

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 13, No. 26

June 28th, 1952

Threepence

EUSTON WORKERS SHOW THE WAY

RANK-AND-FILE trade unionists in all the large unions are becoming increasingly aware of the division between them and their leaders. The anarchist criticism of centralisation and leadership is finding more and more support as workers learn—the hard way—that power corrupts, and that when privilege and position are given to a man for one purpose, there is nothing to stop him using it for another.

The trade unions have given to their officials considerable power and substantial privilege—high salaries far in advance of the men they are supposed to represent, permanent or semi-permanent positions, and the right to take decisions which affect the welfare of hundreds of thousands of workers. And the difficulty to-day is not to find an official who has been corrupted by power, but to find one who has not!

Just lately, Mr. Figgins, General Secretary of the National Union of Railwaymen, has made several statements which, on the face of it, seem to be militant and to show concern for the well-being of his members. He has opposed both rearmament and the wage-freeze. But a glance behind the scenes of the NUR gives one a few hints as to Mr. Figgins' game.

What would be very interesting to discover would be just how many railwaymen have left the NUR in recent years. And from that, whether we could logically draw the conclusion that Mr. Figgins is fighting for membership? That is if we are charitable and don't simply dismiss him as a Communist Party stooge.

I have been moved to think on these lines as a result of going along to Euston Station to find out a little more of what was behind the recent flare-up there between the NUR and the Mutual Aid Society the Euston men have created for themselves. (See FREEDOM, 14/6/52).

The story that emerges is one of high-handed double-dealing by a union executive in flagrant contradiction of the professed "democratic" organisation for dealing with internal union matters. The so-called "breakaway" is the result of an attempt by the union executive to browbeat an entire branch and to get out of the way a branch official who would not be a yes-man or go against the decisions of his fellow workers.

The dispute began when, in 1944, a vanman who had left his job in 1942 to become a foreman returned to it at his own request and put in a claim to be regarded, for seniority, as he would have been had he never left in the first place. But when he became a foreman, all vanmen behind him in the seniority scale moved up a place; if he were to be put back, they would all have to be moved down again.

Union Executive versus Branch

On this issue, in itself a small point, grew up a bitter fight between the Branch and the Executive, which claimed the right to over-rule the Branch, in contradiction to the established rule that the Sectional Council were not to interfere with the LDC internal working. This rule had in fact been supported, back in 1934, by the vanman concerned, Flynn, but it was not until the men had staged a Work to Rule, the National Executive Council had had innumerable meetings with the Company, several mass meetings had been held and finally a resolution had been unanimously carried giving him three days to decide whether to accept the working arrangements to which he had always been a party, or to get out of the Department altogether, that Flynn accepted the policy operating, and signed a statement to that effect. As far as the men were concerned, that closed the matter, but the National Executive accused the Branch Secretary, Mr. Jack Rice, of having brought pressure to bear upon Flynn to force him to sign a statement against his will. This Rice indignantly denied, at two meetings where he was interrogated by somebody taking notes of his replies (a police touch about that!) and the next action was that the NEC decided that Flynn should have the seniority he had asked for, and that any action taken by the Branch to obstruct that decision would result in the immediate suspension from office of the Local Departmental Committee members.

Branch withdraws from Union

At that, Rice resigned his union office, the staff declared a Work to Rule again, which developed into a strike which, briefly, led to Rice and 11 others of his Branch being expelled from the NUR. Then the NEC demanded that the Branch elect new officials, but the workers' attitude was "Rice or nobody" and the whole Branch withdrew from the NUR.

In a written statement which he circulated among the membership, Jack Rice carefully documented and dated all the steps leading up to the final break, and it must never be forgotten that men with years of activity in a union do not suddenly give it up for no valid reason. Rice had been Branch Secretary for the Euston Terminal Branch, Representative on the Local Departmental Committee to the NUR, and Representative to the TUC. One can only imagine the sickness and disillusionment which could lead him to say, "I was more than satisfied that the members of my group had had not only a very raw deal, but I had experienced the worst form of trickery that was possible, and decided that to continue as a delegate was of no advantage to my group; further I have never accepted a position of trust for the purpose of making money and a holiday."

It is, I believe, a measure of the respect which the Euston workers felt for Jack Rice that they stuck by him and preferred to show loyalty to an individual they all knew and worked with, rather than to an organisation which only claimed blind, unthinking acceptance of its dictates, but which had, after all, been built up over the years by the efforts and loyalty of the workers themselves.

Unpaid Officials

So the Euston workers were without any organisation, and the natural thing to do was to form their own. This they proceeded to do, and the Assistant Secretary, George D'Arcy, told me that they had elected an Executive of twelve members, and that it was a carefully-guarded principle that they should be all voluntary and unpaid. All organisational work is done by these twelve after they have earned their living at their jobs. Calling their organisation the Railwaymen's Mutual Aid Society, they have established it solely for the purpose of self-protection on the job. They maintain that it is not, strictly speaking, a breakaway union, for they are still covered, as are all railway workers, on

the national level by the national agreements of the NUR with British Railways. The Mutual Aid Society restricts itself to local issues alone. It is an organisation of workers on the job to guard the interests of workers on the job.

When the MAS was first created, the NUR wanted to interfere, but Figgins was in favour of letting it alone, saying it would collapse after three months. (After all, how could workers run their own organisation without a leader—like Mr. Figgins, for example?) But now that it has lasted for three years, he is seeing that he has made another mistake. His first was when he thought he could shove the Euston workers around,

Continued on p. 3

World Housing Shortage

A REPORT submitted to United Nations Food and Agricultural Organisation, which met in Rome this month, said that a large part of the world is still suffering from hunger and malnutrition, and the world's need for more food had not yet begun to be met (FREEDOM, 21/6/52).

Another United Nations report on world social conditions, published last month, reveals that there is no country without a housing problem and the gap between need and supply is getting wider all the time. One of the main causes is the "backwardness of the building industry as regards technology and organisation".

The report estimates that if the building industry in Europe were to double its pre-war output of 810,000 housing units a year, it would still take 22 years to meet housing needs. The report gives these facts:

INDIA: Nine out of ten homes are only of one room, and every lavatory serves an average of 23 people;

EUROPE: 5,667,000 dwelling units were destroyed in the war;

AFRICA: "The number of people who for the common good of the world need to be rehoused is just about equal to the total number of people";

UNITED STATES: 1,500,000 housing units must be built every year for the next ten years to fill current needs.

Experts suggest that the solution of the housing problem lies largely in planning. A known programme would enable the industry to expand production and bring down costs.—British United Press.

AMERICAN ELECTIONS

The Gloves Are Off!

GENERAL Eisenhower's recent attacks on Senator Taft's election managers illustrate once again the extraordinary character of American elections. At the same time, the methods of U.S. electioneering are only a more extreme development of devices which the necessity for canvassing of votes tends to impose on all nose-counting procedures. "Going to the people" by way of the ballot box is by no means the simple honest procedure which most advocates of democracy like to think it.

Eisenhower accuses Taft of disfranchising a large bloc of Texas electors. "In this case," he picturesquely claimed, "the rustlers stole the Texas birthright instead of Texas steers." English readers may not immediately realise that the General is calling his opponents, in effect, cattle thieves!

The General went on to denounce all this as dishonest and corrupt, and implied that it represented corruption in the Republican Party. "No party can clean up the Government of the United States unless their party—from top to bottom—is clean itself. They have got to come into court—the high court of public opinion—with clean hands."

The comical side of all this is that this squabble is between rival representatives of the same party—it is not like Bevan and Churchill snarling at each other.

Moreover, the same thing is going on in the Democratic Party, where Senator Kefauver claims that there is a conspiracy to put up candidates who are mere pawns to divide the vote and to outmanoeuvre his nomination. Such devices are, of course, commonplace in American elections, just as various kinds of political manoeuvring are used elsewhere—to circumvent the advantages of opponents or rivals.

The point which these two parallel squabbles in both the Republican

"The history of liberty is a history of the limitations of governmental powers—not the increasing of it."

—WOODROW WILSON

and Democratic camps have in common is that in each case the complainant is the candidate of "honesty" and no-corruption. Senator Kefauver's Committee's revelations about the corruption in the Democratic administration made it inevitable that the election would be fought round this issue, and political honesty is Kefauver's main card—just as it is in the case of Eisenhower, the plain man turned politician to help his country out.

But not even the personal honesty of these men can alter the fact that any election based on votes which can be influenced and canvassed beforehand is bound to make use of subterfuge, concealment, and dishonesty. Eisenhower himself spoke of the "high court of public opinion": but every election manager regards the public as a man to be manoeuvred, worked on, jockeyed about—their whole concept of electioneering is an insult to the electorate. But the honest general, in public, calls the electorate the "high court of public opinion".

Meanwhile Taft recognises that Eisenhower's practical experience in Europe gives him a start on the question of foreign policy. He therefore insists that there is no difference between Eisenhower and himself on this point—obviously with a view to reducing the General's advantage in this respect and regardless of the facts, whatever they actually are. Eisenhower, on the other hand, declares that Taft has no grasp of the needs of foreign policy and emphasises the disagreement.

The interest for English readers lies not in the tumult and the argument, but in the whole spectacle of what electioneering involves. But there is no cause for smugness: the English scene may be less flamboyant, the Party system simpler: but the need to catch votes is still there.

The Public Pays for Political Dogmatism

THE parliamentary debates upon the Government's proposal to denationalise road transport are an illustration, if any were needed, of the emptiness of the political philosophies of the parties. "At the moment," says the *Manchester Guardian*, "Tories scream 'Private enterprise!' and Labour screams back 'Public ownership!'—leaving a bewildered public and a hopelessly befogged transport system to get on as best they can."

When Mr. Lennox-Boyd, the Minister of Transport, had finished expounding the White Paper on denationalisation on May 21st, Mr. Herbert Morrison, full of righteous indignation, declared that:

"Our public duty in these circumstances is to say, on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition, that in our judgment it is only fair and proper to the nation and to the interests of possible innocent investors to indicate to everybody concerned the shape of things to come. If the electorate support us next time, as seems likely, and a Labour Government with a working majority is returned to Parliament, we shall return to public ownership such operable units as are necessary for a co-ordinated transport system.

"We reserve the right to leave in the hands of private owners services or vehicles which, for any reason, are not

needed or, because of neglect, are not worth having. Furthermore, I think I should indicate the broad principles which we shall follow in working out the necessary financial arrangements. It is obviously impossible to indicate these in detail, but we shall see to it that the public purse does not pay again for what has already been paid for out of funds of public authorities. Moreover, if the Government let transport units go at knock-down prices, as it looks as if they will have to do, we will not allow the nation to be exploited as a consequence. In the case of assets which private owners dissipate or fail to maintain, such assets, if needed, will be reacquired on terms which will not involve the public in loss. In short, we will pay compensation but only compensation on terms which will fully safeguard the public interest and prevent private speculators from making profits at the public expense out of the Government's reckless folly and their willingness to serve private greed."

The Prime Minister in reply said:

"There is one grave issue to which I must refer and that is the threat of renationalising road transport without paying fair compensation. . . . Hitherto, when the Socialist Party had nationalised an industry it had paid reasonable compensation to the owners and shareholders. To establish a principle of confiscation would be a departure from the hitherto fundamental aspect, and effected the whole aspect of our laws. If a person, acting with good faith, and the full authority of the Crown and Parliament was to be dispossessed with-

out compensation, or with inadequate compensation, a new era might open."

Mr. Morrison denied having said anything to justify these observations. The Opposition would pay compensation which, in all the circumstances of the case, was fair. It was opposed to the confiscation of private or public property.

Mr. Churchill said he was glad of the assurance. If the threat was taken seriously it would affect the value of the National Property the Government proposed to sell. "It would mean that the purchasers would get it very cheap and the State would be the loser perhaps by a very large sum. The responsibility will not rest with those who are pursuing a constitutional and parliamentary course, with the full right and authority of the House of Commons. It will be resting with those who, by unprecedented and unconstitutional action, inflicted a serious injury upon the nation for the undoubted advantage of private individuals who would get national property very cheap. . . . Never, however, in any circumstances would we be justified in surrendering in the teeth of such a challenge the undoubted rights of Parliament to legislate as it chooses."

★

These parliamentary exchanges (which were enlivened by the Prime Minister referring to Mr. Morrison's having been a conscientious objector during the First World War, and Mr. Morrison twice referring to the Minister of Trans-

port's having been a supporter of Franco during the Spanish Civil War), seem to indicate that whatever happens to road transport during the next few parliaments, we poor mugs the public will have to pay out more and more for the privilege of owning or not owning 41,000 lorries.

During the debate, Mr. Lennox-Boyd, setting out to prove that the workers would not be opposed to denationalisation, quoted some interesting figures from the *Railway Review's* enquiry amongst railwaymen about nationalisation.

One question had been: "Did you support the nationalisation of the railways," to which 91 per cent. had replied "Yes." Another was: "Do you now feel you have a share in the running of your railways?" Nine per cent. had said "Yes," 9 per cent. that they did not know, and 82 per cent. replied "No." Another question was: "How do you find your jobs?" Five per cent. answered "More encouraging," 42 per cent. "About the same," and 52 per cent. "More frustrated than under private enterprise." Last August, in the *Railway Review*, the secretary of the Eastern District Council stated that never in the history of industrialism in modern society did a group of employers and the Government of the day have such an amount of goodwill to start this great service and never was such goodwill so wantonly thrown away.

REVOLUTION IN GREECE 1944

"It has been taken for granted that revolutions will meet or follow the arrival of the Allies in the liberated countries," wrote Stephen P. Ladas in his essay *Government and People in Post-War Greece*. "This danger is greater in countries like Greece where the existence of the dictatorship before the war did not permit the function of the safety valve allowed by democratic process." This quotation focuses upon each other the elements of conflict that were latent in Greece: conflict between the republic and the monarchy. The republic was the creation of the Venizelist party. The Kingdom of Greece was the device of the Metaxas dictatorship. Thus the December Revolution in Athens was no accident. It was—if one believes that revolution comes about as part of a causal system—the result of the disproportionate growth of republican forces in a country that was virtually a monarchy.

Bounded on the north by Albania, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria, on the south and west by the Ionian Sea, on the east by the Aegean and Turkey, Greece is the elbow of the mountain-system that stretches from Spain to Syria and encloses the Mediterranean. The west coast is precipitous and harbourless, while the east is full of bays, gulfs, inlets and havens bringing Greek commerce into communication with Asia Minor. The soil is for the most part limestone—half of it pasture-land and waste. It is an area about the size of England, with a population smaller than that of London. Greece derives strength from the mountains; but they are also her chief weakness. They imbue the people with a spirit of independence; but they also prevent effectual combination. Geography is the greatest single influence in Greek politics. The country has a cultural affinity with Europe and a geographical unity with Asia Minor. Like a work of sculpture by Myron, Greece gives the impression of a person facing one direction and looking over his shoulder in the opposite direction.

We must now go back to 1941, when the Greeks under Metaxas were successfully resisting Mussolini's assault in Albania and the Germans were threatening to take a hand in the Balkan Campaign, to discover the formation of the *Ethnikos Epeletheroikon Metopon* (EAM). The National Liberation Front consisted, for the most part, of men who were either too proud to submit to Metaxas, or too far from the scene of action to admit defeat when the Germans marched in. It was a crude, rough-hewn, instinctive movement that yet contained the sinews of revolution. It was well organised and kept the spirit of resistance alive among the Greek

people; and to it went some British stragglers and many Greek and Cypriot youth who were determined not to submit. It printed its own newspapers; prepared information and recruited men for the Greek forces in Egypt, and was generally a thorny problem for the occupying forces. It formulated no political policy but was broadly republican in character. It acknowledged as its only obligation the task of worrying the occupying forces as much as possible, though at times its action was quite ill-advised and illegal, resulting in the execution of hostages at the hands of the Germans.

Birth of ELAS

Then in September 1943 came the armistice with Italy and General Wilson's broadcast to all Italian troops in Greece to hand over their arms to the Resistance or to join the movement and go into the mountains to await the arrival of British troops. Marshal Badoglio endorsed his wishes. These orders were only partially obeyed: the Pinerolo Division under Gen. Infante and the Aosta Cavalry Regiment under Col. Berti went over. Thus sprang into being the military arm of EAM known as *Ethnikos Lankos Apeletheroikos Siratos* (ELAS). The National Liberation Army was, presumably, the guerilla force that would harass the extended lines of communications in agreement with the policy of EAM; but unfortunately, a political party sponsored by armed force invariably loses its head. Here in Greece was had a repetition of the situation that had existed first in Italy where the Fascist Party was brought to power by the Militia Fascista, and then in Germany where the S.S. and S.A. were the hard core of the Nazi Party. "Our task as S.A.," said Lute in a speech in Saxony (Oct. 1936), "is to take care the German people remain National Socialists." The ELAS under General Sarafis, now took on the job of making sure that the Greek people became their supporters.

From this time the EAM/ELAS coalition seemed to conserve their energy and supplies for an opportunity to seize power and take over the Government of Greece. This was the period of deviation from the former aims of EAM. It was also the period of the emergence of Mr. Kallikak. You all know Mr. Kallikak. He takes one of the dozen or so newspapers printed and published in Athens because to do so had become a convention, a habit, a kind of tradition. Its daily sales are higher than those of any of the other twenty-eight

newspapers in Greece, and Mr. Kallikak and family see no reason why they should do anything to change the existing state of affairs. Mr. Kallikak does not feel strongly about anything, except perhaps his wife and family—and his job—and by taking this paper he does not commit himself. He dislikes trouble; he much prefers to sit on the fence. He is rather conservative in opinion, and though he no longer goes to church and has resigned from the club, he would not be seen reading *Eleftheri Elladha*—that would be almost as bad as joining a party. Mr. Kallikak believes in the need for apathy; he is non-political. He likes to read the news by glancing at the headlines, but he does not like to be shocked by them. He is getting on a bit now, and he likes to feel that the country is going to the dogs, but he also likes to feel that things are improving as they get worse. If things were as bad as they appear he would not read the editorial. Mr. Kallikak is a practical man so he does not read the suggestions for making odds and ends. Though he is a practical man he can't resist a few drachmae on here or there, and so after the front page, he turns to sport. He finds his newspaper folds quite nicely into his pocket. Mr. Kallikak is difficult to please and still more difficult to amuse, but when reading his paper at home he likes to read the personal bits aloud. If he should see a joke he would like to share it with the world. Mr. Kallikak uses his old papers to make up the fire.

As I said, you all know him; he is, of course, Mr. Everyman.

Mass Support

By now six hundred persons a day were dying of starvation in Greece. So

Mr. Kallikak began to feel that he ought to do something. He, and many more like him, joined ELAS. Authority within the movement had fallen into the hands of a few opportunists who expected to gain influence by playing Britain against other conflicting political interests. When asked by its exiled Government to supply the Royal Hellenic Navy with officers, it carefully chose staunch members and these were held responsible for the mutiny that took place through their EASDO organisation at Alexandria. This caused the fall of the Government and the accession of Papandreou.

The movement now developed along revolutionary lines. Funds poured in to help propagate the cause. Bulgaria would supply revolutionary forces with money and arms to strengthen her claim for a territorial outlet to the Aegean through Western Thrace. Albania would take advantage of civil strife to consolidate her position in Epirus—an area claimed by Greece on purely ethnological grounds. Germany and Italy would send whatever aid they could to any resistance to Britain. Russia would not, of course, be antagonistic to a sympathetic régime in Greece; but on the question of arms, Col. Popov, Russian representative on the Allied Military Mission, failed to supply any.

About this time the Lebanon Agreement was drawn up. It gave Papandreou as Chairman of Conference, the opportunity of attacking EAM/ELAS. Venizelos followed the same line. It also gave Professor Svolos of the Political Committee, Stratis as EAM representative, Rousos as the Communist delegate, and Sarafis as ELAS commander the opportunity to defend the activities and policy of the guerillas.

The Conference denounced the Security Battalions; proposed the disbandment of ELAS; decided to form an administration of national unity, and closed on May 20th, 1944. It had achieved nothing except to emphasise the disagreement between the Republican and the Populist or Monarchist Parties.

Security Battalions

Back in Greece, the ELAS had set up the *Epimelittia tou Andarti* or Guerilla Commissariat (EAT). In order to subsist in the mountains their troops had to fall back on pillage to supplement their rations. When they needed supplies they swooped down on villages and took what was useful to them from the wealthiest villagers. There came to be formed as a counter measure—and at the request of the population—Greek Security Battalions who waged war against the raiders. These battalions were recruited chiefly from the police; armed, and supplied with special identity cards by the Germans, and approved by the Rallis Government, they presented us with the familiar spectacle of Greek fighting Greek. The ELAS held that all police forces had collaborated. They were arrested on the landing of British forces.

At the same time there was another guerilla column commanded by Col. Zervas, who received full support from British H.Q. in Cairo to recruit, train and equip a national force to fight the Germans. It was an irregular National Guard called *Ellinikos Dhimokratikos Ethnikos Sindhesmos* (EDES). Zervas operated in Epirus with some success but without political ambition. When he was not attacking ELAS he was defending himself against their attacks. His band was eventually dispersed by ELAS.

Continued on p. 3

BOOK REVIEW

Revolutionary Movement in France

THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT IN FRANCE, by John Plamenatz. Longmans, 16s.)

THE revolutionary movement in France is so interesting a study that it is surprising that it should have to wait for one until to-day when the revolutionary spirit seems extinguished across the Channel and most French workers appear to have made their choice between the lackeys of Moscow, the moribund Social Democrats and the Catholic trade unions. Only a few, the anarchists and some of the autonomous syndicates, have remained faithful to the ideals preached with such sincerity and vigour more than a hundred years ago. Yet such was the fecundity of the social thinkers, so perseverant were the revolutionaries and there were so many dramatic episodes in Paris, that the optimistic 19th century gained the impression that France was becoming more revolutionary as the years passed and that the Paris Commune would be followed quite soon by new and successful battles against the State and capitalism.

It took the Marxist capture of the working-class movement and the failure of their Second International to prevent the outbreak of the war in 1914, to destroy these hopes at home and abroad. The fight for freedom and social justice was replaced after the Bolshevik victory in Russia by the "anti-fascist" struggle of our days in which the Red Army is an instrument of conquest and puts into power the local CPs led by "professional revolutionaries" chosen by Moscow from whence they receive their orders and the cash they need.

The difference between then and now is, of course, a big one and we can be grateful to Mr. Plamenatz for helping us to understand the course of events in France since the Revolution of 1789 and for telling us without bias about the rôle and motives of the leading personalities as well as of the workers, peasants and the Catholic Church. We come across a multitude of groups which wanted to destroy the successive régimes in France. All these groups were not revolutionary; indeed, only a few of them were really so, and they were the least popular and they often quarrelled bitterly among themselves. But all of them, with the exception of Proudhon and his followers,

had one thing in common: they wanted power and this they could only obtain, in view of the nature of the government (whether royalist, republican or Bonapartist), by means of plots and risings. The revolutions of 1830, 1848 and the Paris Commune they did not start, and as Mr. Plamenatz rightly points out, they took control of them after they had begun. With their capture of the insurrectionary movement, invariably came the defeat, accompanied by bloody repression in Paris. Thus none of the revolutionary groups was able to realise its programme, which may be just as well, since the 19th century worshippers of the Jacobins of 1793-4 and the partisans of Saint Simon, Fourier and Blanqui, like the Communists of to-day, believed in the dictatorship of an "enlightened" minority and depended for the realisation of their utopias on a mass of regulations which, put into practice, would inevitably turn men into robots without any private life and individual freedom.

If there is one revolutionary who shines during this period it is Proudhon, to whom full justice is done by Mr. Plamenatz. He was the only one who warned the French workers against the various kinds of authoritarian socialists, insisted that the struggle for justice and liberty was a hard one, and preached distrust of the State. Events since then have proved how right he was and cast many a doubt on the validity of the "scientific" theories of his opponent, Karl Marx. To the latter's interpretation of French history, the author devotes several stimulating pages and shows how frail some of Marx's basic arguments are.

Though it is possible to disagree with some of Mr. Plamenatz's statements and one could wish his study were more detailed (there is, for example, no mention of Bakunin at Lyon in 1870), his is a most illuminating book and should find many readers.

I.A.

COMMENT

A Bill of Horses' Rights?

THE correspondence columns of the *Manchester Guardian* have been reflecting the passionate reactions of its readers who have followed that newspaper's series of six articles on the Irish horse trade, and the allegations of cruelty in the transportation of horses to the Continent, as well as in the methods used in the abattoirs. And day by day a news column gives details of the repercussions these articles have had in official circles—in the Irish Dail and in the House of Commons.

To assist a campaign for horse-justice, the articles have been published in pamphlet form and special terms quoted for quantities.

There can be no doubt that the *Manchester Guardian* has "started something". In their editorial columns, they express their appreciation of the "huge volume of letters" they have received from "people in all walks of life", and which are "evidence of the strength of public feeling anxious to enforce decent treatment for horses and honest dealing in their flesh". In the House of Commons, there was no Party feeling; Conservatives and Labour men being united in their staunch defence of horses. Mr. R. R. Stokes (who, we believe, was a staunch advocate of bigger and deadlier tanks) expressed the feelings of many members when he told the Minister of Food at question time (after asking him whether he had read the *Manchester Guardian's* articles) that "the House would not allow the matter to rest where it was, and he and his friends would not rest until this vile practice had been stopped". Such determination and indignation has only too rarely been heard in parliamentary circles.

★

TO correspondents who have suggested that in a world containing much suf-

fering it has been out of place to devote newspaper space to the plight of horses, the *Manchester Guardian* replies: "It is a point of view. But we would reply simply that if the world can succeed in limiting any suffering it will become that much a cleaner place." Which is quite true, but it does not answer the point: why pick on the plight of Irish horses rather than that of Arab refugees, or political prisoners in Spain, or African workers in the South African mines, or the conditions in British prisons and Borstals, to mention a few of an ever-growing list of deserving "causes". Is it a fact that the *Manchester Guardian* and its supporters in the present campaign can argue with clean hands an ethical and uncompromising case for horses, whereas in the case of refugees, the exploitation of native workers and the fate of political prisoners (this side of the curtain) they are so involved in the political game that they cannot champion these causes without exposing the very political policies which they support and advocate.

The *Manchester Guardian* has on many occasions reported the facts, and whatever one may think of its editorial policy, its value as perhaps the best source of factual information in this country must be recognised. But we have yet to recall, at least in the past fifteen years, any campaign in that paper's news and editorial columns to match that devoted to Irish horses. It is a shocking commentary on the world we live in that there is no shortage of advocates for the cause of horses—and even tortoises—but a growing indifference to the sufferings of human beings, with human feelings, who in many cases have fewer rights than an Irish horse awaiting transport to the knacker's yard.

Reader's Viewpoint

Ownership and Function

MANY socialist writers and propagandists demonstrate clearly that their minds are firmly rooted in the society that has conditioned them, and in which they live, by their remarks on the common "ownership" of the land and the means of production, distribution and exchange, as if the concept of ownership would mean anything at all in a free society. It is a short step from the idea of common "ownership" to the idea of national ownership by the State. The idea of ownership can only survive in an acquisitive property-owning society, and in minds attuned to the property relationships implicit in it.

Burnham has performed a great service, in the *Managerial Revolution*, by demonstrating the importance of control, which does not rest on economic power, in breaking down the economic stranglehold of the property-owning classes, and

his work in this respect is part of the general transference of the focus of sociological interest from economic power to power in general, represented politically by the decline of Marxism, with its emphasis on the redistribution of wealth, or purely economic power, and the growth of interest in anarchism which advocates the redistribution of power in all its forms.

If we are to avoid a mistake similar to that of the Marxists, we must add to the idea of power the two concepts of access and function. Access to the means of production and the land to carry out social functions. As individuals grow up and develop, they show a natural inclination towards the carrying out of specific social functions. One of the mass tragedies of our society is that millions of people never reach their full stature in this respect, and are forced to earn their daily bread by the performance of functions which neither satisfy their creative instincts nor allow them to be of use to society in the way in which they are best equipped, and which deny their humanity and through a mass of petty snobberies and prejudices destroy their solidarity. If a man is equipped by inclination and ability to farm the land, the land is part of his function as a social animal, and he must have access to it, and control over his own work. To receive according to his needs in order to give according to his abilities.

This functional relationship is implicit in all anarchist views of education, production, consumption, every aspect of human living. I have read the early propaganda of Fascism, and am aware of the danger of the idea of function when linked to an authoritarian social structure, but I am not speaking of a society in which function is regulated from above in the interests of a directing caste. The human biology on which anarchism is based, the idea of the organic growth of social units and the organic movement of production and consumption, means only this: the free development of creative and functional activity in the people, through access to the necessities of social life, the factories, schools, and the land, a free development which is not controlled by the few in their own interests, but by all in the interests of all.

D.J.

COMMUNITY OF WORK BOIMONDAU

READERS who were interested in the condensation of Mrs. Thelma Edge's unpublished report on the "Community of Work Boimondau," which appeared in our issues of Jan. 19 and Jan. 26, will be interested to hear that Mrs. Edge is to give a broadcast talk on Boimondau at 7.40 p.m. on Friday, July 4th, on the B.B.C. Home Service.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

- The Conduct of Life Lewis Mumford 21/-
"Now in his final volume he moves from diagnosis to cure. The *Conduct of Life* is meant as a call to action, to very revolutionary action for saving mankind from a very tragic predicament."
—*New York Herald Tribune*.
- The Good Soldier Schweik Jaroslav Hasek 2/6
Complete and unabridged edition with all the original illustrations.
- Recollections Alexis de Tocqueville 3/6
This volume of memoirs of the great 19th century historian is reduced in price from £1/1/0.
- The Watch Carlo Levi 15/-
A novel by the author of *Christ Stopped at Eboli*.
- No Green Pastures Roi Ottley 18/-
Mr. Ottley's previous book, *Black Odyssey* was a masterly history of the American Negro. In this book he describes the position of the Negro in Europe to-day.

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

THE SLIPPERY SLOPE OF TOTALITARIANISM

DURING the twenty years that followed the Russian revolution, the socialist and progressive sympathisers with the "new civilisation" were gradually disillusioned by the way in which the new Russia came to act more and more in the manner of the old capitalist states. In George Orwell's *Animal Farm* this process was satirically mirrored in the last scene where the pigs become more and more like men so as to be with difficulty distinguished by the horrified farm animals peering through the farmhouse window.

If the anarchists did not share in this disillusionment it was because they never shared the illusion of faith in a "revolutionary government". The anarchist opposition to the state was too well founded to make the Bolshevik apparatus a palatable foundation for revolutionary hopes. Besides, they knew the Bolsheviks and the rest of the Marxist Social Democrats only too well, and the Germany of Ebert and Noske had recently pointed the same lessons as revolutionary Russia.

But in Orwell's final scene, the men also become indistinguishable from the pigs. If former "revolutionaries" have become like any other rulers, the democratic rulers are now becoming more and more like their totalitarian opposite numbers.

Since 1945, the Iron Curtain governments have from time to time charged their own nationals with giving information to foreign powers usually through some named members of a western embassy staff. FREEDOM has always denounced the method of these trials—the presupposition of guilt and all the other patent disregards of the safeguards of justice which have become normal in fascist and communist countries. But it would be absurd to deny that spying goes on, a curious undercurrent to the official diplomatic relations.

A similar charge has now been made in London against a foreign office employee, and a secretary of the Soviet Embassy has been named. But a similar case has recently been heard in Sweden. And whereas in the past, charges involving spying always referred to "a foreign power" without even naming it, to-day no such reticence is observed and such affairs become part of the cold war. Willy-nilly, the West copies some of the actions of Russia.

At the Swedish trial, the accused man described the network of sabotage and disruptionist activity which the Swedish Communists were supposed to have organised in the event of Sweden being attacked by the Red Army. He also represented such activity as being seen by him as his duty. This Communist duty involves the rejection of patriotism for "one's native land" in favour of devotion to some ideal represented by the Soviet Union, but in fact constituting no more than patriotism transferred to Russia.

Revolutionists have long rejected patriotism, and embraced anti-militarism. The conflict between legal duty as represented in patriotism and some other moral imperative exists for them, too. But they seek to replace patriotism, the blind devotion to one's own group, or the geographical or political accident that makes a nation, by devotion to the needs of humanity as a whole. They, too, struggle against war—but not in the interests of the rival power.

The incursion of Communist Parties into politics has thus had serious effects for revolutionists and progressives. Not only must the latter struggle against capitalist conceptions and trends and at the same time seek to explain their outlook: they must also dissociate themselves from the transferred-patriots of Moscow, and reject their outlook. Such a struggle on two fronts has been and is of disastrous disadvantage to the forces of international amity and the social revolution.

The future war is not to be stopped by lending aid to the other side. It can only be halted by the action of the peoples of the world declaring their mutual interdependence and brotherhood and rejecting the rifts and rivalries fomented by their rulers.

AFRICAN AFFAIRS Central Africa & the Shadow of Malan

THE Government's White Paper on Central African Federation, published last week, while an ingenious piece of constitution-making is not very different from last year's proposals. It is now suggested that the new state should be called "The Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland": the change of name, says *The Times*, "marks a deference to the memory" of the grandiloquent commercial adventurer who gave his name to Northern and Southern Rhodesia.

The new scheme with its African Affairs Board, has even more complicated provisions to safeguard the interests of the Africans, but will certainly do little to placate the hostility to federation amongst politically conscious Africans since experience in South Africa and in Southern Rhodesia has shown how little constitutional safeguards are worth.

Opposition to the proposals is coming too from the opposition to Sir Godfrey Huggins' government in Southern Rhodesia. Mr. R. O. Stockil, Leader of

the Rhodesian paper, the official Opposition, has as the *Manchester Guardian* puts it, "paraded the black bogey and strongly attacked the proposals."

"By inference he has attacked the idea of federation at all, for what he is advocating is that Southern Rhodesia should concentrate on promoting its own constitutional status and should arrive at the independence implied, in becoming a Dominion."

"So far from federation proving a means of protecting Southern Rhodesia from the danger of having a 'Gold Coast' on the north bank of the Zambezi, it would prove to be a bridge by which this Colony would pass into such a 'Gold Coast'."

"It had been expected that Mr. Stockil would make a bid for the support of the strong 'Keep the African Down' school of politicians. It has taken on a new significance in that the Democratic party—representing the extreme Afrikaner Nationalist element in the Colony—held a special congress in Salisbury recently, the nature of which can be gauged from the fact that the proceedings were conducted entirely in Afrikaans, although English is the only official language in the Colony."

This party seeks, of course, the incorporation of Southern Rhodesia in the Union of South Africa, and it is the unspoken fear of South African expansion northwards, that is the driving force behind the anxiety of the British and Southern Rhodesian Governments to bring about federation.

Lord Salisbury, Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations at a press conference after the Colonial Secretary, Mr. Lytton had explained the White Paper to the House of Commons, said that this was "the last chance of maintaining the British way of life in Central Africa. A crucial moment has been reached in the building up of a homogeneous bloc in these territories."

Between the Union and the Rhodesias lies the largest of the protectorates, Bechuanaland. The other two, Basutoland and Swaziland, are entirely surrounded by South African territory. And the correspondent of *The Observer*, Mr. John Worrall, reported on May 17th that:

"It is believed that Dr. Malan is waiting only for the publication of correspondence between the British and South African Governments on the Protectorates question before launching his campaign for incorporation of these territories in the Union. This correspondence contains a record of all negotiations for transfer of the Protectorates over the past 40 years. Much of it took place between successive British Governments and General Smuts. Dr. Malan has asked Britain for its assent to publication but he admitted in Parliament this week that this has not yet been granted. He has said he intends to make the transfer of the Protectorates an issue at the next General Election. He hopes publication of the negotiations will provide excellent propaganda material because it will show the electorate how consistent have been South African demands, irrespective of the Government in power."

EUSTON WORKERS

Continued from p. 1

and his second when he thought they were incapable of running their own affairs.

So now the NUR is making an attack on the Euston organisation. My guess a fortnight ago that a directive had gone out to NUR members not to handle goods carried by vanmen of the MAS was in fact correct. The orders went out from the London District Committee. But the MAS now claims to have a membership of between 750 and 800, and is not going to be so easy to crush. Its strength lies in the fact that it is rooted in the workers at their place of work. They have no offices to pay for, no officials' salaries to find, no paid organisers who could be bought over—and it obviously has the support of one hundred per cent. if its members, which is more than the NUR can say. In fact it is interesting to wonder whether the recent strike threat was diverted because Figgins was by no means sure of how much support he would get from his members.

It would be misleading to read too much into the Mutual Aid Society, and much as I would like to, I must not pretend that there is any conscious revolutionary or syndicalist aim to it. Nevertheless, among the railmen I spoke to, there were nods of approval at the mention of "workers' control", and the basis of their organisation can only win approval from anarcho-syndicalists.

Through their unions the workers have learned how to stop the boss pushing them around; through such organisations as the Mutual Aid Society they will learn how to stop the unions pushing them around. The Euston workers, in a small but sound and honest way, are pointing the direction which all workers must eventually take. P.S.

REVOLUTION IN GREECE

Continued from p. 2

The Lebanon Conference had been an effort to reach a political settlement; and it had failed. The Caserta Agreement was a simple plan of battle for the military operation in Greece. It was signed by Sarafis, Zervas, Wilson and Papandreou. It gave supreme power to Scobie; divided Greece into about five regions, some of which were allotted to Zervas and others to ELAS; and made provisions for the disarming of the Security Battalions.

The aim of the Balkan invasion by Force 140 under General Scobie was to drive Loer and the 68th Army Corps out of Greece. Had Force 140 landed in sufficient strength they would either have cut off the Germans and destroyed their army in Greece with the help of the guerillas, or have shown ELAS that they were in a position to deal swiftly with any trouble emanating from that quarter. ELAS thought that, as Force 140 was not numerically strong, they could quickly overwhelm any opposition to a coup d'état against the Provisional Government. As we shall see, they were mistaken.

When the Germans moved out of their garrison towns and villages, they had abandoned a certain amount of equipment which ELAS were not slow to acquire. They hoped to gain by arms and the threat of armed force applied to politics what EAM could not hope to achieve alone. Propaganda was put out to the effect that the British were in Greece to establish King George on the throne and to disarm the ELAS. This propaganda had the dastardly virtue of being true.

The Kommunistikon Komma of Greece, a political party of long standing and a small following, associated its aims with those of EAM/ELAS, but the socialists held aloof. Communist Party secretary, Zakhariadis, had been imprisoned by Metaxas.

Anti-Jewish Discrimination in American Medical Schools

MOST of New York State's nine medical schools discriminate against Jewish students in a flagrant violation of the state's fair educational practices law, according to a report sent to John Myers, chancellor of the State Board of Regents earlier this month.

The report was drawn up by the American Jewish Congress and the Committee for Equality in Education.

The organisations based their charges on a survey analysing the experiences of 57 of 112 pre-medical students awarded state medical scholarships on the basis of written competitive examinations in 1951.

The survey showed 41 Jewish students who won scholarships had to file a total of 214 applications with nine schools in order to gain admittance, while 16 non-Jewish winners filed only 39 applications, a ratio of 5.4 to 2.40.

The report said non-Jewish students had a record of 76.1 per cent. of acceptances and Jewish students had a 35.9 per cent. record, although the groups supposedly ranked equally in scholarship and aptitude.

The organisations named the worst offenders as Cornell University Medical College, New York Medical College and Columbia University's College of Physicians and Surgeons, all in New York City.

The best record was achieved by Long Island University's medical school, which accepted 26 out of 29 Jewish scholarship winners.

The organisations said the evidence supplied by the survey was so strong that only a complete study of accepted and rejected applications could establish a rebuttal to the charge a "quota system" still flourishes despite enactment of a law designed to bring it to an end.

In the creation of a potential force by the organisation of the *Eniata Panellinos Organosis Neolaias* (EPON) or United Panhellenic Youth Organisation, the EAM had the examples of Germany and Russia to build on. The youth movement worked with the main ELAS forces picking up or stealing grenades, detonators, pistols, plastic explosives and ammunition. These were collected into dumps and augmented by Italian and German supplies.

The émigré Greek Government landed at Piraeus with seaborne British forces. Papandreou, the Premier, quickly summed up the situation. His was a government without authority—without military force. One Greek mountain brigade was available under Col. Tskalotos. Papandreou asked Britain for aid. Gen. Scobie took over the military government of Attica. He issued an order that no arms were to be held in the city of Athens by irregular forces and reiterated a decree that all the guerillas would lay down their arms and be disbanded by December 10th.

Armed Clash in Athens

Early in that month, a political demonstration in Athens was fired on by the Greek police. Twenty-eight demonstrators were killed and over a hundred wounded. This was the magician's trick of whipping away the handkerchief and drawing out into the light "what were much better hid": the naked violence of the State. Its usual aim is to establish law and order by means of intimidation. The funeral was made an occasion for another demonstration. This was again attacked by the police.

The ELAS 1st Army Corps launched a counter attack against the police station in Athens from which these had come; the police resisted—and so the fighting began.

Scobie withdrew his garrisons: those south of Lamia to Athens, those north of Lamia to Volo, and those in northern Greece to Salonica. The British Military Mission left ELAS H.Q., and Scobie issued an ultimatum calling for an end to the fighting. It is at this point that revolution became inevitable. The very actions that those who are to lead the insurrection take to avoid it, only make the collision more certain.

British troops were ordered to intervene. During the street fighting that ensued in Athens, the ELAS showed no respect for the Red Cross, nor indeed, any knowledge that it is protected by Geneva Conventions. They had scant consideration for prisoners and carried off ten thousand hostages; they gave no quarter to the wounded. It is difficult under the plea of military necessity to justify why a young man walking between Piraeus Street and Sokratous Street, should have been taken in the back of the head by a shot that came out above his left eye; or to explain the passing of a bullet between the teeth of a civilian who peeped out of a doorway; or to give a reason for the shooting of a girl of about fourteen, whose only action was to have opened a door leading on to a balcony; but so it was. After inflicting about fifty thousand casualties, the ELAS lost the initiative and British troops began to attack.

Meanwhile, Damaskinos, Archbishop of Athens, had been appointed Regent. He negotiated the Varkiza Agreement with EAM. It provided for the repeal of martial law, the restitution of civil liberties, a general amnesty, the holding of a plebiscite and general elections. Such is the cynicism of government that not one of these was fully implemented!

The December Revolution had failed to bring forward any constructive idea after the collapse of the *status quo*. Men seemed to desire nothing more than its re-establishment: the semblance of law and its corollary of injustice.

The struggle ended officially on January 14th. Another revolution had found its end in disillusionment and in a fit of the blues.

R. E. MURRAY EDGHILL.

On May 16th, Professor van Schalkwyk, of the Free State University, said that the Protectorates should be used to enable the Union to segregate its natives territorially: in other words, that they should be used as gigantic native reserves.

In Bechuanaland, riots occurred in the Bamangwato territory when the tribal deputation returned after unsuccessfully pleading Seretse Khama's case in London. The trouble started, says *Tribune*, "towards the end of last month when the British District Commissioner tried to explain to a Bamangwato kgotla (tribal assembly) why Seretse Khama would not be allowed to return. The District Commissioner was shouted down and the kgotla ended in uproar. After that the holding of further kgotlas—which might demand Seretse's return—was forbidden. In protest against this new restriction of their traditional rights, hundreds of Africans nevertheless appeared on the kgotla grounds, trying to hold a meeting. When the police intervened rioting broke out, the District Commissioner and his assistant were stoned, three African policemen were killed and many others seriously injured."

"Two days later the police began the work of arresting all the responsible leaders of the Bamangwato. Among them are several members of the royal house, including Keaboka Kgamane, the leader of the recent Bamangwato delegation to London, and Peto Sekgoma, both close relatives of Seretse Khama. After that fresh clashes followed. Another African was killed and several other people, both European and African, injured. More arrests followed, and the situation is growing tenser."

Sir Godfrey Huggins declared at the beginning of this month that, "although the mood of the natives in Serowe is one of grim defiance, the matter is still in the hands of the police and has not yet become a military operation."

This makes rather unconvincing the statement by Lord Salisbury in the House of Lords on June 10th, that the disturbances were the work of "a noisy minority—many of them drunk".

FREEDOM PRESS

- MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI :
Neither East nor West cloth 10s. 6d., paper 7s. 6d.
Workers in Stalin's Russia 1s.
- SELECTIONS FROM FREEDOM
Vol. 1, 1951, *Mankind is One* paper 7s. 6d.
- TONY GIBSON :
Youth for Freedom paper 2s.
- PHILIP SANSON :
Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step 1s.
- ERRICO MALATESTA :
Anarchy 6d.
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.
- 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.

SYNDICALIST NOTEBOOK

AN "OFFICER CLASS" FOR INDUSTRY

FEW people think of the House of Lords as a gathering of industrial workers. But there can be few members of the House of Lords whose names do not figure on the Board of Directors of some industrial or commercial concern.

Indeed, some of our noble peers are so versatile that their names appear on the Directors' list of anything up to 50 firms! The secret is, of course, that they don't have to know anything about the productive processes—or even what the products are—to get into a position of direction.

It is a matter of prestige for many firms to have a peer's name on their letter-headings, and, in any case, directorships are bought by the investment of money in the concern, not earned (except in a small minority of cases) by technical knowledge, or effort.

This system has a great advantage for those with more money than brains, for their money will multiply without their ever having to disturb the old grey matter. But it is not necessarily the most efficient way for industry to be controlled.

Our noble lords discussed this matter the other day in a debate on the use made by industry and agriculture of the results of scientific research, and Lord (Red Meat) Woolton pointed out that, with some outstanding exceptions, an understanding of the scientific basis of technical progress was still not regarded as an asset in the board-rooms of industry. His solution? To "take active steps to train an officer class for industry".

Those who believe they are moving towards "industrial democ-

cracy" should ponder these words—which won approval in the House of Lords. It is significant that a military phrase is used, and is indicative of the creep of militarism into our lives. Lord Woolton would undoubtedly like to see as much democracy in industry as there is in the British Army.

We are by no means against technical advance and development, or the encouragement of research, but we shall resist strongly the establishment of a privileged class bought over and trained to serve authority. This smacks too much of a technocracy, providing the industrial control of a managerial society.

An officer class always demands a servile class beneath it.

TOO MANY DOCKERS?

THE National Dock Labour Board, after being concerned with a shortage of labour for years is now complaining that it has a surplus—and the number of dockers having to exist week after week on the basic wage of £4 8s. 0d. is an indication of how work has dropped off.

The blame for any redundancy can fairly be put on to the NDLB. Over a year ago, tally clerks in London approached the Board to curtail recruitment, but the Board ignored their arguments.

The Board has attempted to take on unregistered workers when there has been plenty of work. The men have naturally resisted this, for it defeats the supposed purpose of decentralisation by bringing back casual labour. So the Board has been forced to take

on more registered dockers in time of shortage who now, in time of surplus, are entitled to their basic wage for no work.

The Board does not like this. It wants it both ways. It wants a steady body of workers to be able to rely on and at the same time a mass of casual workers who can be picked up and cast aside as the situation fluctuates.

The dockers must sooner or later face up to these issues. There are rumours going around the London docks that the Dock Labour Board is now considering sacking about 3,500 dock workers, with the attack directed at old men and young workers.

Only the dockers' traditional solidarity can provide the answer to that.

AMERICAN JAZZMEN BARRED BY UNION

THE Musicians' Union is sometimes put forward as a "militant" union, and it is certainly very militant at stopping performers from other countries coming to play over here.

It's latest effort has been to tell six British jazz bands not to play in the International Jazz Festival at the Royal Festival Hall on June 28 and 30. Two American artistes and a Continental singer were to have taken part.

Mr. Ted Anstey, assistant general secretary of the Musicians' Union, said: "The union objects to the appearance in Britain of American bands and individual musicians in the field of dance music, including jazz, because in comparable circumstances, British musicians would not be permitted to appear in the United States."

"We are willing to discuss with the Ministry of Labour a system for the presentation of foreign solo jazz artistes in this country."

We wonder whether, if the artistes were coming from Russia, would they be so "militant"? P.S.

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

COMMUNITY LIFE

I THINK that P.S. rather contradicts himself in his reply to J.R.H. He states that he has never written of a "syndicalist society, since I have always maintained that syndicalism is a means not an end. A means to achieve a free society, and a means to organise and co-ordinate production and distribution in the free society."

It seems to me that, in spite of his following proviso regarding the commune, P.S. is describing nothing less than a syndicalist society. When we talk of a capitalist society we mean a society in which production and distribution are organised in a capitalist manner, therefore a society in which production and distribution are organised in a syndicalist manner can validly be described as a syndicalist society.

Though I disagree with J.R.H.'s attitude towards violence and revolution, I must say that I welcomed his warning against the habit of contemporary British anarchists of considering anarchism and syndicalism as synonymous ("Syndicalism is the translation of anarchism into industrial organisation," as P.S. and others are fond of saying). George Woodcock wrote an article on this question some years ago ("The Commune as a Factor in a Free Society") and I consider it a great pity that he did not develop his theme in more detail. Perhaps the present controversy will stimulate him into doing so.

There is a danger that the syndicalist ideal of "one industrial union" for each industry would degenerate into monolithic rigidity and a consequent growth of bureaucracy and a new dominant class. The best guarantee for the fluidity that is the prerequisite for the continuous development of the free society lies rather in a multiplicity of free associations, not only in society in general but in each industry in particular, than in the syndicalist "one industry, one union" with its pyramids of "delegate councils", each one up the pyramid more and more remote from the workers on the job.

London, W.9. S. E. PARKER.

happily in the environment of a free commune", and surely that is their value to us of the anarchist movement.

I only wish I could quote the example of similar groups of my own countrymen, the propaganda value would be better than all the arguments for, and against, anarchism.

I believe that it is only by familiarising the mass of the people with the anarchist alternative to the modern centralised military state by constant propaganda, and convincing them of its desirability or practicability by the examples of existing experiments in communal living, that we can really lay a secure foundation for the free society. We ought to use the Fabian tactics of getting as many articles as possible in non-political papers and journals, giving an anarchist slant on particular issues. Modern controversies on town-planning, re-distribution of industry and population, agricultural policy, local government, are all grand opportunities for us to urge our views without necessarily presenting them as "Anarchism" with a capital "A". We ought not to be a jealous and esoteric body of conspirators. New forms of society are not established by conspiracy and "social general strike" seizures of power (is this my horrible, "pacifist", "dogmatism" again?) The example of Spain may be quoted in order to contradict the examples of our own revolution, the French and the Russian revolutions, but, unfortunately, we never saw the result of the Spanish experiment; however, I do think it did help to confirm the incompatibility of trying to maintain an anarchist society by militarism.

It is because of the above argument that I doubt the effectiveness of the syndicalist means to an anarchist end, and not because I believe P.S. deliberately wants, or has ever supported in writing, a centralised or military state. I have not the slightest doubt that P.S. and myself are at least 90% in agreement about the society we want. It is only on the means to reach it that we differ, amicably, I hope.

Stockport. JAMES R. HOWES.

HUMAN RELATIONSHIPS

"HUMAN relationships transcend all frontiers, and are too valuable to be subordinated to the follies of . . . political scheming." These important words written by your correspondent from Leeds (FREEDOM, 14/6/52), give yet one more example of the false significance attached to that word "political"—in contradiction to "party-political".

The true meaning of this mud-spattered, deeply misunderstood expression does in fact imply a "human relationship" that transcends all frontiers: i.e., those of nation and nation and person to person. The new politics then, according to anarchism, have nothing to do with parties and ideologies. (How does one ideology maintain a relationship with another ideology?) The test of a human being's loyalty to a communication with another is part of the "startling doctrine of the immeasurable and equal value of every living human soul," as J. C. Powys puts it in his book, *The Meaning of Culture*, "this class-destroying, intellect-defying passion for equality." And further: "No one can be regarded as cultured who does not treat every human being, without a single exception, as of deep and startling interest, for every one of us is a world by himself, mysterious and unique."

Putney. E.A.

YORKSHIRE MINERS AND THE ITALIANS

COMRADE P.S. has failed to prove that Communists in this country had any appreciable effect on the Bullcroft strike and its sequel. What if there were Communist slogans at the pit-head. Even if a Communist in their hostel at Doncaster attempted to get the Italians thrown out, he was singularly unsuccessful. The decision not to work with Italians was taken by the Bullcroft miners themselves for their own particular reasons, amongst which were national prejudice, fear of unemployment and wage differences. These may appear trivial in London Town but obviously have great weight in Skellaw Village, where the pit lies. It is significant that in the press on this issue no Italian has been quoted as blaming Communists for the dispute. Always the Italians have not mentioned the C.P. but have blamed hot-headed youths (see article in last week's *Picture Post*).

I am sorry if my letter appeared to P.S. as merely a defence of Yorkshire miners; but he must be aware that large numbers of foreign workers have settled in Yorkshire not only in the mining but also in the textile industry and incidentally these folk are strongly anti-Communist as most of them have experienced Soviet rule.

I agree with most of what P.S. has written about Bullcroft, but feel that he is weakening his own case by oversimplifying the motives involved. I am aware of the C.P.'s knack of infiltration and of fishing in troubled waters; but

ON PUTTING IDEAS ACROSS

OUR Special Appeal Fund has received a real boost this month, thanks mainly to a number of contributions from American comrades. To our friends on the West Coast who for many years have been unfailing supporters of Freedom Press activities, we send our greetings and thanks. To the young comrades who organised a social which has resulted in the magnificent contribution of £87, accompanied by their hope that Freedom Press will continue its "good work", we send our thanks and our assurance that so far as we are concerned the work of spreading anarchist ideas and of encouraging independent thinking will be continued to the best of our abilities. But as we have so often pointed out—so often, indeed, that we can no longer think of a different way to express the same ideas!—the work that can be done by the F.P. group is only a part of the work that has to be done if we are to reach a wide public. Remember that the usual channels for the distribution of books and periodicals are virtually closed to us. Not simply because there is hostility amongst newsagents and booksellers—and often there is—but because we cannot prove to the trade distributors that there is a sufficient "demand" for our publications. By extensive advertising we might be able to break down this resistance, but we are not in a financial position to indulge in such luxuries. The task of introducing FREEDOM and our publications to new readers is therefore the job for those existing readers and comrades who are interested in spreading anarchist ideas. So far we have not touched the fringe of potential readers of our publications. In America, for instance, we have but a few hundred readers, as in Australia. In India and South Africa our readers can be counted on the fingers of two hands, and in Ireland there are more sympathisers in the fate of exported horses than in that of FREEDOM. And finally, in Britain, though undoubted progress has been made during the last two years, there is still no real indication of a determined effort by any large number of comrades to undertake the work of distribution.

Special Appeal

May 29th to June 21st:

S. Francisco: Man Group (per J.S.) £7/8/11; Cambridge: R.S. 17/6; Leeds: M.F. 3/-; Edinburgh: T.O.M.* 5/-; Aberystwyth: S.H. 3/-; Hull: M.A. 4/6; Derby: R.G. 3/-; London: K. 9/6; Glasgow: R.L. 1/-; Cambridge: C.L.D.* 5/-; Blackburn: W.A. 3/-; London: Anon* 2/6; Anon* 2/6; London: L.G.W.* 5/-; London: F.E.D.* 5/-; London: Anon 1/5; Peterborough: A.W. 3/-; London: A.U.* £1; London: Anon 2/6; Coventry: L.H. 6/6; Smethwick: F.G. 3/-; Sandiacre: C.W.R. 3/-; Detroit: per G.B. £1/15/0; S. Francisco: l'incarnato (per O.M.) £9/16/0; Los Angeles: Emma £1/15/0; Paterson: D.V. 7/-; Detroit: Youth Group Social, March 29th £87; London: Anon 5/-; Horwich: W.H.B. 5/-; York: H.A.A. 13/6; Yalding: J.T. 3/6; London: A.E.H. 3/-; Coleman's Hatch: D.M. £1/12/10; London: Anon 2/3.

Total ... 116 15 11
Previously acknowledged ... 213 15 8

1952 TOTAL TO DATE ... £330 11 7

GIFTS OF BOOKS: Stroud: S.L.R.; M.K. †This amount includes a \$10 donation from G.M.

* Readers who have undertaken to send regular monthly contributions.

HAVE YOU RENEWED YOUR SUB. TO FREEDOM?

THERE are ways of increasing circulations, we know. The *Daily Worker*, which carries a red banner with the words "Every new reader a recruit to Socialism" had also a front page item a couple of weeks ago which read, "THEY ALL REMEMBER CAYTON. The man who picked the winners of *2000 Guineas, *1000 Guineas, *the Derby—and they will want to read what Cayton tips for Ascot. There will be an increased demand for the *Daily Worker* this week, so increase your order to-day." That is one way of increasing circulation. Whether every new reader is "a recruit to Socialism" is so doubtful that it is not the method we propose for FREEDOM? Nor do we propose to publish the sensational half-truths, scandals and murder stories that are the life-blood of the gutter press. If anything, we want to make FREEDOM better than it is: better informed, more varied, more international in its news, more stimulating in its discussion of present day problems and constantly re-examining our own ideas in the light of accumulated knowledge.

But to do this we need more readers. More readers means not only an expansion of our activities; it also means more discussion of social problems from a standpoint outside the political parties which will be reflected in more discussion in the columns of FREEDOM. More readers throughout the world will mean more direct information on conditions and social problems internationally, closer contact.

Is it possible that in a world divided into the apathetic and the fanatical, there are still a minority of individuals ready to do a little independent thinking and discussion? We think there are, and that FREEDOM is the medium for their expression. But it is up to the readers who share our optimism to make sure that this minority is introduced to our paper and our literature!

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting
HYDE PARK
Every Sunday at 4.30 p.m.
MANETTE STREET
(by Foyle's, Charing Cross Road)
Every Saturday at 6.0 p.m.

INDOOR MEETINGS

at the
CLASSIC RESTAURANT,
Baker Street, W.1
(near Classic Cinema)
Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.
LAST MEETING THIS SEASON:
JUNE 29—BRAINS TRUST on
ANARCHISM & SYNDICALISM

NORTH-EAST LONDON DISCUSSION MEETINGS

IN EAST HAM
Alternate Wednesdays
at 7.30
JULY 9—Arthur Uloth
SEX AND THE COLOUR BAR

WEST LONDON

Enquiries to—
C. Brasnett, 79 Warwick Ave., W.9

LIVERPOOL

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

GLASGOW

OUTDOOR MEETINGS
at
MAXWELL STREET
Every Sunday at 7 p.m.
With John Gaffney, Frank Leech,
Jane Strachan, Eddie Shaw
Frank Carlin

LEEDS

Anyone interested in forming a group in Leeds, please contact Freedom Press in first instance.

COVENTRY

Anyone interested in forming a group in Coventry, please write Freedom Press.

SAN FRANCISCO

FREEDOM readers are invited to support a Spanish Protest meeting to be held in San Francisco, at the Hall in 827 Broadway on July 19th.

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