

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"Up till now it has been an article of pride among English politicians that the public would shove its head into any old noose that they might show it—unflinching steadfast patriotism—unshakable morale—obedience and an absence of direct action. When enough people respond to the invitation to die not with a salute—but a smack in the mouth, and the mention of war empties the factories and fills the streets, we may be able to talk about freedom."
—ALEX COMFORT.

There may yet be Time to Save the Nine Workers Condemned to Death in Barcelona

Stop Franco's Firing Squads!

AS we go to Press, considerable doubt still exists as to the authenticity of the Press reports that the nine syndicalist workers condemned to death at the recent trial of thirty syndicalists by a military tribunal in Barcelona, had actually been shot by Franco's firing squads. No effort must be spared, therefore, to bring pressure to bear on Franco's Government by world opinion, to save these men.

Unlike the Press in Spain, which dismissed the trial of the 30 syndicalists in six lines, the world press has given considerable publicity to the death sentences passed by the Military Tribunal at a trial which established their guilt and that of their comrades in a mere six hours! In an effort to prejudice public opinion against these men of the Resistance, the Spanish Embassy in London has issued a statement in which it is denied that there was any political significance in the trial, adding that "it was a question of dangerous gangsters". The Embassy statement then lists the "assassinations" for which these "gangsters" were responsible and points out that, in addition, all the prisoners had participated in a number of other crimes including "armed hold-ups at banks, factories and shops, and the setting of bombs, including one at the Bolivian Consulate in May, 1949."

"As can be seen the statement adds, the strictly criminal activity of

the persons condemned has nothing to do with political ideologies, which have not been taken into account at all, and it is clear that it was a question of dangerous gangsters."

One has grown accustomed to this kind of character assassination by the totalitarians to justify their ruthless suppression of political enemies, whether the trials take place in Moscow, Prague, Belgrade or Barcelona. What the Spanish Embassy does not explain is why it is that these "gangsters" should be tried by a *Military Tribunal* if they were charged with "strictly criminal activity" and not "political" activity.

As the *Observer* points out (24/2/52) in commenting on the Embassy statement:

"But it is established beyond dispute that the condemned men were all trade union leaders, the majority of whom had been held incommunicado since 1950; they were tried secretly by a military court and refused permission to choose counsel

or call witnesses; and the indictment alleged 'acts against the security of the State'. These would be extraordinary measures for a case of common crime."

Franco's London representative must obviously think up a better explanation another time, for it is quite clear that the Press in this country has contemptuously dismissed this attempt to whitewash the Barcelona trial.

★

NO time must be lost in rallying public opinion to the support of the militant workers' struggle against the fascist régime in Spain. Two men were condemned to death at the Seville trial of 75 syndicalists last December, nine this month in Barcelona, and we have every reason to believe they are still alive. Then, as the *Observer* reports, there are "Several similar military trials, with some scores of defendants, now pending in Barcelona, Madrid and Seville. An example of the kinds of cases now being tried concerns Marcos Villar Mendoza, member of the syndicalist

trade union, who was arrested in Barcelona in January, 1950. He is now to be tried for his life for events at the seaport of Sagunto in 1936. The chief witness against him, a member of the Falange, was at the time 11 years old. Mendoza is also to be retried for revolutionary activities committed in 1932, for which he had already been acquitted by a Republican court at the time."

Last week-end, a huge protest meeting was held at the Salle Wagram in Paris, at which the speakers included Albert Camus, André Breton, Jean Paul Sartre and many other prominent men of letters. Similar protest meetings should be held throughout the world so that American ex-Ambassador Griffis' squeak that Spain began to fight Communism long before America, shall be drowned by a mighty roar of horror and disgust at a régime which has maintained itself in power by suppressing freedom of the press and of association, by the cold-blooded murder of thousands of its political opponents, and by condemning thousands of men and women at secret trials to savage prison sentences and often to death by the firing squad.

Franco's régime is not as "solidly entrenched" as his American apologists—for political reasons—would have us believe. World public opinion can do much by its condemnation of Franco's régime, to severely shake the dictator's confidence in a secure future bolstered up by American arms and dollars and at the same time give new encouragement to the brave men and women of the Resistance who for more than twelve years have refused to give in.

But we also think that by making the cause of a free Spain our cause we shall be reviving that spirit of freedom which years of "total" war and more years of post-war political opportunism and hypocrisy have reduced to apathy. We appeal not to political parties and politicians but to the men and women of the world. To the ordinary people: to the writers, artists and scientists, to the students and to the workers. The United Nations pay lip-service to the Four Freedoms and to Human Rights. It is for us to convert the empty rhetoric of these top-heavy, moribund organisations into reality. "An injustice to one, is the concern of all."

AMERICAN COMMENTARY

"War Settles Nothing"

—declares General Eisenhower

IT is no longer only the anarchists and a few socialists who say that war solves nothing. We have been joined by no less a person than General Ike Eisenhower who is quoted by Senator Duff, one of his supporters in the presidential nominations, as having said:

"When people speak to you about a preventive war, tell them to go and forget it. I have come to hate war. War settles nothing."

We must not, however, read into this unsolicited confirmation of the rightness of the anarchist opposition to war, what it does not say. The general does not think as quickly as all that. It would appear to have taken two major wars to bring him to the position of hating war, assuming one has correctly interpreted his remark: "I have come to hate war" (our italics). But he has also learned other things from his experiences. He is opposed to "preventive wars" (does that mean he is opposed to the present conflicts in Korea, Indo-China and Malaya?) and also to wars in general, since "War settles nothing." We assume, for the purpose of this *Commentary* that the General is also opposed to all "aggressive" wars. The next step will be for him to come to the conclusion that the problems of the world cannot be solved so long as the world is a vast armed camp. But somehow we feel such a step is one the General will find beyond his understanding, even assuming the business interests allowed him, as their candidate for president, to express such heretical views, which run counter to the new American economy of "guns and butter."

THE apologists of American democracy are at pains to tell us that the examples of anti-democratic behaviour in their country which we read about in their press are the exceptions that prove the rule. We hope they are right. One cannot help feeling, however, that what gets into the Press is only a fraction of what never even reaches the public ear. And what gets into the Press is so revealing of a state of mind which is more widespread in the country than some would have us believe. Take, for example, this *United Press* report from San Francisco:

"A 25-year-old former Chinese Nationalist intelligence officer said yesterday that he would abide by the ballot that denied him his legal right to move into a newly-purchased home."

"The usual secret balloting was carried out by a grim-faced crowd of more than 200 persons in a neighbouring garage in the suburban community of Southwood, in south San Francisco, on Saturday."

Residents of the predominantly middle-class neighbourhood voted, 174 to 28, to bar from their group Sing Sheng, his American-born wife, Grace, and their two-year-old son for racial reasons.

Mr. Sheng, dismayed that Americans should fail to practise the democracy they preach, said: 'We'll have to sell the furniture we bought and go elsewhere to live.'

"His young wife, who expects another child within a week, concurred with her disappointed husband's decision. She said, tearfully: 'Legally we have a right

to stay here, but if everybody is against us we should have no peace.'

"Residents of the neighbourhood voted against his acceptance on the grounds the presence of a Chinese family would depreciate real-estate values."

"The United States Supreme Court has ruled illegal racial restrictive clauses in property transactions, so the couple could have opposed the vote had they chosen."

Our comment need only be a very brief one. We would simply underline the reasons for voting against the acceptance of Mr. Sheng by these 200 good Americans: "the presence of a Chinese family would depreciate real-estate values"! Also to draw attention to the potential tyranny of the community group, but to defer discussion of this question to another issue, since it is obviously much too big a subject for a brief *Commentary*.

★

MR. Graham Greene, the English author, whose United States visa was held up for several weeks, because some journalist had disclosed that Mr. Greene had joined the Communist Party for a period of four weeks way back in 1922! Eventually the visa came, and Mr. Greene entered the States. But from reports of a speech he made in New York to fellow Catholics, he obviously does not reciprocate the American authorities' attitude of letting by-gones be by-gones. Instead he unburdened himself in the most un-American way, perhaps in order to emphasise his concern over "the state of fear in the United States".

Mr. Green said he thought that his own case was rather comical, but that the anti-Communist policy of smearing and besmirching was not. "This was a land of freedom. People came here not to win television sets or refrigerators but to gain freedom from the house spies, the informers, the military régimes. But there are a lot of informers going around here now."

He referred to methods used by some people to accuse others of being Communists and added that as part of their religious beliefs all Roman Catholics should be opposed to this. He also said: "America's allies are beginning to wonder if their concept of democracy is the same as yours. The fear of one man—Stalin is not found in England or Europe."

It is to be hoped that Mr. Greene has settled all his affairs in America and has appointed an Agent over there, for one suspects that the next time he applies for a visa, to his dossier of 1922 will be added his most recent remarks as a clear proof that he has all along been an under-cover agent of the C.P. detailed to work on the Catholic elements in the democracies!

LIBERTARIAN.

T.U. Leaders 'Loyalty' Call

To Workers' Industrial Action Threat

THE repudiation of workers' industrial action was, as we suggested last week, not long in coming from the so-called leaders of the industrial workers.

The call from the York railwaymen for a General Strike and the Welsh miners' ban on Saturday shifts in protest against the Government's proposed cuts in the social services, brought hurried speeches from Sir Vincent Tewson, Mr. Arthur Deakin and Mr. Herbert Morrison. Probably, by the time these words appear in print, other stalwarts from the "Left" will have added their stern calls for loyalty, discipline, moderation and all those other virtues of the oppressed.

Sir Vincent Tewson, general-secretary of the T.U.C., started the ball rolling by maintaining that the political battle should be canalised through the political machinery of the trade union movement and industry itself must not become the cockpit of political controversy.

He went on to say: "I hope that in all sections of industry our people, however keenly they may feel about the political decisions, will continue to see that industry is able to play its vital and crucial part in determining whether we can maintain economic stability and give us a fighting chance as a trade union movement of being able to protect the interests of our people."

Tewson was backed up by Herbert Morrison, who declared that industrial coercion of Parliament would be "wrong in principle, difficult and ill-advised in practice and damaging to the Labour movement."

And Deakin contributed the profound remark that the Government's measures were just "something we had got to face," and added, "If we are to enjoy a better standard of living, production must be increased."

Concern for Themselves

These statements show three things. They show that the leaders of the trade union movement are concerned, not for the welfare of the industrial workers who form the backbone of that movement, but for the position and stability

of the machinery of trade unionism and its function in supporting the existing economic system.

Secondly, they show that the leaders of the labour movement regard the trade unions as strictly subsidiary to the Labour Party, and that one of its main functions is to support the Labour Party, but to remain otherwise quiescent and ineffective.

Thirdly, that the industrial workers are expected by their leaders to remain completely passive and irresponsible, leaving all action to be taken by somebody else "on their behalf".

We notice that it has been "the Labour movement" which stands to be damaged by the workers' action. There seems to be little thought of how much the workers are going to be damaged by the Government's action, and how much workers' health is going to suffer from the continued strain of the "more production" which is the only solution the T.U.C. offers to the present situation.

Mr. Deakin spoke at Bristol to the Bristol Transport Festival. He said: "We can only live as well as we work," but obviously what he really meant was: "We can only live as well as you work," for it is a long time since Mr. Deakin did any productive work himself, although his function as 20th century trade union leader is the continual calling to others for more productivity.

No Politics

But, in a sense, when Tewson maintains that the industrial field is not the place for political battles, he is quite right, although the Labour Party would feel sorry for itself if the political levy was withheld by the industrial workers.

But, except inasmuch as it is "agin the Government," the struggle which faces us is not a political one at all. The Tories are only carrying on where the Labour Party left off and there is no more political struggle worth the name left between the two parties. (True, Attlee has the cheek to come to the microphone and attack the Tories for putting the shilling charge on N.H.S. prescriptions—but he himself proposed

Continued on p. 4

More About Yugoslav Freedom

THE Central Committee of the Slovene Communist Party (Slovenia is a region of Yugoslavia) has sent a letter to members of the Party calling upon them to purge their ranks of "unreliable elements" and intensify their struggle against the political influence of those who oppose socialism.

The letter, which was published in the Party official paper, *Borba*, particularly attacks the Roman Catholic Church and names individual priests—just as in the "loyal" Russian satellites. "It was necessary to prevent the future appearance, even in the Press and the Arts, of ideas foreign to socialism."

The letter clearly shows how deep the new "freedom" in Yugoslavia goes! According to Boris Zihel, a Slovene member of the Central Committee of the Yugoslav Communist Party, "too many people are mistaking what is intended to be a deepening of socialist democracy for the

establishment of bourgeois democracy on the Western model."

Alleged Army Disloyalty to Tito

A former U.S. Minister to Yugoslavia, Mr. Arthur Bliss Lane, declared recently in San Francisco, that the Yugoslav army "would disintegrate under a Soviet attack". He based his remarks on talks he had had with peasants last year. This may mean no more than that the peasants are, as always, distrustful of war and conscription ("the blood tax"), and are, no doubt, especially hostile to the present régime.

In view of the recent wave of white-washing of Tito, it is gratifying to hear Mr. Bliss question whether Americans really wanted their government to support "a régime which enslaved people". We hope he has similar views on Spain.

Mankind's Arrested Development

A few weeks ago, the quotation at the head of page 1 of FREEDOM was from Dr. Brock Chisholm, Director-General of the World Health Organisation. Dr. Chisholm is a psychiatrist, and extracts from his lectures have been collected in a mimeographed pamphlet by the International Forum in Geneva, with the title World Health and Survival of the Human Race. We are indebted to an American magazine, Manas, for this note on his ideas.

DR. CHISHOLM is an outspoken man, making it easy for the layman to understand what he is talking about. His thesis is plain: No well-intended world organisation can possibly succeed in regulating human affairs without an accompanying effort to eliminate or reduce personal, social and religious immaturities at the psychological level. Such education, according to Dr. Chisholm, requires recognition that the familiar reasons for fighting wars are pathological, no essential distinction being allowable between the war-willingness of "Nazis", Communists", or even "Democrats". What is the common denominator? Dr. Chisholm insists that immaturity is most serious in respect to morality, and that when we base our evaluations of persons and of conduct on preoccupation with "evil" or "sin", we begin to claim the righteousness of ourselves—and the moral corruption of those who disagree with us.

Dr. Chisholm, in other words, is no friend of sectarian religion. However, he sees that moralistic bias is produced by something far deeper than religious indoctrination over the course of centuries. He feels that there is a primal moral problem which we have so far failed to solve. The first temptation to do evil, as Dr. Chisholm has it, is the temptation to localise badness somewhere outside ourselves, while we attempt to feel secure in some kind of organised agreement as to what the good moral standards are.

"The necessity to fight wars, whether as aggressor or as a defender who could have, but have not, taken steps to prevent war occurring, is as much a pathological psychiatric symptom as is a phobia or the anti-social behaviour of a criminal who has been dominated by a stern and unreasonable father. They are alike irrational behaviour patterns resulting from unsuccessful development and failure to reach emotional maturity. It is evident that this failure is usual in the whole human race, and has been so throughout historical time.

"To use a medical analogy, the human race is socially, desperately and dangerously ill. The first necessity is a clear diagnosis of the type of illness, with an identification of the causes and then a prescription of treatment. Using all available knowledge of the human being and his functioning, it should be quite possible to do this with some confidence in our ability to reach sound conclusions. The real difficulty will come—as in prevention of diphtheria, tuberculosis, and many other diseases—from the probable unwillingness of the patient, the human

Correction

In the third paragraph of the note in our last issue on the late Agnes Inglis and the Labadie Library, for "persecutors" read "precursors".

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

Geography of Hunger

Josue de Castro 18/-
Here, in a survey of the world, continent by continent, nation by nation is the terrible story of the economic exploitation of the earth and of man by man, during the last five hundred years. Much of this enforcement of hunger upon peoples, and ruination of the soil, was due to ignorance or lack of foresight. Much, especially during the nineteenth century, was due to deliberate policy, to the rapacity and brutality of mercantile imperialism. We no longer have the excuse of ignorance; and we like to pride ourselves on an enlightened and anti-imperialist outlook. Yet we breathe pious cant about Freedom from Want, and let Asia starve until she revolts. Then we lift our hands in horrified protest.
MARK HOLLOWAY.

Nineteenth Century Opinion

ed. Michael Goodwin 2/6
This anthology from the first fifty volumes of *The Nineteenth Century*, includes Kropotkin on "The Coming Anarchy" and "The Scientific Basis of Anarchy."

Pioneers of Russian Social Thought

Richard Hare 25/-
Includes studies of Belinsky, Herzen and Chernyshevsky.

Obtainable from

27, RED LION STREET, LONDON, W.C.1

race, to take the medicine or treatment because it tastes bad, or smells awful, or is painful, or involves giving up some of his present certainties, or because he still has faith in one or other of the old medicines which have never been effective. Any change drastic enough extensively to modify perhaps the most consistent behaviour pattern of the whole human race throughout thousands of years, is going to be very painful indeed. Extensive surgery is not pleasant, but a persistent cancer is worse in the end."

Next, Dr. Chisholm turns to an examination of our unquestioned, "last-resort" justification for going to war—"defence":

"Can we identify the reasons why we fight wars, or even enough of them to perceive a pattern? Many of them are easy to list—prejudice, isolationism, the ability emotionally and uncritically to believe unreasonable things, excessive desire for material or power, excessive fear of others, belief in a destiny to control others, vengeance, ability to avoid seeing and facing unpleasant facts and taking appropriate action. These . . . are all well-known and recognised neurotic symptoms. The only normal motive is self-defence to protect ourselves from aggression, but surely we should be able to see the aggression coming long before it breaks out in warfare, and take appropriate action to satisfy or suppress it. Even self-defence may involve a neurotic reaction when it means defending one's own excessive material wealth from others who are in great need."

Dr. Chisholm makes impressive arguments for the complete elimination of the "God versus Evil" method of personal and social evaluation:

"What basic psychological distortion can be found in every civilisation of which we know anything? . . . In the old Hebrew story, God warns the first man and woman to have nothing to do with "good" and "evil". It is interesting to note that as long ago as that, "good" is recognised as just as great a menace as "evil". They are the fruit of the one tree and are different aspects of the same thing.

"We have been very slow to rediscover this truth and to recognise the unnecessary and artificially imposed inferiority, guilt and fear, commonly known as sin, under which we have almost all laboured and which produces so much of the social maladjustment and unhappiness in the world. For many generations we have bowed our necks to the yoke of the conviction of sin. We have swallowed all manners of poisonous certainties fed us by our parents, our Sunday and day school teachers, our politicians, our priests, our newspapers, and others with a vested interest in controlling us. "Thou shalt become as gods, knowing good and evil," good and evil with which to keep children under control, with which to prevent free thinking, with which to impose local and familial and national loyalties and with which to blind children to their glorious intellectual heritage. Misguided by authoritarian dogma, bound by exclusive faith, stunted by inculcated loyalty, torn by frantic heresy, bedevilled by insistent schism, drugged by ecstatic experience, confused by conflicting certainty, bewildered by invented mystery, and loaded down by a weight of guilt and fear engendered by its own original premises, the unfortunate human race, deprived of its incubi of its only defences and its only reasons for striving, its reasoning power and its natural capacity to enjoy the satisfaction of its natural urges, struggles along under its ghastly self-imposed burden. The results, the inevitable results, are frustration, inferiority, neurosis and inability to enjoy living, to reason clearly or to make a world fit to live in."

Literary Notes

Pre-Bolshevik Russian Thinkers

THE legerdemain by which the Communists have managed during the past thirty-five years to pass themselves off as architects of the Russian Revolution has tended very largely to obscure, in the minds of general observers and readers at least, the memory that they in fact represent only a segment of the tradition of Russian opposition to the Tsar. Even Plekhanov, the father of Russian Marxism has been almost written out of the history books because he happened to differ from Lenin. Libertarians keep alive the memory of Bakunin and Kropotkin, but the celebrity of both of these lies far more in their later international activity as exiles than in any part they actually played within Russia. Herzen has a permanent place in European social literature, but this again is largely because he wrote one of the great autobiographies of the nineteenth century and because of his connection with the international revolutionary figures of western Europe, such as Proudhon, Mazzini and Garibaldi. And apart from these, what are we likely to gain from readily available literature about the social movements and thinkers in nineteenth century Russia? Something about the Decembrists, a little about Nechaev as a cloak-and-dagger villain, the more sensational facts about the terrorist exploits of the People's Will, and some rather distorted impressions on the movements of the time which have found their way into the novels of Turgenev and Dostoevsky. And very little more, unless we are prepared to dive into some large library and embark on a major campaign of research.

Yet the period from the Decembrist rising of 1825 up to the Revolution of 1917 is full of interesting thinkers and writers. Most of them have never been translated into English, and the best we can usually gain about them is some brief summary in books like Sir John Maynard's *Russia in Flux*. And it seems as though, as Bolshevism becomes more and more fixed in the general mind as

the stereotype of Russian "revolutionism", there is an increasingly slighter chance of the writings of men like Pisarev, Dobroliubov and Chernyshevsky ever becoming available in any fullness for the English reader. And, indeed, the polemical and topical character of many of these works would give them only a relatively limited interest to-day. Nevertheless, I think that in some happy future when the supplies of paper are once again readily available, some enterprising editor might produce an extremely interesting omnibus volume of extracts from all these lesser Russian social writers which would illustrate their basic theories without dragging in too much of the day-to-day squabbles about political issues which have very little bearing upon our modern problems.

Richard Hare, in his new book, *Pioneers of Russian Social Thought*,* has done the next best thing, by giving sketches, with copious quotations from their works, of the lives and thoughts of a score of these minor Russian social thinkers. His bag is in some ways a disappointing one, since it belongs to the earlier part of the nineteenth century, and includes neither the important nihilists, with the doubtful exception of Chernyshevsky, nor the populists and the followers of Lavrov in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. But this criticism is answered by the promise of a later volume in which these other people and tendencies will doubtless be considered.

A good half—and probably more—of the thinkers here discussed, Khomayakov, the Aksakov brothers, Kireyevsky, Samarin, etc., are Slavophiles, and Mr. Hare does a service to those who have accepted the usual view of the Slavophiles by pointing out that by no means all

Continued on p. 3

*PIONEERS OF RUSSIAN SOCIAL THOUGHT, by Richard Hare. (Oxford University Press, 25/-)

POSTSCRIPT TO POSTERITY by HERBERT READ

DEAR POSTERITY:

By now you will be getting a little bored with the letters you have been receiving from my contemporaries in this year of grace 1952, but before you return to the more serious business of rebuilding the world we left in ruins, may I beg you to read this postscript? It will not take long, and it may hearten you to find that we were not all humbugs. Of course, I feel a bit of a humbug in making that claim, for how can I, and a few friends who share my indignation, be sure that we have not caught the prevalent infection? But you will have no patience with false modesty, so I hasten to explain that a minority does exist in our time which is not and never will be deceived by the stupidity around us. You will say, your side of all the disasters of a century, why did we not do something about it? If any records have survived you will find that we were not inactive; what you will not realize, perhaps, is the impotent insignificance of reason in a world gone mad. But let me try to explain,

At the moment of writing—it is the month of February, 1952—we have just experienced a vast conspiracy of humbug which makes those letters you have been receiving hardly worth their postage. A king died—a decent, harmless fellow by all accounts, a perfect prototype of our bourgeois virtues. Though long deprived of any power, a mere symbol of pomp and circumstance, this king's natural decease is swollen, by press and radio, by film and television, into an event of universal, of supernatural significance. The whole life of the nation is disrupted, and uncounted wads of its shrinking pounds are expended in a delirious abandon to wholly fictitious grief. The parades and processions might perhaps be excused—the life we are accustomed to is drab and depressing, and the sight of a scarlet uniform, or the sound of a fanfare, rouses the indifferent heart. But the little man in his millions creeps out of his suburban home, carefully adjusting the black tie he last wore at his grandmother's funeral; looks round fearfully to see that his neighbour is giving his little gesture support; buys his newspaper on which the printer's ink has taken on a blacker hue, presses through the milling crowds of ghouls that always emerge from God knows where on such occasions—myopic spinsters, wispy toothless hags, gawping adolescents—and finally arrives, ten minutes late, at his office, where he proceeds to carry on his little game of deceit.

His little game of deceit—he calls it earning a living, and we all play it in some way or another: punching the machines that now calculate the astronomical figures of finance, pulling the levers that control the machines that make the goods we exchange for food, collecting the taxes that pay for the bombs we shall explode in the Third World War. At the end of the week the little man gets his pay packet—the solution of an equation whose factors are taxes and contributions, leaving a sum with which to pay more taxes and a final surplus for food. He will look at it ruefully, and when he gets home he will face as best he can the anguish of his wife, beset with petty cares, sinking into the zestless, sexless indifference of a middle-age without fulfilment, of an old age without hope.

But you will know all this, or you can read it up in the social surveys and the fiction of our time. What you want to know, I imagine, is why we so complacently endured it all. Why, in this year of grace (you must excuse this cliché which I go on repeating: I use it wryly enough) why do we go on with the mad and monstrous comedy? Who knows? We have mass-psychologists, but they cannot give a convincing answer to this question. You must have foreseen (I imagine you saying) the coming of the Third World War; you must have seen the coming of the Great Famine—why did you do nothing about it?

I will try and answer that awkward question presently. Some things, you know, are too big to be seen—and some are too small. But some of us did see, for example, the fantastic folly of our money system—a system which only a college of lunatics could have evolved, and only a gang of criminals could have deliberately operated. Criminals? That is too crude and easy as an explanation. I have a friend who is a trained scientist, a physiologist who seems to have operated on his own eyes, for they see where others are blind, and he has shown that these people who sit in power are simply delinquents—people who in any lowlier sphere of operations would be recognised as such, and put under control. But the banking world, the stock exchanges, and those mysterious international committees that control the "value of money" are exempt from any kind of control, moral or medical. They sit in some Delphic board-room, furnished no doubt with statues of bronze (or portraits of past chairmen) and utter their oracles which immediately spread desolation throughout the world. A few of us saw the deception of it all, but for one voice that was raised against these Pythian priests, there were a thousand professors of economics to stifle it with pamphlets and broadcasts. (When one of us, in the second world war, did eventually get behind a microphone, he was promptly denounced as a traitor and a lunatic, and put into a mental hospital.)

I shared the view (it is the view of a tiny minority among us) that the root of all our misery is in this irrational monetary system, and that therefore any direct action against secondary follies, such as war and famine was largely a waste of effort. At the moment of writing, we, who live in an island off the coast of Europe, dependent for half our food on the rest of the world, are engaged in spending £4,700 millions on rearmament. For a quarter of that sum, perhaps for less, we could transform our agricultural system and make ourselves self-supporting (a statement which the professors of economics will controvert after their fashion). The rest of the sum might go to a world fund for the aversion of famine . . . but you see how easy it is even for me to slip into the Pythian jargon. For what are funds, and what are pounds and dollars? The mumbo-jumbo of an obsolete magic. There is no wealth but life, as Ruskin said. We could see—the tiny minority whose voice was unheeded—that the human race was being crushed by machines of its own invention—verbal or ideological machinery rather than machinery of steel. We could see that the way to freedom was wonderfully simple: simply to abandon all that machinery and live as direct producers and distributors of the produce of the earth. Yes: to repudiate all debts, to make usury a mortal crime, to unite all men in a common effort to survive—to survive and celebrate a new-found leisure.

We saw the truth—we proclaimed the truth, and yet we were ineffectual. We left you a legacy of war and famine, and as I write this letter in the year of disgrace 1952 (at last I have found the right phrase) I feel very uncertain that it will ever reach you. I feel very uncertain that any of our efforts, in art, literature, philosophy, will survive the coming catastrophes. But I have to pretend that they will. One lives on an overdraft of hope, and it is a pitiful illusion. Either our ideas must penetrate into the caves where the oracles sit and spin their devastating myths (and can you ever convert people to a surrender of their power?) or must we persuade the deluded millions who listen and obey to turn away and seek the truth. The difficulty is to make our voices carry: the voice from Delphi roars across the cities and fields, and we have no amplifiers—no microphones to command, no forests to convert into newsprint, no delinquents to co-opt on our committees. On our overdraft we might live another century, and on your side of universal catastrophe you might take up the message, and in a world still as death your living voice might be heard.

I had no power, therefore had patience.

FREEDOM FROM NUMBERS

VIEWED from a Continental angle, the abolition of identity cards in Britain will, no doubt, seem a remarkable act. Identity cards, often with photographs, papers to prove this or entitle a man to that, are among the normal documents that (for example) every Frenchman carries. There is a long tradition of resistance to such docketing in England, and it took considerable persuasion and promises to make Identity Cards acceptable in September 1939—twelve a half years ago. FREEDOM has often pointed out that the promises included a pledge that Identity cards would be abolished when the war ended—and that this promise was not kept. That the traditional hostility to them was never fully lulled was shown by the law case of a year or so ago which resulted in the London police being instructed not to ask for Identity Cards.

There are obvious objections to personal papers. A man should not be required to prove his identity, nor should inability or unwillingness to do so be taken to be *ipso facto* something for the police to require further investigation of. The whole atmosphere of suspicion which surrounds them is unpleasant and repugnant to normal people, and not merely to minority political sections.

But the development of the welfare state, of rationing, of national insurance, and planned economy in general has given new force to the impulse to docket individuals. Identity Cards are to go, but the National Number is to stay, and arrangements are to be made to provide the newborn with such numbers.

They are to be known as National Insurance numbers, and the name sufficiently indicates the tie-up between the docketing of individuals and the development of the Welfare State. Many will think that with the abolition of the card and of the right of policemen or Post Offices or other noney parkers to demand it, the objections to such National Registration also disappears. But there are other objections which still remain, though they are more theoretical.

In the past, some anarchists (and also some others not connected with anarchists) have objected to censuses, and even to the registration of births. They have done so not out of mere crankiness, but as a protest against the trends which these things exemplify. Registration of birth is chiefly for the purpose of determining legal issues of property and succession. To-day, it also serves to fix an individual's age. It is not unreasonable to object to the conception of property and inheritance, and a man's (or woman's) age can be regarded as the individual's business and no one else's.

Censuses illustrate another trend to which reasonable exception can be taken—increasing centralisation. The retreat from communal life to metropolitan centralisation has been a slow but relentless process with many evil consequences for human and social life. The top-heavy administrative machinery of the Welfare State shows the present position of this progression.

It will be seen that the abolition of Identity Cards makes no difference to this aspect of National Registration. A contributor to FREEDOM made this point some months ago when he recommended just this abolition to the Tories as a concession which would cost nothing. Later on, FREEDOM remarked that they would not be

abolished till their function had been absorbed elsewhere.

When all this has been said, however, the freedom of individuals from a particular kind of police and administrative snooping is an important position regained for the citizens of this country. The traditional hostility towards such things and the determination of a few individuals are to be thanked for it.

THE RIGHT OF ASYLUM

INTERNATIONAL treaties and laws agreed upon by states have always remained a dead-letter, quite valueless but always invoked when circumstances and "reasons of state" make it desirable. The rights of men and citizens written in blood in the turbulent days of the French Revolution and which since then have only served to decorate the façades of the so-called democracies—have no longer the moral consistency of

the past, nor the romantic aura attributed to them in the past by multitudes of slaves. The right of asylum has been a nice theory. In practice it has been in unceasing and steady decay; a farce and sometimes a monstrosity.

Man has always sought to defend himself against tricksters, against the hatred and vengeance of his fellow creatures. Self-defence is instinctive even among inferior animals. When man's strength and forces show themselves impotent to resist the prepared and accumulated onslaught of his enemies, it is natural for him to try to escape to a place or country far from the vengeance and wrath of his adversaries.

The ancient Hebrews instituted the right of asylum in designating six cities where the persecuted could take refuge. The Egyptians knew and practised the right of asylum as a protection for debtors and maltreated slaves. Perhaps even in that time governmental powers started to abuse these rights, for this struggle has been kept alive throughout the centuries, sometimes manifesting itself in violations of the right of asylum, and at other times in attempts to obtain the extradition or capture of the refugees.

In Mexico, a political exile has been consigned in an underhand and secret way back to the United States. Gus Hall, one of the ex-Stalinist general secretaries of the Communist Party in the U.S.A. was arrested on December 9th by special agents of the government. The interesting and scandalous fact is that contrary to any "law of international rights" the arrest of Hall had been ordered and made in open collusion with the Mexican police, by the F.B.I., an American police organisation which does business in Mexican territory with the sanction and approval of the Mexican Government. The arrest of this man has been made with the brutal and undignified methods always adopted and employed by the police all over the world: violation of domicile, opening of doors with pass-keys, surprise late in the night . . . etc. At three o'clock in the morning, Hall was taken to the frontier and from there, by aeroplane, transferred to prison where already a five-year sentence was waiting for him; a sentence imposed by the American court for the "crime" of "having plotted to overthrow the U.S. Government by force".

The detention of this political fugitive is (if we stand upon the juridical aspect of the question), under every aspect: illegal, abominable and contrary to any judicial law. Hall was accused of a political "crime" before the U.S. court, a crime which is not contemplated in the Mexican constitution. Moreover, the constitution of the Mexican republic absolutely prohibits the extradition for political crime. Thus, under a régime of recognised right of asylum, in the very capital of our country, a land ruled by a constitution lavishly eulogised by moderate revolutionaries, the Mexican police, helped by foreign accomplices, have with impunity violated the constitution of the republic and the invol-

nerable dispositions of the penal code. All this, to consign to the U.S.A. a man persecuted for his political opinion.

Now, our conceptions are diametrically opposed to those of the victim of the abuse perpetrated by the Mexican police. We always fight and will continue to fight the so-called Stalinism, considering that in Russia the State tyranny is practised as in any capitalist country of the universe; but nevertheless, as true defenders of the right of asylum, just as much in cases in which we differ from the political views of the victims, we unite with the general clamour of protest against the consignment of a victim to his hangman, for the simple fact that he thinks differently than his persecutors. We think neither just nor legal the arrest of a citizen no matter what his nationality may be, and the handing over of any man to his country of origin as prisoner. If this absolute power of action should become law, no man on earth could ever be free from the persecutions of dictators and satraps who are abundant in all hemispheres.

The Hall case is a very bad one; it is dangerous for hundreds of thousands of political refugees who have been compelled to abandon their own countries to avoid incarceration or even execution that faces them for having opinions contrary to the dominating régimes. All men persecuted for their ideas and convictions must be vigilant and must courageously defend themselves because their attitude and firm stand depend their freedom and independence.

However, coming back to Hall's case, the Stalinists must learn to analyze their own charges. The Stalinist totalitarian régime, defended with such enthusiasm and tenacity by its adherents, in reality does not bother with laws dealing with the right of asylum. The communist State, simply does not either consign or expel citizens or foreigners; but arrests and confines them in concentration camps, where they are persecuted and martyred. In the majority of cases they are, indeed, suppressed by a firing squad or by other similar methods.

In conclusion, we assert that if a decided and firm popular action of protest does not materialise pretty soon in the world, scoundrels will repeat the monstrous case perpetrated by Mexico and the U.S.A. and there would no longer be any freedom for the reason that the power of some men upon others means: terror, submission and perpetual tyranny.

—From the Mexican anarchist paper, *Tierra y Libertad*, (trans. J.S.).

COOKERY CORNER

Stalin is a man of taste when it comes to food and drink, says the French newspaper *France-Soir*. He likes spiced dishes. The authority is a close relative of Stalin's cook, Ivan Andreievitch Karachev, who said Stalin often discusses a menu for an hour with his chef.

—Manchester Evening News, 9/2/52

Literary Notes Continued from p. 2

of them were advocates of absolute authority, and the best of them were by no means blind to the benefits of certain forms of western progress. Nor did they all even subscribe to the imperialist doctrines of the pan-Slavs. What did unite them was a common horror at the social demoralisation which set in through western Europe as a result of the defeat of the 1848 revolutions, and an illusion that Russia held some strange mystic force which would enable it not only to bring about its own regeneration, but also to regenerate the rest of the world. This did not preclude a recognition of the faults of the existing social situation in Russia (most of the Slavophiles favoured the emancipation of the serfs), but it did deliver them up to the lemming-race of messianic nationalism, and brought a tacit acceptance of autocracy and orthodoxy even among those who sought a social transformation. The naïve idea of the Tsar as the little Father of his people lay behind all their attacks on corruption and bureaucratic tyranny.

But the Slavophiles are nevertheless extremely significant in the tradition of Russian social thought. For their central idea of Russia as a self-regenerative and world-regenerative force (most dramatically expounded in Dostoevsky's novels) was shared to a surprising extent even by those Russians who were revolutionary in other respects. Herzen, it will be remembered, turned towards this view after the shattering experience of revolutionary ineptitudes in 1848, westernisers like Chaadeyev and Belinsky showed occasional touches of it, and this nationalist itch even played its sad part in the lives of some of the leading Russian anarchists. Bakunin had his period as a fervent pan-Slav, and the heritage of the Slavophiles came out with a vengeance in Kropotkin's actions during the 1914 war and also in 1917 when he returned to Russia and called upon his fellow countrymen to join a patriotic crusade to drive the German barbarians from their native soil.

Finally, as Mr. Hare makes clear, the messianic rôle of Holy Russia is a conception which the Bolsheviks, despite their failure to pay due tribute to the Slavophiles, have inherited from them in full measure. But the difference between

the present-day Communists and the earlier social thinkers who contributed in varying degrees and ways to the messianic illusion lies in the fact that the former are the administrators of a monolithic state which is forced to rely on nationalism as a self-preserving force. The men of the nineteenth century, on the other hand, were responding to the nationalist urges which still dominated the revolutionary movements of their time, and which were embraced in western Europe by men like Kossuth and Mazzini and even, despite their socialism, like Marx and Lassalle in Western Europe.

It is for his complete lack of nationalist messianism that Chernyshevsky is in some ways the most appealing character in Mr. Hare's book. He had neither the mental subtlety nor the literary ability of Herzen, his social ideas were woolly and his attitude to the State, while he distrusted it, was rather of the "necessary evil" kind. But at least he had a vein of genuine internationalism and a tendency to debunk accepted views and institutions which prepared the way for the later nihilists and for the anarchists.

Indeed, that a man like Chernyshevsky should have risen up and have had such influence in Tsarist Russia when he went not only against authority, but also against most of the current intellectual trends, is a somewhat inspiring thought. We all know—and do not need Stalin's former friends of Potsdam and Yalta to tell us—that the oppression of intellectual liberty under Tsar Joseph is much more intense than it was under Tsar Alexander. But thought has not yet been efficiently repressed and it has its own devious ways of communication even where the written word is banned. Mr. Hare has shown how the messianism and autocracy-worship of the Slavophiles has survived among the Bolsheviks. Personally, I cannot believe that the heritage of Chernyshevsky is entirely dead, that the spirit of iconoclasm and internationalism is wholly lost in Russia today; indeed, when the chance does come for it to emerge, I think we may well find it vastly strengthened from the sickening experience of the last century of Tsarist and neo-Tsarist imperialism.

GEORGE WOODCOCK.

Indoctrination of American Youth

IN an article on "Classroom Movies," in an American magazine *Coronet*, Frank H. Grover describes some of the ways in which film-shows in high schools—"the most effective means of youth-propaganda to date," are to become a focus for the co-operation of innumerable American local education authorities with the Department of National Defence:

"The diverse efforts of school administrators, educational leaders, and private industry were all being focussed on a single objective: to make available to the schools of the nation for the school year

1951-52 an adequate series of instructional films which would help young people prepare to give their best to, and make the most of, military service.

"With the beginning of the Korean War, and especially with the passage of the Universal Military Training and Service Act last June by Congress, the nation endorsed new principles which demand great psychological adjustments by our young people and by their parents.

"We now, as a nation, have declared that boys in high school will be trained to fight, no matter what their past experience . . . We do not know whether or not war will come; if it does come, we don't know when it will come. These boys may be men with sons of their own in high schools before the next war. But these boys will be trained for military service."

Mr. Grover notes that the reconditioning process will perhaps be very difficult to achieve, since "youngsters have been taught to abhor violence and to value 'getting along with others.'"

LIFT UP YOUR HEARTS

I wonder how many people felt their patriotic hearts uplifted by the news that the first British atom bomb is to be tested some time this year in an Australian desert? Mine certainly was not. We have just been told by Mr. Butler that we have no money to replace schools which were condemned half a century ago and that we must cut the free health service in order to make ends meet. Yet, we can find scores of millions of pounds for the project of adding to the huge American stockpile of atom bombs half a dozen British models. If any thing makes nonsense of our defence plans it is this kind of waste. We are to have no air-raid shelters, but we can find the money for nice new air-raid sirens all over the country and for mustering the Home Guard east of a line from Flamborough Head to Selsey Bill. Now, in addition, we shall possess an A-bomb, in order to make us feel really safe.

—New Statesman, 23/2/52.

HOTEL TRUMAN

THE Federal Government has just taken over a surplus Florida military installation for use as a prison camp if the nation ever starts "a round-up of subversives".

The installation at Avon Park, Florida, is the fourth designated by the Federal Prison Bureau as a "stand-by" subversive prison. Others at Florence and Wickenburg, Arizona and El Reno, Oklahoma, already have been "activated".

Under the McCarren Act the President is authorised to declare an emergency if there is an "internal rising". Then all persons the Government "suspects" might be engaged in sabotage or espionage would be "picked up".

The Prison Bureau is expected to set up other "subversive camps" in the future and it seems quite clear that the Federal Government is confident of supplying enough guests to make the project worth while.

The enthusiasm, speed and efficiency with which the accommodations are being provided seems to indicate that the Government is expecting subversive camp business to be good in the immediate future and anybody with a tendency toward subversion would be wise to get himself into the neighbourhood of whichever Truman hotel he thinks will provide the best service.

—Industrial Workers, 11/1/52.

NOTES ON CONSCIOUS EGOISM

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS THE "LESSER EVIL" AND THE "THIRD FRONT"

THE slogan "the lesser evil" is well known. The German Social-Democrats used this slogan to elect Hindenburg as president of Germany with the hope that he would save them from Hitler. The results are well known.

In our own circles, too, there are several comrades who intend to try out the lesser evil by participating in the war policy of the West with the hope that, in the event of war, their support would bring about the victory of the West, and consequently save them from the Bolsheviks. Certainly we do prefer a government under which we can exist and agitate for our ideas than Bolshevik rule. It would be a denial of facts if we were not to distinguish between a system which tolerates us and a system which exterminates us when we spread our ideas. That was also the opinion of our forerunners Bakunin, Volin and others. But our sympathy for "democracy" should never have any influence on our attitude towards a state, i.e., to serve a state or defend a state. Do we no disavow our anarchist principles when we take part in an imperialistic war?

The well-known Belgian anarchist, G. Ernestan has written in anarchist newspapers, "The rearmament of Western Europe is necessary, and the victory of the West in case of war is desirable; let us be frankly and sincerely with Truman."

Every activity which has been undertaken by anarchists in common with non-anarchists has so far been disastrous for anarchism. In Russia the anarchists were liquidated after they had helped the Bolsheviks to beat the armies of the Tsar. In the Russian satellite states our comrades fought on the side of the Bolsheviks against Hitler, and when Hitler was beaten and the Bolsheviks ruled the countries, our comrades were liquidated by them. In Spain it was the Republican Government which did not lift a finger when "democratic forces" destroyed the work of our Spanish comrades. The exiled Spanish anarchists in France fought in the Resistance against Hitler and had heavy casualties. They did so because they thought that the Western Powers would keep their promise which was that when Hitler was beaten, they would chase Franco out of Spain. The facts are to-day that the Western Powers assist Franco's régime with every possible means, and the "right of asylum" for our Spanish comrades in France is by no means safe from abolition.

These are a few examples of our experiences.

If put into practise, the proposals for collaboration with the State would mean

DIRECT ACTION SUCCEEDS IN LEEDS FACTORY

A COMRADE writes from Leeds the following account of successful direct action in his factory (Price's, Tailors: Leeds). "On January 30th this year, our Works Manager came into the factory about 9.30 a.m. He saw a foreman holding his head. The reason was that the foreman felt ill. However, the manager accused him of sleeping. This accusation, of course, was not true, but being a tyrant, the manager eventually got this foreman sacked.

"As a result, the workers refused to work. They made two demands: that the foreman be reinstated, and that the manager be sacked.

"The foreman was immediately given his job back, but they would not sack the manager. All the workers, therefore, booted him whenever he entered any of the work rooms, and as a result he kept out of sight and stayed in his well-heated office. The feeling of our workers at present is 'we are well rid of him!'

"I notice several meetings taking place between the union stewards regarding the position of the manager, and I believe that the union will compromise on the question of sacking the manager.

"My point is this: what a wonderful weapon 'Direct Action' is! This strike was quite spontaneous, and the union bosses were not needed. At the present time our manager has not entered the factory.

"Our local press gave a small report which was misleading, as usual, and caused only amusement among the workers.

GOD SPEAKS

President Truman, in an informal talk to Grand Masters of Masons on Feb. 1st, said: "When I think I am right in what I am doing, I don't care if anyone likes it or not."
—Reuter.

the disavowal of our principles and the death of our militants. The difference between a democratic and a totalitarian State grows smaller every day, regimentation grows everywhere. In the States which describe themselves as democratic there is a more or less veiled dictatorship, which becomes total if war breaks out. For instance, the Attorney-General of the United States published a statement a few weeks ago which said that concentration camps had been established at Reno, Florence and Wickenburg in which "subversives" would be locked-up in case of war. *Shall anarchists fight for the preservation of concentration camps?*

For more than a year, our Paris comrades of *Le Libertaire* have been agitating on behalf of a Third Front or Third Force which is directed against both the Eastern and Western blocs of Powers—to oppose war with revolution. According to comrade Fontenis, the Third Front will fight the agents of Truman on the social platform and the agents of Stalin on the political platform.

The Third Front is interspersed with non-anarchist elements—some communists, and some who reject the rule of Stalin but belong to other political associations—thus the Third Front rejects the anarchist independence from political parties. The slogan, "fight the agents of Truman on the social platform" is nebulous. It is well-known that there have never been so many secret agents of the U.S. Government than today. But how it is possible to fight a foreign secret state-police on the social platform remains a secret of the Third Front. And because the rearmament in the U.S.A. can hardly be stopped by our French comrades, the whole matter seems to be a blow into empty space.

The agents of Stalin are represented in the West by the Communist parties and their fifth columns. All anarchists in the West struggle against their machinations and deceitful swindles. Yet this struggle has no connection with any political struggle against Stalin.

Would it be possible for our comrades to oppose a war with a revolution, and what would be the chances if ever the idea were put into operation? In the conditions of to-day and the near future, it would end in catastrophe. All that the Third Front could do would be to build up an anarchist "maquis" resistance group or be an auxiliary force of the Western Powers. But in both cases it would be an unpardonable sacrifice of our militants.

War and violence are the enemies of anarchism. By political revolution and violence we can never reach our aim. Whether in a future anarchist revolution violence will have been completely abolished is still a controversy. But we will never come to an anarchist revolution until a revolution has taken place in people's minds.

How to Hold Your Own with Children

I WOULD like to clarify objections to the conscious attitude towards children advocated by Mr. Robert Copping in his recent lecture on "How to hold your own with children," at the London Anarchist Group.

Each child is a product of a number of factors most of which we do not understand; some of which are hereditary and some environmental. The essence of Mr. Copping's thesis is the conscious regulation of the environmental factor and it is on this issue that I must protest strongly. You cannot consciously create a congenial environment—except in theory. A child will have a healthy environment when a healthy relationship exists spontaneously between the parents. Such a relationship is in no way affected by the intellectual rational approach as

Not Enough Food

YOUR correspondent, A. B. Chalkley, himself is guilty of Victorian thinking, "starvation in the midst of plenty," etc., etc.

The plain facts of the situation are that there is not enough food produced on the earth to feed the whole population adequately. The nations that would have a surplus of food if their whole populations were adequately fed are very, few, whereas the nations that have populations exceeding food supplies, are many.

Every nation can now produce a large proportion of their industrial needs, and the inhabitant of another country is not going to look at a British television set with an empty belly, so that A. B. Chalkley can look at his with a full one.

NO one who has read and studied Max Stirner's *The Ego and His Own* would attempt to improve upon his analysis of conscious egoism, and it should be understood that the writer does not intend this as an interpretation of Stirner's work, but is only attempting to introduce this basic approach to others who have not been fortunate enough to obtain a copy of his book.

The phrase *conscious egoism* carries the implication that there is an unconscious egoism, and this is exactly what is intended, for in human relationships everyone, without exception, is egoistic but only a few enlightened individuals understand this or will admit it to be the case. The vast majority of human beings have been so indoctrinated by the various creeds and faiths, that to deny one's self is regarded as man's highest calling, so long as one serves "The Cause". If they throw off the yoke of one cause they immediately search around for another: they are "serving beings". Among many examples is that of the Communist who having served the party as a journalist for twelve years, renounced it to join the ranks of the Church of Rome which he had been castigating beforehand.

Of course, the highest cause one can serve is the cause of God, who has taken great pains to point out that there is no other God but him. In other words, God makes himself the centre of all things, and looks to his own affairs, which is sound egoism. However, we hope to dispel God's claim as we proceed.

Let us have a look at ourselves: of the beginning we have no re-

Therefore our main task is by our actions and way of life to show our fellow men what anarchism stands for and to decide with them how we can reach our aim. If war should come we can only try to save our lives in some way or other according to the prevailing conditions which in every country and in every particular case, are bound to be different. To make plans about that today is completely useless—circumstances are liable to turn up which even the most judicious among us cannot foresee. We have the task of keeping the flame of anarchism alive by every means. It is an inheritance which our predecessors have left to our care, and, we believe, the only means for the emancipation of mankind.

Germany WILLY FRITZKÖTTER.

recommended by the speaker. This is well illustrated by the number of neurotic offspring of parents well versed in the current psychological approach.

In an uninhibited relationship, one naturally treats the child as an individual (not "as an adult"). But I cannot visualise a sane relationship between an inhibited parent, however "enlightened", and an unbearable child.

The difficulty as I see it is how to conduct our lives in a sane and healthy manner amidst the frustrations and conflicts of an authoritarian society and the solution must aim towards a personal and ultimately a social anarchy.

London. JOSEPHINE SIMON.

I would suggest the best way to promote international amity is to reduce our demands on world food supplies in order that our fellow men can enjoy a minimum standard of life.

As P.S. suggests it is unlikely in a society where production for profit is the main aim of agricultural and other activities, that a reasonable economy will be developed, especially as farming for profit can mean a reduction in yield per acre.

A. B. Chalkley will no doubt have to draw in his belt a few more notches before he gets some realism into his thinking.

Boxford, Essex. A. ALBON.

membrane, and have to accept the facts of our first few years of existence from those who reared us, until we developed the ability to memorise. The first few years of our being is in complete dependence upon others, and no thought is given to the why and what of our having been born, in fact, we are carefree—"without care". At this period, the child and the adult very often come into conflict, and the latter use physical violence or mental torture—"Bogeymen and Devils". The fear of the unknown seeks dominion over the child. On the other hand, the child can instinctively sense the weakness of their guardians and play upon it with disastrous results for both. Here we can get a picture of what goes on throughout human relations—seeking out each others weaknesses.

Our path is set for us by our being inculcated with the prejudices and beliefs of our forbears: Evil Deeds and Devils, Good Deeds and Gods, so that before we can blossom into the "age of reason" we have had poured into us "the reasons of age" which demands our veneration. We pass through the first phase of our lives concerning ourselves only with the things of the world, and not until we reach adolescence do we concern ourselves with what is behind the things. All could be well if our reason had been allowed to develop naturally without all the obstacles of faith having been forced on us. But this would never do, for looking after our own affairs would run contrary to the affairs of those already entrenched in their natural and supernatural strong-

T.U. LEADERS

Continued from p. 1

it when he was in office, only postponing it because of opposition from the chemists and doctors.)

No, the struggle which we have to face up to is an economic one. None of our political rights—for what they are worth—are yet being tampered with; it is our standard of living which is being attacked. And the struggle which has to be made is not one which can be carried on within Parliament, but only against Parliament.

As such, it is clear that it is precisely on the industrial level that the struggle must be waged. Some of the workers have already made clear their willingness to take action and their unwillingness to take the situation lying down.

The T.U.C. has made clear that it will be on the side of the big battalions—against the workers. This we knew already, and in fact think it is far better that this should be clear from the beginning. The 1926 General Strike failed largely because the rank-and-file had illusions about where the leaders stood. It is better to know your enemies right from the start.

But also we have to make clear that at the moment the workers are in no position to wage any large-scale struggle. It needs preparation—both physical and mental.

That is the task of the syndicalists. As yet few in numbers, they remain the only ones with a real alternative to the present problem. For that problem is not how to prevent the Government cutting the social services, although that is a part of the problem. The real issue remains what the syndicalists have always maintained it to be: the abolition of capitalism and the establishment of workers' control.

This is an economic issue and can only be achieved through the strength of the workers in economic-industrial-fields. With the obvious failure of politics the workers are beginning to return to self-reliance, to the consternation of the politicians.

But it is one of the most heartening signs of the present grim situation.

P.S.

PAUSE FOR THOUGHT

"It was considered rather disloyal for Labour M.P.s to ask these questions when a Labour Government was in office but they are being asked now."

These words occur in Mr. Emrys Hughes' paragraph in *Peace News*, Feb. 15th. The calm acceptance of the fact that allegiance to one's political party should come before allegiance to one's conscience should make us all pause.

Peace News, 22/2/52.

holds, and they, being very conscious of their weakness, have us conditioned to consider their affairs our affairs.

It is a noticeable fact that youth are the revolutionists, and that middle age is more likely to accept compromise and accept things as they are, in effect, to become realistic. Youth is out to change the world, age to use it as it is. The Idealist and the Realist. The idealism of youth is annihilated. It is always youth which flies to the various banners held aloft, with the fine slogans of the good cause. Freedom, Liberty, The People, God, The Nation, where you like and what you fancy. Banners prepared by shrewd, cunning individuals to pull the flower of the race into their grasp; to use it to feed their vanity, their insatiable appetites for power, in short to feed upon them in what may be called *abstract cannibalism*. The self-satisfying eschew the self-sacrificing and draw their strength from others weakness. They consume them in a manner so abstract as to escape condemnation. They vaporise individuals, and call them The People, The Masses, The Army.

EDDIE SHAW.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting
HYDE PARK
Every Sunday at 3.30 p.m.
TOWER HILL
Every Friday 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.

MAR. 2—Albert Meltzer on
THE JEWS

MARCH 9—John Beresford on
GOEBBELS AND CALCULATING MACHINERY

MARCH 16—E. V. Swart on
SOUTH AFRICA'S TREK FROM PROGRESS

NORTH-EAST LONDON

DISCUSSION MEETINGS
IN EAST HAM
Alternate Wednesdays
at 7.30

MAR. 5—Edgar Priddy on
AN A.B.C. OF ANARCHISM

MAR. 19—S. Corio on
MY VIEWPOINT
Enquiries c/o Freedom Press

LIVERPOOL

DISCUSSION MEETINGS at
101 Upper Parliament Street,
Liverpool, 8
Every Sunday at 8 p.m.

GLASGOW

INDOOR MEETINGS at
Central Halls, Bath Street
Every Sunday at 7 p.m.
With John Gaffney, Frank Leech,
Jane Strachan, Eddie Shaw

FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

Postal Subscription Rates
12 months 17/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)
6 months 8/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)
3 months 4/6 (U.S.A. \$0.75)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies
12 months 27/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)
6 months 13/6 (U.S.A. \$2.25)

Cheques, P.O.'s and Money Orders should be made out to FREEDOM PRESS, crossed a/c Payee, and addressed to the publishers.

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