leader who must think for all; it is the leader who is charged with the duty of watching for the well-being and liberty of the mass in general and the individual in particular; the result being that there are millions of brains among the mass that never think, because the leader has to think for all. Thus it comes about that the masses remain passive, that they have no initiative, and that they drag out a sheep existence; wheedled, at election times, by the politicians and place-hunters, who beat them when the elections are over; deceived, during times of revolutionary action, by the promises of the ambitious, who reward them with kicks for their self-sacrifice when the victory has been won.

There should be no mass; there should be a league of thinking individualities, united among themselves for the attainment of certain ends; each thinking with his or her own head; each exerting himself or herself to give an opinion as to what must be done to realize our aspirations, which are no other than the liberty of all based on the liberty of each; the welfare of all based on the welfare of each.

—RICARDO FLORES MAGON.

humility to the Doukhobors. Several of these unique communities flourish in Canada. They recognise no claim to property, and are consistent in applying this principle to wives equally, with other chattels. No-one is entitled to demand the service of another's body as in civilised societies. Consequently, no child knows its own parents and does not want to, for all adults are equally to be regarded as protectors and providers. Needless to say, neurosis is unheard of, despite the fact that they have been persecuted unmercifully for practising Christianity in a Christian country. Similarly, in one of the societies studied by Margaret Mead in Samoa, neurosis is unknown, although the sexual code here is not as radical as that of the Doukhobors. Complete sexual freedom is recognised until the individual decides that he or she is ready to settle down to the routine of marriage.

Enough has been said to demonstrate the irrational roots of this archaic institution. For the individual to develop into an emotionally mature and stable personality, the basic needs of the organism must be freely recognised and given legitimate channels for satisfaction. Grundism and the burying of heads in the sand will only produce a society of hypocrites, neurotics and debauchees, who have reacted to authoritarian discipline and swung to the other extreme. It is time we woke up to the fact that society is made for Man and not vice versa. Social psychology now has sufficient evidence to make a cast-iron indictment of our present social system, especially its pernicious sexual code.

ROBERT GREEN.

\* See Bertrand Russell: *Marriage and Morals*. Margaret Mead: *Coming of Age in Samoa*. Aylmer Maude: *A Peculiar People*.

## "... BUT THERE ARE SO FEW ANARCHISTS!"

A BOLSHEVIK worker said to us: "There are very few anarchists compared with the Communist Party which has thousand upon thousands of followers!"

What could we answer? It is true! But does "Number" symbolise "Reason"? The great multitude of men who don't bother to think, to understand anything, who don't reflect and who, in reality form the fertile ground upon which vegetate the evil plans of oppression, exploitation, state and governmental domination, political and economic privileges . . . in a word, all the social calamities which anarchists want to eliminate for the general welfare of mankind; can this "Number" symbolise "Reason"?

Indeed, we know that it is not the number that makes reason but good sense and logic. In the same time, experience proves how the majority have been and still are brutalised by their long servility, their sheepish resignation, rendered innocent and easy victims of exploitation by all kinds of cut-throats.

The anarchists realise perfectly well that they are a minority and far less numerous than the tallied Bolsheviks. But we are proud to form, let us say, a common little crowd, instead of belonging to the disguised and disciplined mastodon which constitutes the mass of manoeuvrers who swear obedience to head-leaders and hierarchy with a fanatical humility.

The anarchists are few, but they enjoy thinking with their own brain, and to be able to distinguish good and evil without falling in the colossal illusion of having abolished all social privileges, where, instead, there exists a monstrous hierarchical scale formed by dominating potentates, commissars, diplomats and militarists, all living from the labour of the humble still subjected to exploitation. This class of bureaucrats, militarists, and rulers perfectly similar to the capitalist

class, emanating from a well-initiated revolution chocked up in its development by bloody politicians.

The anarchists are few, but they are pleased not to be among those who see socialism where the antipod of it exists; for by socialism we understand a society in which men are living free and equal.

The anarchists are few, but though few, they aspire to the doing away with bosses and not about substituting themselves for them; they work for the abolition of the State and not with the idea to make of it a monstrous machine that organises and commands everybody and everything in suppressing freedom, right and all possibilities of initiative.

The anarchists have clear and precise ideas, while the force of mass party is constituted not with thinking men, men with brain, but they form an agglomeration of tallied stocks, as we know, they are useless pieces of pasteboard. A conscientious man, an ardent fighter for a high ideal, as is the anarchist ideal, is worth hundreds of docile and passive militants who let themselves be led anywhere and any way by leaders, politicians and ambitious types of men seeking power.

The anarchists don't want the revolution to fall under the control of politicians of any kind. The revolution must maintain its excellent social character and triumph against anyone interfering with the affirmation of freedom and justice by the abolition of state and privileges.

If the revolution should fall under the control of politicians, it would perpetuate the centuries-old shameful of the division of men into dominated and dominators, in rejoicing idlers and wretched suffering workers.

AMEDEO BOSCHI.

(Trans. by J. S., from L'Adunata dei Refrattari, New York.)

## FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

- Four Thousand Million Mouths  
Le Gros Clark & Pirie 12/6  
Scientific humanism and the shadow of world hunger.
- Geography of Hunger  
Josue de Castro 18/-  
With a Foreword by Lord Boyd Orr.
- Marriage & Morals Bertrand Russell 9/6
- On Education Bertrand Russell 7/6  
Reprints of two modern classics.
- The Popes & Their Church  
Joseph McCabe 1/-  
A new edition of this account of the origin and development of the Papacy.
- The Logic of Liberty M. Polanyi 15/-  
A collection of Professor Polanyi's addresses and articles.
- Crime & Punishment F. Dostoevski 5/-  
A Penguin Classic translated by David Magarshack.

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



## POWER & SOCIETY

"IF I speak of the problem of power, at least I do not mean that it is a problem whether power should exist or not." With these words Lord Radcliffe opened the B.B.C.'s third series of annual Reith Lectures. Modern society, he went on, "cannot be conducted at all without central authority to keep the whole activity from breaking down."

Lord Radcliffe's opening sentences were intended to dismiss from his listeners minds an aspect of Power and the State which he was not going to deal with; but it is worth our while to consider them more closely. The clear implication is that central authority is both justified and required "to keep the whole activity from breaking down." But what is the "whole activity" of modern society? It is certainly not the satisfaction of basic human wants or the phrase "poverty in the midst of plenty" would not have gained universal currency. The "whole activity" is the pursuit of profit and the specifically capitalist kind of prosperity which flows from this: ultimately, in our time, it has become the production and servicing of armaments.

That this is no mere anarchist hobby horse is suggested by Lord Radcliffe's next sentences: "And, just as to-day's social life requires the existence of power, so to-day's developments have furnished the means of that power becoming a strong force; even changes such as the greater ease and quickness of communication have worked to give it a sharp eye and a firm hand. Moreover, society has become used to the standing armies of power—the permanent civil service, the police force, the tax gatherers—organised on a scale which was unknown to earlier centuries. So the philosophy of the backwoods is useless, because it is too simple, for the present age: the philosophy that goes to bed with the thought that the less authority men have over each other the better for all concerned, for then each man's native virtue will see him through." For if militarism is not specifically mentioned, the terminology implies it at every phrase.

If this is the "whole activity" that central authority props up, and if central authority indeed implies, an increasingly large "standing army of power—the permanent Civil Service, the police force, and tax gatherers"—then the anarchists hostility to the State and to the whole type of present-day society is surely justified up to the hilt?

"Poverty in the midst of plenty." But, meanwhile, central authority continually augments the Civil Service, with its red tape and soullessness; the police force of busybodies and snoopers, the tax gatherers—all of them essentially unproductive occupations which lay increasing burdens on the minority of productive workers. Unproductive, too, in the character destruction they induce in those who pursue such occupations. This is the kind of power which the Reith lecturer does not think it needful to discuss—it is "necessary" for our sort of society.

Of course, it may be said that it is easy to set up an Aunt Sally and then knock it down. Who, after all, cares what Lord Radcliffe says?

But it is not so easily dismissed as that, for his characterisation of central authority in our society is correct enough. And his acceptance of it is also symptomatic of much social thinking. For he is not alone. Lord Beveridge, in a speech recently at Oldham, declared that "it was time we all realised that peace could

not be established without force in the world—without some effective authority above all national governments, able to do justice and at need to enforce it." In a word, world government—and Lord Beveridge made it clear that the Liberals were in favour of that further step in the centralisation of authority.

These are old men speaking: what of the young? Alas, much the same trend was espoused in the widely-read *Illustrated* by H. E. Bates. Claiming that the British were in fact very warlike and very experienced in war, he called for a dropping of peace-time talk of the dove, and that "Britain" should openly exhibit her readiness to fight wars. This, he claims, would secure peace—paradoxically enough after such opening sentiments as this:

"Our children have . . . played at air-raid shelters before they could dig with buckets and spades; their nurseries were full of guns instead of butter. About half their lives have been spent in listening—or perhaps not listening, and who would blame them?—to solemn proclamations by their elders that they loved peace, hated war, and would go to any lengths, always including war, to gain one or reject the other. 'We want only to be at peace with the rest of the world,' might well be written over the tomb of our time."

It is true that power was never so firmly entrenched or more thoroughly centralised than in the State apparatus of to-day. And it is clear that the connection between power and the permanent armaments is not fortuitous. The conclusion seems inescapable: that we cannot be happy or peaceful or in material comfort in a society which maintains these institutions.

But the initiative in putting a stop to this vicious circle, this maelstrom which increasingly engulfs us, will clearly not come from the State. It can only come from individuals.

## Proudhon: A Prophet for Our Time

Continued from p. 2  
present and the future. This is what makes his teaching so valuable to us in 1944; but it needs careful reading to disentangle the tenses. Not that he is a difficult writer. Critics have hailed him as one of the greatest masters of French prose. Sainte-Beuve, his first biographer, praised his style and called attention to his strict etymological use of words and to his debt to the great Latin authors and to the Bible. He wrote a vigorous and lapidary prose, and it is not so much his language that is difficult but the construction of his books which are confusing in their lack of balance and constantly changing angle of attack. He thought of himself as a metaphysician and sometimes as an economist, whereas he was a moralist first and last. That makes him easy for the unsophisticated to read and for the sophisticated to refute. (For English readers, his work awaits a translator; there is only one book available in our language.)

Moralists are often immoral men, as physicians are often invalids, and this is no valid criticism of their work. But how inspiring to find a man whose life bears out his teaching! Proudhon's life ranks him among the rare saints of Socialism. He was born of working people, his father a brewery labourer in Besancon, his mother a servant doing heavy work in the brewery. Proudhon herded cattle on the foothills of the Jura for five years before being able, at the age of twelve, to go to school, where he was too poor to buy books and often had to go without cap or sabots. At nineteen he became a printer's apprentice, and as a printer he made his *tour de France*. Most of his learning he picked up in the Besancon library and in the printer's shop, where he mastered Hebrew and perfected his Latin while setting up an edition of the Bible. Circumstances made him a grammarian, and like Renan, he came to philosophy by way of philology, but the direction of his life's work was clear to him from the beginning.

Submitting an essay for a prize at Besancon Academy, he addressed the examiners as follows: "Born and bred in the working-class and belonging to it now and always in heart, spirit, habits and above all, in common interest and aspiration, the candidate's greatest joy, if he were to secure your votes—would be . . . to be able in future to work unceasingly through philosophy and science with all the energy of his will and all the powers of his mind for the

## Who Are the "Bandits" in Malaya?

THE struggle against the Imperialist powers in the Far East shows little signs of abating, and though the French have been promising ultimate victory in Indo-China, there are still no signs that what has now become an out and out military campaign will be concluded in the near future, and in Malaya the British continue to pour money and men into the jungle battle with the "bandits". The number of "bandits" there must be in Malaya is quite extraordinary! Perhaps thinking people here are not being taken in by these "bandit" stories. Governments have a habit of labelling their opponents with the most derogatory names in order to win popular support for their cause and to hide the true motives for the opposition to their power. In Indo-China there is a very strong anti-French movement. On the grounds that they are "Communists" the French have been appealing to America and the Western democracies to give them the necessary war material to retain their foothold in a country where they are no longer wanted. Their terrorism is being met by counter-terrorism. Last May, a French security official in Vietnam gave the order for twenty prisoners to be shot as hostages a few hours after his own chief had been killed by "Vietnam commandos". This action created considerable unrest both in the country and in France itself. In July, a Nationalist "death volunteer" assassinated the South Vietnam Governor and the French Commander. Last month the French Commissioner for the Indo-Chinese Kingdom of Cambodia was assassinated in the bedroom of his heavily guarded palace, where he was taking an after-lunch nap, by a Vietnamese servant who is alleged to be a member of a Viet Minh terrorist cell. The servant escaped but reports say that "Thousands of police and French and Cambodian troops are hunting for the murderer."

How this will be carried out we can surmise from reports on progress in Malaya, where they are hunting the assassins of the late High Commissioner Sir Henry Gurney. A report from Singapore (7/11/51) states that the whole village of Tras, comprising 2,000 inhabitants, mostly Chinese, were moved out on orders received that the area was to be cleared. The report states that "The action was taken because the inhabitants of Tras were alleged to have supported members of the gang responsible for the assassination of the High Commissioner."

"The villagers are being placed under detention for eventual resettlement in

## Foreign Commentary

other parts of the country. The Federal Government to-day published an indictment, charging that the people of Tras had permitted members of the gang responsible for the assassination to operate about the area."

This action is, of course, legalised by some Defence Regulation or other, but in less polite terms than those of the report it means that 2,000 people have been forcibly removed from their homes and placed in detention camps; their village will then be razed to the ground and "eventually" these 2,000 people will be separated and "resettled" in safe areas where they will perhaps be a minority among a hostile majority. [It should be borne in mind that the tactic of divide and rule is not being neglected by the British in their efforts to maintain their rule in Malaya, where there is a large Chinese population.]

IN the struggle in Malaya and Indo-China, no quarter is given by either side. To say that the British are fighting the terrorists is only half the truth. For the ill-armed Chinese and Malayan nationalists to carry on the struggle against the well-equipped military formations at the disposal of the British (official figures in 1950 give the cost of military operations at nearly £16,000,000) they must use any advantages offered by the terrain and by sympathetic sections of the population. They are doing no more than the resistance movements in Europe, encouraged and assisted by British and Allied agents did, against the German armies of occupation during the war. And just as the Germans shot hostages when one of their officers was ambushed and killed so now the French and British are using the very same tactics against the resistance movements in Indo-China and Malaya.

In September last, the British authorities named Ching Peng, a Hokkien Chinese as leader of the armed struggle and offered a reward of £9,400 to anyone who captured him alive and £7,050 for anyone who delivered his dead body to the authorities. A month later, the authorities received their reply from the "bandits" with the body of the High

Commissioner, Sir Henry Gurney. And the authorities replied by rounding up 2,000 villagers and razing their village to the ground. And who knows how many "suspects" have just been eliminated without even the semblance of a trial.

The situation in Malaya is undoubtedly a tragic one. In the long run the motives of the nationalists ("bandits") may be as base as that of the Imperialists who are holding on to protect their rubber and other interests. But in so far as we have our share of responsibility for British actions in Malaya (remember what they said at Nuremberg about the German people's responsibility for the Hitler régime with its concentration camps and gas chambers?) we must expose the policy of terrorism (or counter-terrorism —it make no difference) as one which no honest Englishman should support, and that the only solution to the present bloodbath is the withdrawal of the British from Malaya. To say that if the British withdraw the Communists will take control is no moral argument. That the British will in the end be obliged to withdraw—just as will the French in Indo-China—there can be no doubt. The resistance to them grows each month as the official figures show. [In February, 1950, "bandit-inspired incidents" as the report calls them numbered 221. By May it was 534, and in October they had further risen to 571] in spite of Defence Regulations, the death penalty for the very act of carrying weapons, and more millions and more men being poured into the country.

British terrorism will only be answered by more terrorism. The Dutch learned it the hard way in Java. It seems that the British and French are intent on following the same road—without even a minimum of protest from the families of those conscripts who are risking their lives for a lost cause and a morally indefensible one.

## PERSIA CALLS IN GOD

THE Persian Government last week announced that "with the help of God" it had begun temporary operation of a major unit of the Abadan refinery. The announcement said Persian engineers and workers, without foreign help, last night started up "apparatus No. 70", one of Abadan's major refining units.

It said present plans call for operating the unit for only a month to refill the storage tanks for domestic consumption.

Apparently, however, even with the aid of God, Persian officials admit Persia's inability to operate the entire refinery, without the assistance of about 1,000 foreign technicians. But this is the first time God has been called in to run a refinery and who knows that once he has got the knack of it he may be able to run the whole bag of tricks unaided. Which should cut down overheads considerably.

## FIRST THINGS FIRST

NO-ONE will surely say that anarchists are pure materialists and utilitarians and therefore far be it from us to consider the work of archaeologists, for instance, useless work, because they very often laboriously dig up the past. But when this assumes major proportions one is surely entitled to protest, as in the case of Pompeii where at the beginning of this month the first stone in the reconstruction of the large auditorium was laid and large scale work in the ancient city was begun. 2,000 labourers and technicians will be engaged for a very considerable time. And but a few miles from Pompeii thousands of Italians are living in dirty, overcrowded slums, without running water, without electricity, without even windows to their hovels. Money is readily available for digging up the glories of the past, but apparently there is always a shortage of money for destroying the squalor of the present.

## WHAT IS EDUCATION?

A U.P. report from San Antonio, Tex., refers to a 26-year-old New Mexico mountaineer who claims he is getting his first glimpse of civilisation. Peter Grainger, the young man in question contends that he never attended school and had educated himself by determined study of some 200 books provided by his father and a doctor who stopped by their cabin once in a while. He saw a motor car for the first time in his life when he came down from the hills a month ago.

When his father, a prospector, died, he buried him on a mountain top and started out by mule to join the Army! Some of us may question his wisdom of choice but not so the Army authorities and he emerged from the Army's comprehensive intelligence test with a general Intelligence Quotient rating of 113, three points above the requirement for officer training.

These results should make the educationists sit up and think.

LIBERTARIAN.

## FREEDOM PRESS

- TONY GIBSON : *Youth for Freedom* paper 2s.
  - PHILIP SANSOM : *Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step* 1s.
  - ERRICO MALATESTA : *Anarchy. Vote—What For?* 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 : *Delinquency* 6d. *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 : *Sexual Freedom for the Young* 6d. *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 or Hovels?* 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.1.

J. HAMPPDEN JACKSON.



# THE TORIES IN OFFICE

MR. Disraeli found out long ago that it was a painful and difficult road the "brilliant politician" in the ranks of Toryism had to travel. They are all very useful, these clever young politicians, but when a Conservative Cabinet is picked, blood tells every time. The earls and the marquises win hands down, all along the line, and the lawyers take second place. A very handsome second place admittedly, for lawyers dominate the political set-up, but it is clear from the Cabinet now formed that with the Tories the rest come nowhere. Aristocrats, lawyers and company directors lead the field and the rest come nowhere. Who can blame the intelligent careerists for going over to the Labour Party? All one finds it difficult to understand is why the rest of the country finds it necessary to help them in their careers. Nobody suggests we go and address envelopes for the benefit of a chain store, or vigorously champion some lawyer's paid brief in the courts among the general public. Do people think that in some way these professional politicians are acting out of pure altruism?

Some do, of course, and they are the first to be disillusioned. For so long we have heard the line of Conservative propaganda, echoed by the Press and so many organisations: "Please, Mr. Webb, make us a concession" . . . and Mr. Webb (who was suspected of sitting on the nation's rations out of pure malevolence) was expected to hearken to public demand and grant us twopenny orth extra on the meat ration. The first act of the Conservative Food Minister (Maj. Lloyd George surely does not expect to be called a Liberal-Conservative Food Minister?) is to dock it tuppence. Will we now have to plead with Maj. Lloyd George? I do not quite see the *Graphic* or the *Mail* doing it.

## Cheap Government

Undoubtedly the popular Cabinet move was the voluntary decision to reduce salaries. There Mr. Churchill played a shrewd hand. The public does not really want government all that much, and puts up with it because it believes it to be a necessary evil. However, it wants it as cheap as possible. As Emerson point out, it is a consider-

able satire on governments that the one debt people pay most unwillingly is the taxes. They can believe they get their money's worth anywhere but from the State. From this point of view, reductions in the gross over-payments to Ministers fit in with the public mood. And the Ministers themselves are not a penny the worse, for all of them are considerably rich men apart from their governmental jobs, and the State would take it in taxes in any case; it is a book-keeping arrangement rather than a reduction. But how well it sounds!

The view of the Tories is that they should keep going the "Welfare State" but with an axe on Civil Service expenditure. There is without doubt much they can do in this direction, and having begun on Ministerial cars there is enormous scope to cut down. The Ministry of Labour is one of the most wasteful organisations, with enormous ramifications in the way of office space, despite full employment. The whole Ministry might well be scrapped and it would also provide flats galore without any trouble or bother whatsoever, since it trespasses on large blocks of formerly luxury flats.

## Will the Tories Bring Down Wages?

But what is behind the "axe" is a campaign to cut down wages. The reason some directors of companies are following the Tory lead is because they intend to cut down "waste" on wages. That, however, depends on the workers themselves, and if they do not tolerate a wage freeze again there will not be one. This is not 1931 and the City cannot afford to antagonise the workers. Commerce is entirely dependent to-day on the running of industry, and British trade in particular is solely kept going by the skill and experience of the British workers. We have long passed the stage when the capitalists could monopolise particular trades for particular countries; they can only sell goods abroad to-day on their market value. It is rumoured with some authenticity, for instance, that if the wool market continues to fall many textile manufacturers may close down for months on end until trade

picks up, causing unemployment in this industry until international trade picks up (which will only be when the price of wool rises, as to-day's merchants are waiting for it to fall further). Frankly, the workers in that industry need not stand for unemployment whatever the Tory policy. The world only buys British and woollens and worsteds on the skill of the Yorkshire weaver, and if the skilled men walked out, the industry would close down not for some months but for ever. They have the economic power just as much as the mill-owner, and a Government dependent on the City could not afford such a conflict. The workers have all the aces to-day. The Tories believe in "the ladder", they say, but even they must have the wall to rest it on!

For this reason there need not be undue alarm about the economic situation, and although there are going to be reports about the "terrible economic situation of the country" it is a bogey-story that will only frighten those who confuse government economics with their own personal prosperity. For many years now politicians have been vying with one another to tell us how bad things are and how much worse they will be; it is high time they got back to their older practice of vying each other with promises. The promises may not always have been kept, but occasionally they were and we got a reform or two. Nowadays when we are promised nothing, the promises are most faithfully kept.

## Where the Estimates Go

When all is said and done, the whole reason why there is the present economic situation is because we have an army too big for the country. As it is the "sacred cow" of the State nobody proposes economics and the mere suggestion of military economies sets forth alarm, despondency and hysteria amongst the gentlemen concerned. What happens to all the money poured in that great unending drain? The amount eventually used in war is not the whole amount we have to pay for. The answer can be seen in many court-martials, when senior officers get cashiered and a few months in the cooler, for disposing of vast stores of arms. Palestine was a typical case. Enormous arms camps were built up in that tiny country, and an entire army was sent equipped as if to fight an enemy State of thirty millions. The result was not only what amounted to defeat at the hands of a few thousand irregular soldiers, but withdrawal and leaving the arms behind. Having pulled out altogether the Army preserved its "neutrality" as between "Arab" and "Jew" by wholesale destruction of arms and stores, without any attempt at least to sell them (as capitalist morality would have dictated) to both sides, to get some of the losses back. Of course, it was not properly carried out; "free enterprise" stepped in and sold the arms indiscriminately to all comers, and a few of the unlucky ones have appeared at court-martials. This is not an individual case; the enormous sums not only spent, but lost wholesale, in Greece and Egypt, could pay for a hundred Festivals of Britain (with no goodwill built up either!) and no mathematician could count up the post-war expenditure in Europe. Lewis Carroll (but not as a mathematician) might be able to calculate the expenditure involved in taking down works in Germany and putting them up again.

If the Government really applied an "axe" to the Army—without even saying at the moment that they should abolish



With Acknowledgements to "Glasgow Weekly News"

it—the pay-as-you-earn racket would soon disappear. They might even grant a few concessions on the strength of the saving. It is long since we had a concession for the workers, but if the Cabinet, so Victorian in sound (the Marquis of Salisbury, the Earl of Hume . . .) would like to be really Victorian and think of some device to "improve the lot of the labouring classes" one or two minor reforms would not really endanger their economic position and might do some good electorally speaking.

For instance: company directors all ride to work in their cars (as the Ministers well know, for although they may be cutting on Ministerial Daimlers, there are none of them who will really have to take the Underground). Invariably it is charged up to tax, and so does the transport of all the business gentry. The Inland Revenue can't stop it, and why not stop trying and allow tax concession on all fares to work? After all, the workers' bus fares are as much a "business expense" as anything the company director puts down. So far as London workers are concerned this would be a considerable relief. To get an average wage with ten shillings knocked off for the London Passenger Transport Board and yet charged by the State as a nett wage, is really a heavy load. Since nationalisation they are in fact paying tax on the money the State itself takes away in fares.

A few little concessions like these could always be pressed for; it is high time in any case that the trade union movement woke up from the idea that the end of things had been reached and when a certain position was reached there was nothing else to ask for; all one had to do was to defend that position. Of course if one believed that such minor reforms might easily be granted by a modern Chancellor of the Exchequer one would rapidly be disappointed; it is so much easier merely to make gestures on paper. If I were a Conservative Minister (and as Lord Helpus I would be no better than the rest of the bunch) I think I would merely make a magnificent propaganda sweep like abolishing identity cards; it would "dish the Socialists" who could not very well oppose it (for what reason?) and would stand convicted of having kept them out of sheer bureaucratic lethargy (which is true enough); it would not in

the least disturb conscription (other countries manage to keep on conscription and other forms of despotism without necessarily using internal passports)—and how much easier it would be than really giving something away!

INTERNATIONALIST.

## MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

### 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. 18—F. A. Ridley on WHITHER MANKIND?**  
**NOV. 25—NO MEETING AT PORCUPINE—Advert. on page 1 for Debate elsewhere**  
**DEC. 2—To be announced**  
**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. 28—OPEN DISCUSSION**  
Enquiries c/o Freedom Press

### BRADFORD

At the  
**MECHANICS INSTITUTE** (Saloon)  
Town Hall Square,  
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.  
**NOV. 18—D. Pude on THE INFLUENCE OF RUSSIAN NOVELISTS**

### GLASGOW

**SUNDAY, NOV. 18th ONLY**  
**INDOOR MEETINGS** at  
Bridgeton Public Hall, London Road  
at 7 p.m.  
With John Gaffney, Frank Leech,  
Jimmy Raeside, Eddie Shaw

## LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

### EGYPT

YOUR article, "Phoney War in Egypt" (27/10/51), although interesting and obviously sincere, does not entirely fit the facts of the situation. "Internationalist," says that "the Egyptians have always asserted that they have a better claim to the Sudan", but it is a well-known fact to anyone who knows the Sudan at all that the Egyptians have been completely unwilling to take any share in Sudanese affairs, to which they are constitutionally entitled. It is only recently that (owing to out of date farming methods and the crude exploitation of the fellahen) output per acre of land in Egypt has begun to fall more rapidly and the Egyptian Government has cast eager eyes on the fertile lands of the Upper Nile. Their action, therefore, has been motivated by political and economic lust.

However, it must not be forgotten that this is only one section of the trouble. Your writer seems to have forgotten, and doesn't mention the Suez Canal at all. This, I feel is the key to the problem. Egypt knows the blockading possibilities of the Canal Zone and does not want to be involved in the next war when troops will fight on her soil and she will disappear completely. Moreover, the alternative proposals for Allied Control of the Suez show the ominous nature of Britain's tenacity.

P.J.H.

"Internationalist" comments: "I quite agree with the first paragraph. Undoubtedly political and economic lust have brought the Sudanese question to a head, but so far as I know the Egyptian authorities have always asserted their claim to the Sudan, and I added to that pertinent fact that the Sudanese did not believe they would be better under one boss only. But I cannot agree as to this being one section of the trouble. I described the Egyptian authorities as running 'a little ahead of the lava', since the periodical riots had already broken out and they could only seek to harness them to nationalistic slogans: Sudan, the Canal, etc. In the last week or two, Egyptian troops have suppressed disturbances in some places which in the Canal Zone are still being hailed as patriotic. The riots to my mind are beyond their control and because foreigners in Egypt are considered a dominant class, they are anti-foreign. I do not think the Egyptian authorities are so much afraid of war (which alone has stabilised the economy in the Delta) as of a violent situation against which once more, as in the past, the ruling class will be forced to seek foreign troops."

### GERMAN IMPRESSIONS

MAY I thank Helmut Ruediger for clarifying and correcting my rather muddled and probably inaccurate impression of the German Federation of Free Socialists and its publication *Die Freie Gesellschaft*? I agree my report

was superficial (my articles on Germany were, as I wrote, only a collection of changeable surface impressions) but I doubt if it can truthfully be described as "slandrous" or "stupid".

I never said the organisation which publishes *F.G.* had ever used the word "Anarchist" in their official title, but that they had "described themselves shortly after the last war as 'the only Anarchist organisation in Germany'." This, I gathered from a trustworthy informant, was the term they had used when contacting organisations outside Germany in 1945. If Comrade Ruediger specifically denies that they ever used such a term, I will gladly withdraw; I should be happy to have it clear that the *F.F.S.* never claimed to be anarchists. From an *F.F.S.* member, I gathered that the "comrades of the *F.F.S.* feel themselves in solidarity with genuinely democratic forces in the West" (to use Ruediger's words) to such an extent that they feel revolutionary agitation in the West to be inadvisable whilst totalitarianism exists in the East, and would support the West in a war against the East. I think it is a fair interpretation of this view to say it means "the next stage in the revolution must be a victory of the Western over the Eastern government."

My observation that "*F.G.* appears to be thriving" and is a "beautifully produced magazine" is, in my opinion, anything but "the most stupid" of my remarks. *Freie Gesellschaft* is beautifully produced, and, chiefly because of the beauty and comparative expensiveness of its production, does appear to be thriving (especially when compared with, for instance, the anarchist *Befreiung*). Although I still find it hard to believe that it is "the poorest journal in Germany", I did not say, or imply, or even think, that *F.G.* had "capital behind it, or paid editors". If it is really so poor, then my comment on the beauty of its appearance is surely, far from being a slander, a compliment. Possibly the chief objection to my comment, in Comrade Ruediger's eyes, is its brevity. "In spite of [not having examined *F.F.S.* very closely] he dares to dismiss *F.F.S.* and *F.G.* with a few stupid remarks."

The answer to that criticism is that the length at which I discussed things in that article is no guide to my estimate of its importance in politics. I "dared to dismiss" the potential influence of the Archbishop of Cologne in forty words (*F.F.S.* got a hundred) and I discussed the German anarchist movement at considerable length.

I agree with Comrade Ruediger that "nobody can have anything to say against open discussion and criticism", and thank him for his comment on my article, with which I heartily disagree.

Fraternally, D.R.

(Owing to pressure on our space we have been obliged to hold over a number of letters—ED.)

## SYNDICALIST NOTEBOOK

Continued from p. 1

We have criticised before the British miners' dog-in-the-manger attitude towards the Italians. Thousands of suitable workers are unemployed in Italy, and surely British miners' own experiences of the bitterness of unemployment should encourage them to do something to help others in similar plight—even if they are "foreigners"?

The fear that their own jobs may be endangered is a ridiculous one in present circumstances. The demand will be for more and more miners for many years to come.

Let the British miners show a little of that international solidarity that the German miners showed in 1926, when

they sent £100,000 to help keep them going after the betrayal of the General Strike.

## THE NEW MINISTER OF LABOUR

SIR Walter Monckton, K.C., the new Minister of Labour, was apparently chosen for his job because of his comparative political purity.

Unlike so many Tories, he has no past to live down, and even his legal career has not brought him into the public eye. He has been a company and estate lawyer—handling the affairs of people like the Nysam of Hyderabad ("richest man in the world") and the Duke of Windsor.

This, in the peculiar logic of the game of creating Cabinets, makes him a suitable choice for Minister of Labour! (What was it the Tories used to say about "jobs for the boys"?)

His opening gambit, supported by Tom Williamson, general secretary of the National Union of General and Municipal Workers, has been an up-grading scheme for producing more skilled workers. He is faced with 400,000 vacancies the Labour Exchanges cannot fill.

In view of the Conservative abhorrence of bureaucrats, we wonder if Sir Walter will cast covetous eyes at the 2,000,000 engaged in local and national government? They could solve his problem five times over—if they were any use!

P.S.

## Special Appeal

Oct. 27th to Nov. 9th:

London: Anon 9/-; London: J.P.B.\* 2/-; London: F.E.D.\* 3/-; Glasgow: A.M.C.D. 4/-; London: Anon E3; Cambridge: C.L.D.\* 5/-; London: J.P.B.\* 2/6; Anon\* 2/6; York: H.A.A.\* 10/-; Dovercourt: L.C.W.\* 14/9; Sheffield: H.W. 2/6; London: J.L. 1/3; London: F.E.D.\* 5/-; London: L.G.W.\* 5/-; Bolton: W.H.B. 6/6; London: A.N.G. 1/6.

Total	6 6 3
Previously acknowledged	452 16 2
1951 TOTAL TO DATE	£459 2 5

GIFT OF BOOKS. Nottingham: K.N.  
\* Readers who have undertaken to send regular monthly contributions.

**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