

THE HOUSING DILEMMA

FEW problems have been so constantly pressing on individual families since the war as that of housing. The difficulty of finding premises makes many young people wait years to get married, or live with "in-laws", or put up with furnished rooms (at inflated prices), to say nothing of the "rest-centres" only recently relegated to the past. The same difficulty makes people continue in unsatisfactory premises which, before the war, they would quickly have exchanged. Few families have not made cold contact with officialdom through applications to the local Housing Officer to be "placed on the list", the years-long queue for premises.

The amount of misery, anxiety, and downright frustration which "the housing problem" covers is simply incalculable.

For some years the operation of the Rent Restriction Act has been a source of unease to officialdom, and now this problem has been brought out into the open. The facts about housing are fairly simply stated.

The 50 million inhabitants of this country live in 14 million houses. Of these 4 million are said to be owner-occupied, 2 million are council premises not subject to the Rent Restriction Acts, and 8 million are privately-owned and let to tenants.

New houses are going up at the rate of 250,000 each year. But to set against these are 200,000 old premises going out of use each year because it does not pay the landlord to keep them in repair. Hence the net increase in houses is only 50,000 a year.

Rent Restriction

This has come about because rents are pegged either at 1914 or 1939 levels by the Rent Restriction Acts, while the cost of repairs has increased three times since 1939. Property owners naturally resent this situation and its difficulties are recognised by the Labour Party who declare in their newly published pamphlet, "The Welfare State": "The Rent Restrictions Acts, while protecting the tenant from excessive rents and giving him security of tenure, do not in some cases allow an income from the property which

is sufficient to maintain it in a decent state of repair. It is obvious that the tenant himself would benefit from some form of revision of the Acts which would provide for a proportion of the rent to be spent on the improvement and maintenance of the dwelling."

It is, however, difficult to see how this can really mean anything more than that the landlord should be permitted to increase the rent. Even if he devotes the whole of the increase to repairs and improvement this only means that the tenant has paid for such work without acquiring any rights over it. He has in fact, improved his house for the ultimate benefit of the landlord. Such a situation, obviously unjust, underlines the basic injustice of rent in all cases.

Representatives of property owners' societies declared, in the course of this controversy, that rent should enable a property to be kept in repair, and pay for its replacement. Annual rent is usually calculated at about a twentieth part of the value of the house, so that after twenty years a tenant has paid out the total value of the house which still, however, remains the landlord's property. After forty years presumably

he has paid for its replacement—but how many houses are in fact replaced every forty years? Some old folk have lived in the same deadly dwellings for the whole of their lives. Sometimes 50 or 60 or even 80 years. And most of the houses, let out to rent in the cities must be over 100 years old.

All this must not obscure the economic difficulties of landlordism. It is said that the average restricted rent is 9s. a week in London and 6s. a week elsewhere and it is therefore plain that despite the basic immorality of the landlord-tenant relationship, the responsibilities of the landlord are in many cases carried out without much margin. At all events, it explains why 200,000 houses a year are written off.

Other Effects

Rent Restriction has other effects. It tends to make landlords change their premises from restricted to unrestricted categories wherever they can. Only unfurnished premises are restricted. Hence the change over to "furnished", often a merely nominal description. Hence the wholesale changing over of houses from providing living accommodation to office premises or workshops. In such ways rent restriction itself has contributed to create housing shortage which has so inflated the rents of unrestricted premises.

Another factor has been the Public Health Act of 1936 which laid down certain standards for living accommodation which resulted in many thousands of basement dwellings being condemned as unfit. These to-day remain empty. It is not suggested that such basements form a satisfactory place to live. But in many cases they would exert a less serious effect on the health of the tenants than the very high rents of certain furnished premises do by cutting into

Continued on p. 3

French Communists Purged

"The Butcher of Albacete"

THE purges which are so commonplace in the Communist countries have now affected France where two foundation members of the party, Tillon and André Marty have been purged, and stand in danger of being dropped altogether. Both of them have not merely been leaders of the Party for years but are surviving representatives of the old type of Communist who had some part in revolutionary upheavals after the first war. André Marty especially, but Tillon also, were prominent in the mutiny of the French fleet in the Black Sea during the interventionist period.

André Marty played a less attractive rôle during the Spanish Civil War. Nominally an inspector

of International Brigades, he was in fact in charge of the purging of elements the Communists thought undesirable, and earned for himself the nickname of "The Butcher of Albacete." He must have sent thousands to their deaths in the gaols of the Communist police. Ernest Hemmingway, the most prominent English-speaking white-washer of Communist tactics in Spain describes him in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* as a sort of blood-drunk maniac. Actually, however, Marty was simply the ruthless instrument who carried out the Communist policy of exterminating opposition elements.

Tillon was a prominent organiser of Communist resistance units during the German occupation. Both are said to be critical of Thorez, who spent the war in Moscow, and the lawyer, Duclos.

More Arrests in South Africa

Seventeen Africans were injured last week when police with truncheons charged a crowd of about three hundred outside Queenstown magistrates court, where African passive resisters were being sentenced for breaking curfew laws. Most of those injured were women. A local white doctor tended the wounds of the injured. The demonstrators shouted "Afrika," the slogan of the African National Congress.

In Pretoria to-day seven Africans were ordered to pay a fine of £5 or twenty days' hard labour on charges of disturbing the peace. They gathered outside the Pretoria central charge office shouting "Afrika" and singing songs.

Welcome to Charlie

NO one can deny that the great welcome extended to Charlie Chaplin on his arrival in this country after an absence of twenty years was a spontaneous and heart-felt expression of public feeling towards the greatest entertainer of our time, and only accentuates the general contempt felt for the mean and underhand action of the American Government in announcing after his departure, and after he had been given a re-entry visa, that he would on his return be "screened" by the immigration authorities to ascertain whether he was a "desirable" person for admission to the States.

The *New York Times* last Sunday gave a warning to the State Department to be careful about taking any action to exclude Charlie Chaplin from the United States after his European holiday. Referring to the statement by the Attorney-General, Mr. McGranery, that he would be barred from returning to the United States until immigration officials had investigated his eligibility, the newspaper said that unless there was "far more evidence" against Mr. Chaplin than "is at the moment visible, the Department of State will not dignify itself or increase the nation's security if it sends him into exile."

The *New York Times* said it might possibly be shown that Charlie Chaplin had in some way been connected with or deceived by what had been described as Communist fronts. It recalled that on an earlier occasion he had denied being a Communist, but described himself a "peacemaker".

The newspaper added: "But those who have followed him through the years cannot easily regard him as a dangerous person. No political situation, no international menace can destroy the fact that he is a great artist who has given infinite pleasure to many millions, not in one country but in all countries."

It is learned in Washington that the Department of Justice will wait until Charlie Chaplin returns to the United States before disclosing its reason for the immigration hearing order. No announcement of the move would have been made at all, it is reported, but for the fact that the news leaked out on the Pacific coast and it was then decided to make the announcement.

[See Editorial Comment, p. 3.]

MORE COMMUNISTS ARRESTED IN U.S.

The Department of Justice said last week that eighteen Midwest and West Coast American Communist party leaders (including two women) have been arrested on charges of conspiring to advocate the overthrow of the Government by force.

SLAYERS OF TRUTH

Eden Slaps Tito on the Back

MR. Eden seems fated to make the gestures and the speeches which illustrate the absolute lack of any kind of moral principle inherent in power politics. He it was who explained that "Britain" had no quarrel with Hitler about what he did within the borders of Germany—this after six years of anti-Semitic massacre, of concentration camps, of deliberate degradation of the finest minds in Germany. "Britain," said Mr. Eden, had no quarrel with that; it was only when Hitler tried it on outside the borders of Germany (and, he might have added, outside the then Czechoslovakia and Austria) that "we" objected.

Now it has fallen to Mr. Eden to make official the careful white-washing of Marshal Tito. "Mr. Eden's visit to Belgrade, the first by any foreign minister of a major Power since Marshal Tito's breach with Moscow," writes the *Times* in a leading article, "is above all an expression of good will and a step in the resumption of contact between Yugoslavia and the West."

FREEDOM has never been other than critical and hostile to the Titoist Government. When Tito walked out of the Stalinist camp four years ago, that gesture did not make us forget the brutal methods by which Tito guided the Yugoslav Communist Party to power. Nor have we forgotten the secret political police, the internal spying, the faked trials, the concentration camps.

The importance of Tito's break

with Moscow to the power line-ups of the West was plain enough from the outset, and FREEDOM foresaw from the first that the execration of the enemy dictator would soon turn into admiration for the democratic ally. From time to time we have noted steps on the way. As an example of the moulding of public opinion, the language used by the *Times* in its leaders describing the Tito régime over the past seven years would make interesting reading. When the break came, he was still denounced as a tyrant, even though practical politics made it necessary to woo him as an ally. At the time of Aneurin Bevan's visit to Belgrade, the *Times* had already forgotten most of its execrations, while the language of to-day is almost comically mild: "The Yugoslav Government . . . has survived through qualities of courage, nerve and resolution, which can be admired ungrudgingly (sic) by countries which do not share Marshal Tito's ideology. . . . (Yugoslavia's) revolt against Stalinist Communism means not a return to capitalist economics but an original attempt to combine Marxist Socialism with the devolution of economic power. . . . In their search, as has been said, Adam Smith is summoned to the aid of Karl Marx. . . ."

And so on. Not a word about civil liberties, about forced requisitioning, about "spies" and "saboteurs". Instead, speculation on whether the Marshal will visit England. "Mr. Eden's visit will, how-

ever have shown that if Marshal Tito appeared able to accept our invitation to this country, he would be a welcome visitor."

Now, it may appear to certain practical minds that all this anarchist insistence on the brutal origins and dictatorial apparatus of the Yugoslav Government is rather petty and unrealistic. After all, the problem to-day is the menace of the Soviet Union and one must not be choosy about one's allies.

The anarchist position on all this is plain. The power alignments of to-day—any more than those of yesterday—have nothing to do with the defence of freedom. They are concerned with—power. Anarchists, on the other hand are very much concerned about freedom, and were so when the British Government was winking at Hitler, when it was allied to the Soviet Union, when it backs General Franco. Anarchists do not defend freedom by joining hands with those who oppress and murder the people of Russia, of Germany, of Spain—or of Yugoslavia. We have heard enough of the specious reasoning of the devotees of governmental power politics and their dupes the "practical" men of the left. For us freedom is defended by defending not alliances but freedom itself. And one of the essential and powerful weapons in that defence is truth. Judged from this point of view the mealy-mouthed utterances of the Edens and the *Times* about Tito are, quite simply, lies.

Re-armament in Japan

THE grip of militarism and economic policy on contemporary history could not be better illustrated than by Japanese re-armament. Just after the war, General MacArthur declared: "Japan cannot possibly raise an army or air force large enough to protect herself. Besides, the raising of armed forces would attract rather than dissuade aggression." (This last argument is less often applied to the victorious powers!)

Renunciation of war was written into the Constitution in Article 9 (said to have been adapted by MacArthur himself): "Aspiring sincerely to an international peace based on justice and order, the Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation, or the threat or use of force as a means of settling disputes with other nations. For the above purpose, land, sea and air forces, as well as other war potential, will never be maintained. The right of belligerency of the State will not be recognised."

It is said (e.g. by the *Times* Tokyo correspondent) that the Japanese people are deeply distrustful of militarism and the militarists, and support this article in the Constitution. But Japan as an ally against China and Russia requires armed forces. More important still, a Japan without re-armament commitments is too free a competitor with the West. Hence she must make arms rather than undersell the West as regards bicycles, typewriters and textiles.

As a result, Japan is re-arming and certain military circles are again coming into prominence

The Great Resistance

"We speak as the first people of this land you call America. And we speak to you a White Man, the last people who came to our shores seeking freedom of worship, speech, assembly and a right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. And we are speaking to all the American Indian People."

★

THIS is what the Old Hopi will tell you: the grass grew tall and billowed across the expansive plains of Arizona. The rains came often, giving a plentiful supply of maize, squash and melons which along with the abundant wild game supplied them with ample food. The land was not eroded by washes and there was no hunger or poverty. There was happiness.

This beneficence the gods granted to the Hopi because the heart of the Hopi was right and there was no division among them. And because the Hopi faithfully observed his ancient tribal ceremonies—colourful symbolic dances—the warp and woof of Hopi tribal life.

But a wistful expression comes over the face of the Old Hopi and his heart is sad as he reminisces of those bygone days so vivid in his memory. For to-day these Original Americans, a tribe of 4,500 living in their ancient settlements atop high mesas east of the Grand Canyon, have been disrupted in their traditional life. Civilisation has scored another of its ironies of "progress", rudely pushing aside the primitive beauty of a land, a culture and a way of life—The Hopi Way.

There was no asphalt highway, no gasoline stations or dudes to mar the ineffable beauty of their beloved homeland so dear to the heart of the Old Hopi. The Hopi domain extended across the wide reaches of upper Arizona but to-day these people are corralled into an area of 1,000 square miles surrounding their 11 villages.

This is the story of the Old Hopi—the traditional Hopi—told from his point of view. It is the story of a great people and their struggle for life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, denied them by rulers whose lip service to democracy obscures their subversion of it. Their struggle is the same as the struggle of Tom Paine and Gandhi.

The crisis of the Hopi is economic as well as cultural. The economic distress has been accentuated by the drastic diminution of their land base, presided over by the omniscient Indian Bureau. The land question is major to the Hopi. Their traditional Chiefs have stated in a letter to the President of the United States, March 28th, 1949:

"This land is a sacred home of the Hopi people and all the Indian race on this land. The boundaries of our land were established permanently and was written upon Stone Tablets which are still with us. It was given to the Hopi people the task to guard this land not by force of arms, not by killing, not by confiscating of property of others, but by humble prayers, by obedience to our traditional and religious instructions and by being faithful to our Great Spirit Massau'u."

What is known to-day as the "Hopi Reservation" was created by Executive Order in 1882. The Hopi jurisdiction was 3,860 square miles, set aside by

President Arthur for the use and occupancy of the Hopi "and such other Indians as the Secretary of Interior may see fit to settle thereon." The ambiguity of the Executive Order has been a source of constant friction with the aggressive Navajo. The Hopi jurisdiction is surrounded on all sides by the vast "Navajo Reservation"; but three-fourths of the Hopi jurisdiction was officially usurped by the Navajo with the sanction of the Indian Bureau in 1943.

To reduce overgrazing, the Collier régime apportioned the entire Hopi and Navajo jurisdictions into 18 land management units; then the Hopi—people as well as livestock—were herded into the smallest of these grazing units, District Six, which is one-fourth of the area officially known to-day as the "Hopi Reservation". To put it another way, three-quarters of the Hopi jurisdiction was given to the Navajo concomitantly with the reduction of Hopi sheep on range capacity one-fourth of its former area. Here was a pressure exerted by some obscure vested economic interests, the real rulers of the Indian Bureau. Perhaps John Collier could name them if pressure was exerted on him to execute their policies. The Hopi did not acquiesce in the enormous stock reduction programme inaugurated by the Collier régime. They had owned over a million head of sheep but there are few sheep in Hopiland to-day. As a consequence, many Hopi have been forced off the "Reservation" to find White Man's work in towns. This is an aspect of the Indian Bureau's "assimilation" programme.

The Hopi villages are autonomous; there is no tribal government. One village Chief may be bought off but not all. This fact accounts for the survival of the obdurate Hopi tribe and their traditions in face of persistent efforts to subjugate them. The Hopi maintains a religious tradition unbroken for thousands of years. Hopi means peaceful. According to the University of Arizona Bulletin:

"To this day it is the old men who are looked up to and depended upon to direct the people in all important matters. . . . In government, the village is the unit, and a genuinely democratic government; its laws are traditional and unwritten. Theft is almost unheard of, and the taking of life by force or laws is unknown. The Hopi live, move and have their being in religion. . . . The social order of the people is established and maintained by way of tribal ceremonials. . . . the very foundation of ancient wisdom. . . . Surely no people on earth, not even the Chinese, show a more consistent

reverence for the wisdom of the past. . . ."

Hopi resistance to alien domination is eloquently expressed by Katchongva, advisor to the Chief of the village of Hotevilla:

"I have been persecuted, went through White Man's jails many times, suffered hunger, was beaten up and dragged through dust. I have many times wiped my blood and tears from my face, all because I want to live my own life and remain true to my traditions and religion. White Man has sought to destroy my way of life but I shall not abandon it. . . . I wanted to stand true to the old traditions that are sacred to me and I found before me a door open to the jail. Then, when you found me it proved to me that you were not looking for a poor Indian, a humble man. You were looking for a man of pride, a man of wealth, and your efforts were all concentrated on that man of pride and of wealth, and I a poor man, was trampled under."

To-day, the Indian Agent issues a permit to this noble leader of a proud people allowing him to graze three head of horses. A painful symbol of domination. Dan is the name given to Katchongva by the White Man. I met him on a sunny Spring morning at the bottom of a deep ravine, hoeing a patch of corn. Katchongva, somewhere near 88 years old, personifies the soul of a people. His sincerity and poise, his great character and intelligence, transmit a quiet, powerful eloquence.

The colonial devices of the Indian Bureau follow a familiar formula. Foisting a government-conceived agency, the so-called Tribal Council as well as imposing a constitution written in Washington upon the Hopi, the Indian Bureau by-passes a democratic tribal government which was in existence long before the arrival of the White Man. Rather it seeks a subservient tribal governing body to facilitate Washington policy, to divide and rule politically. The Hopi have never been at war with nor signed any treaties or agreements with the United States. It considers itself a sovereign nation.

The hereditary Chiefs are not connected in any way with the Tribal Council, the government-sponsored agency whose members are generally employees of the Indian Bureau—bought and paid for—mainly recruited from a generation trained in federal Indian schools. Many Hopi children whose parents resisted their compulsory school attendance were forcibly separated from home for as long as eight years and

Continued on p. 3

GROUP MARRIAGE AND ANARCHIST PRINCIPLES

IN an article on marriage some months ago, it was suggested that not all people held that a sense of private ownership was necessary to relations between the sexes. An unfortunate example was cited, the Doukhobors having greatly modified their communal systems since migrating to Canada. However, there are many other contemporary societies which might be taken to illustrate the point. Those who wish for a comprehensive treatment are referred to Sumner and Keller's *Science of Society*, from which most of the factual material in this article is taken.

The most rudimentary arrangement between man and woman still extant is that of monandry, which is to be carefully distinguished from the later development of monogamy. Monandry means one man at any one time for each woman—temporary monogamy. Competent observers have sound reason to believe that monandry arose from an even less restrictive condition. It is this least restrictive of arrangements to which the anarchist is logically committed, but we will return to theory after facts have been stated. Very similar to monandry is the syndyasmian family as described by Morgan in the *Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*. "The relation . . . continued during the pleasure of the parties, and no longer . . . The husband could put away his wife at pleasure and take another without offence, and the woman enjoyed the equal right of leaving her husband and accepting another. . . ."

PRIMITIVE FAMILY

Sumner and Keller are of the firm opinion that the primal horde developed from the family and not vice-versa. Briefly, their argument is based on the evolutionary principle of biological necessity. Even the most primitive family unit has an advantage over lone competitors, if only in terms of greater physical power. Also while the law of the jungle reigns the child brought up in the more powerful family unit has the greater chance of survival to a fertile age. In hard times the family shares individual windfalls, which as the size of the social unit increases will become less erratic statistically. A family might be able to tackle a fierce animal where the individual would himself become the meal. For larger projects such as a mammoth-prodding jamboree a larger party would be necessary—hence the emergence of the horde.

From monandry, group marriage emerges as a form of sexual communalism. In the characteristic Australian form "We have a number of men belonging to one class married col-

lectively to a number of women of another class."

Another instance is provided by the Chukchee of Siberia. W. Rivers in his *History of Melanesian Society* uses the term "sexual communism" meaning "a social condition in which it is recognised as legitimate that sexual relations shall take place between a group of men and a group of women. Sexual communism may be of two kinds; in one, sexual relations may take place between any man and any woman of the tribe; in the other, they are limited by social groupings within the tribe." Communism of property shows the same categories. "Thus in one part of New Guinea, all the men born within a given period form a group, the members of which have various social relationships, duties, privileges, etc., to one another, and among these relations is one that although each individual member may have an individual wife, she is shared with all the other members of the age grade."

Similarly among the Masai "though individual marriage is recognised, sexual communism or something very like it prevails between all the men of one age grade and the women of the corresponding age grade." It may be inferred that among the ancient Yakuts "the children belonged to the whole horde. Any one of the adult men might be the father of a certain child since the sexual relations were undefined and perhaps unregulated." Caesar reports a form of group marriage among the ancient Britons.

DIVISION OF LABOUR

Sumner and Keller conclude that the formative period of the marriage system was likewise the formative period of industrial co-operation between the sexes. Distribution of labour has survival value and marriage favours this development. Further, any tendency that served to stabilise marriage with its economic advantages, such as a ritual which brings social pressure to encourage a more permanent and presumably eventually more efficient liaison, would have, at a given period of social evolution, distinct survival value. It does not follow that such artificial restrictions have the same value in our more highly (?) developed society. Among the western peoples at any rate the struggle for bread is no longer the dominant issue that it was.

Hence the family as a social unit is no longer inevitably advantageous. It appeared as a natural development in the social history of mankind. But the process is necessarily dynamic not static, and whereas the family unit at one time met an economic need better

Continued on p. 4

Lessons of the Spanish Revolution—II

The C.N.T. and Political Action

(Continued)

WHEN we say that power corrupts those who wield it, we do not mean that such people necessarily fall victims to the temptations of bribery and material gain as is, for instance, the case in American political life. What we do firmly believe is that no man can resist the effect that power has in modifying thought and human personality. And only few strong personalities can, once they have basked in it, dispense with the limelight that accompanies power. The frailty of mankind in this respect has always been clearly understood by the anarchists, and because of this they have always advocated a decentralised society in opposition to the centralisation in present-day society which permits power to be concentrated in few hands. In their own movement the general form of organisation has been the affinity, or functional, group; each group maintaining contact with the others through some co-ordinating or correspondence secretariat, but each retaining its autonomy and freedom of action. In the revolutionary syndicalist movement the same principles apply, with the syndicate as the unit of organisation. These views were in theory shared by the Spanish C.N.T.-F.A.I., but in practise not always observed, and for reasons which are peculiar to the Spanish movement. We have already referred to the "militant mentality". One has also to bear in mind that for long periods in their history the C.N.T.-F.A.I. were illegal organisations and therefore unable always to act organically. And the fact of the C.N.T. being a mass organisation carried with it, to our minds, the dangers inherent in all mass movements, of the creation of groups of influential militants within its ranks whose preoccupation is to safeguard the "purity" of the movement from reformist elements. The result of all these factors was that there have always been outstanding personalities representing different tendencies though very often the internal crises in the C.N.T. have not been so much ideological as a clash between these personalities. It is noteworthy, for instance, that the present crisis in the C.N.T. in exile, ostensibly between the "collaborationist" and "purist" tendencies, has in fact been a struggle between personalities aiming at control of the organisation. It is also significant that many Spanish anarchists seem unable to discuss ideas without descending to personalities. A careful reading of their press, particularly in the early period of the present crisis confirms, we think, such a statement. But this happens also to be the technique of every self-respecting politician in the game of power politics!

The situation created by the revolutionary workers' successes in July 1936 made it possible for a further building up of leaders in the ranks of the C.N.T.-F.A.I. Overnight the whole propaganda machinery in their hands was increased beyond belief. Besides having their own Radio Station, and issuing daily Information Bulletins in a number of languages, there were some eight daily newspapers and innumerable weeklies and

monthlies, covering every aspect of social activity.²³ Vast meetings were held throughout Spain addressed by "the best orators of the movement such as Federica Montseny, Garcia Oliver, Gaston Leval, Higinio Noja Felipe, etc." And the concentration of political power in a few hands was further aggravated by the fact that many active militants whose voices might have acted as a counter-balance to those of the "influential militants", were engaged in the all-absorbing task of the collectives, or with the fighting columns manning the fronts. Indeed, it is a reflection of the revolutionary integrity of the movement as a whole that so many of the men capable of running the propaganda machine, and of filling administrative posts shunned these positions of power and that in the first weeks of the struggle it was not possible to find sufficient men to carry on this work. To solve the problem the Bureau of Information and Propaganda of the C.N.T.-F.A.I. in Barcelona decided on the creation of a School for Militants (Escuela de Militantes). In a Radio talk explaining the purpose of this School it was revealed that it was "under the auspices of, and supported and maintained by the Regional Committee of the C.N.T. and by the F.A.I. of Catalonia." Its purpose was "to create an organism with the exclusive aim of cultivating militants and adapting and equipping them for the work and the ideas of the organisation in its various aspects". To belong to the school it was necessary to have "personal views and a general culture, especially in social questions". But, failing these, a "desire to achieve the objectives aimed at by the school". Also that all students at the school "should have the economic backing of the Syndicate to which they belong". In the course of the talk it was said that, "There is no doubt that one of the major successes of our organisation has been that of creating this original kind of institution, since the students whilst obtaining useful and interesting knowledge in all the branches of human thought, acquire, at the same time, methodically, the maximum perfection in their specialised subject" (our italics). The historiographer of the C.N.T. in exile makes no comment on this far from "original" institution (perfected long ago by the rulers in Moscow and used by the British Labour Party and Trade Unions as a method for training the future Party leaders and Trade Union bosses). To our mind such revolutionary incubators are fraught with more dangers than advantages, particularly when, as in the case under discussion, they are organised by the Propaganda Bureau with the specific purpose of turning out public speakers and journalists, who, clearly, if they are to speak or write for the Propaganda Bureau will be expected to express the "party line" and not their personal views, the more

so if they are paid propagandists.²⁴ Thus the official line gains a serious and dangerous advantage over minority viewpoints by its monopoly of the channels of expression.

Space permitting, we should have wished to examine in detail the whole technique of propaganda; and propaganda in Spain was conducted by all parties and organisations on such a vast scale that a study of the methods used would provide valuable lessons for the future. We will, however, have to content ourselves at present with stating our view that the oratorical demagogues (as opposed to lecturers and speakers at group meetings and small gatherings) represent the greatest of all dangers to the integrity of a revolutionary movement. The microphone is the curse of modern times. And in some parts of Spain where they still till the soil with roman ploughs, there was, and still is, no shortage of chromium plated microphones!

A characteristic of political demagoguery is that one day one says one thing and the next one expects the people to swallow the contrary. We have been provided with a classical example of this technique by the document issued by the C.N.T.-F.A.I. on September 3, 1936, against collaboration, followed by the paeons in praise of government when they joined the Caballero Cabinet. And there are many more. Garcia Oliver, who ranked amongst the highest in what Federica Montseny has eloquently referred to as the "anarchist dynasty"²⁵ provides us with all the material we require for a study of the corrupting influence of power. He it was who said at a huge public meeting held in Barcelona on August 10, 1936: ". . . The Madrid Government thinks that one proceeds with the formation of any army to combat fascism without this army having a revolutionary spirit. The army can have only the character that emerges from the voice of the people, and must be 100% proletarian. To demonstrate this I must refer to the corps of Assault guards, carabineers and civil guards who mixed with the working-class masses in the struggle against fascism, forming with them a popular army which has been proved in practise to be superior to the classical concept of armed corps organised behind the backs of the people." On December 4, 1936, at a meeting in Valencia, the same speaker (now Minister of

Continued on p. 4

²⁴ Any propaganda financed by the Propaganda Bureau had to support the official line or be starved of money. One case in point was the excellent periodical *Espagne Nouvelle* published in France, and which had a large circulation among the French workers and intellectuals. As soon as it dared to criticise the policy of the leadership of the C.N.T.-F.A.I. funds were suspended, and the journal though it did not cease publication altogether, was considerably reduced in format and ceased to have the wide appeal of its predecessor.

²⁵ From a speech delivered in Valencia, June 1937, and quoted by Peirats, Vol. 2, pp. 270-277.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

A Giant's Strength Alex Comfort 10/6
Alex Comfort's new novel is set the other side of the "iron curtain".

The Physiology of Sex Kenneth Walker 2/-
"It is extraordinary that in such a small number of pages Mr. Walker has been able to deal with such deep and far-reaching problems."—Times Educational Supplement.

Strikes: A Study in Industrial Conflict K. G. J. C. Knowles 42/-
In the first part of this book, industrial practices are considered in their relation to strikes, with a wealth of historical detail. In the second part, the causes and effects of strikes are discussed and the relevant statistics over a long period are analysed and interpreted.

The Conduct of Life Lewis Mumford 21/-
"Mr. Mumford's maturity of thought is shown in his protest against rigorously formulated systems. The effort to whittle down valuable conduct to a single set of consistent principles and ideals does not, he argues, do justice to the nature of life, with its paradoxes, its complicated processes, its internal conflicts, its sometimes unresolved dilemmas."—Times Literary Supplement.

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

CHARLIE CHAPLIN

PEOPLE do not expect governments to be truthful or to keep faith, but they generally expect them to have some kind of excuse, some kind of overriding reasons for their faithlessness. And it is by such tawdry "explanations" that governmental trickery gets by and is accepted, rather in the way that one accepts the earnest excuses of an old drunkard. But it sometimes happens that governmental trickery is shamelessly brazen—for example, the luring of Seretse Khama to London with a safe conduct and then banishing him.

The United States Government has now done the same thing with Charlie Chaplin. For years it has been rumoured that Chaplin dare not leave the United States, of which (unlike many other twentieth century emigrants from Britain) he has never sought citizenship, for fear that he would not be allowed to return. Before his visit to this country, he therefore applied for, and was given, a re-entry visa, thereby, one would have thought, guaranteeing his return. The *Observer's* Washington correspondent indicates the lines governmental chop logic is likely to take here, now that the Attorney-General has ordered an enquiry into his suitability.

"A non-American citizen who is a permanent resident of the United States can, if he wishes to leave the country for a short period of time, apply before leaving for a re-entry permit which is valid for one year. This document, however, merely supplies the American immigration officers with a *prima facie* evidence that the holder of the re-entry permit is a permanent resident of the United States. The permit does not guarantee that he will be readmitted, and does not authorise readmission."

It is obvious that the department which issued the re-entry visa knew what was in the wind, but they still issued the visa. The Attorney-General's department also knew that the re-entry permit had been issued. Neither was concerned with the breach of faith involved in allowing a man to think he was safe in leaving when they knew he was not.

Of course, the whole point is that the U.S. Government have been anxious to be rid of Chaplin for years. Not being prepared to deport him, however, they had to wait until he left on a visit abroad, and to have given away their intentions by refusing a re-entry visa would have blown the gaff altogether.

What makes the case so interesting is the nature of Charlie Chaplin's activities. If he has ever had any sympathy or contact with the Communists it certainly does not appear in his films—which constitute after all, the sum of his public activity. His films are "Left" only in the sense that they display a strong sense of justice, a dislike of the strong and the hypocritical who oppress the weak and the truth. They advocate no political action.

But they do satirize the whole industrial way of life also. Is this enough to make Chaplin odious to authority? It hardly seems likely. Ranged against him must also be many powerful film interests. "Lime-light" is now being attacked, just as "Monsieur Verdoux" was attacked, out of all proportion to the usual canons of criticism. If this is so, then the U.S. Government is acting as the tool of a section of Big Business in a most shameless way.

It is said that Chaplin's morals also offend. But here again he does not seem to have done anything very flagrant. His crime is that he has never been apologetic, has never paid lip-service to conven-

tional morals, and his films show an individual morality which holds the hypocritical ethics of conventional behaviour in mere contempt. Finally, one is amazed at the American Government's action in its seeming disregard for the disservice they do themselves. If Chaplin is made the victim of this sort of double-crossing, who can doubt where public sympathy will lie? Once again the case illustrates the cruelty and baseness of governments and the time-serving attitude of its officials. For our part we are not surprised at that. Meanwhile, on the internal evidence of his films, it seems plain the Chaplin is in no sense a Communist. It is to be hoped that he has more sense than men like Picasso and also rejects their "support" and "sympathy" which hopes to use him and his world-wide appeal to gloss their own purposes.

THE GREAT RESISTANCE

Continued from p. 2

sent to these government schools great distances from their parents in order to destroy their traditional culture. Their cultural conflict is carefully exploited. Such is the conqueror's policy of "assimilation".

While other Indian tribes have been demoralised by liquor, the White Man's sedative, and made servile in their submission, the Hopi have stubbornly refused to accept that status. The I.Q. of Hopi children is higher than any other children in the United States. The Hopi are too well aware that their submission will destroy themselves and their traditional way of life. The traditional Hopi leaders have stated:

"... be careful and watch the ways of the White Man with diligence. His tongue is sweet, his hand is quick and he will not hesitate to use any means to obtain that which his heart desires. He will use tricks, rations, money and material things to defeat us in taking away our land from us. All the laws and policies he makes which at first glance may appear good and just are aimed at taking from under us our homeland. The more we accept material gifts from the government the more we go in debt to him."

Apologists for the Indian Bureau are numerous and well-financed but the sole spokesman for the Hopi are their wise and trusted hereditary Chiefs who assume the grave tribal responsibilities without pay and till their fields like other Hopi. Indian Bureau apologists dismiss as "too complex" the essence of the Hopi and Indian problem: self-determination. The Indian Bureau cannot give self-determination to the Hopi. All it can do is get out of the way.

Self-determination is sovereignty—self-rule. Self-determination means that a people have the sovereign right to determine and carry out their own destiny without any alien authority to say whether their acts are good for them or not. Under self-determination a people have a right to make their own mistakes and be accounted for them. The Indian Bureau cannot give self-determination to the Hopi. All it can do is get out of the way. For the truth is, the Hopi want to run their own lives, without a boss over them to restrict it. Nor do they want to boss anyone else around, telling them, I want you to do this, I want you to do that. Gandhi demanded the same self-determination from English oppression for the Asian Indian that the American Indian demands from the United States Indian Bureau. This is what the Hopi have always demanded for all people.

GEORGE YAMANDA.
[Next week: "The Predatory White Man."]

The Housing Dilemma

Continued from p. 1

the amounts available for food. Many a young couple would prefer such premises with all their disadvantages to continued living with their "in-laws".

No positive recommendations can be made from all this—what does emerge however, is the way in which measures designed to protect tenants and protect health produce effects which are absolutely damaging to these same tenants.

The Fear of Votes

When one considers what to do about it, yet other absurdities arise. For instance, neither the Tories, nor Labour, are willing to tackle the question of Rent Restriction and decay, because they are afraid to be the one to raise rents and so lose votes. Their solution is to try and collaborate so as to "share the blame". This fear of the voter has something comic about it and illustrates the awkwardness of centralised administration.

If the problem were treated on a local

REVOLUTION & HAPPINESS

For the benefit of all our readers who were not able to be present at this year's Summer School in London, we print the text of Tony Gibson's lecture, which followed that by Geoffrey Ostergaard, which appeared in FREEDOM in our issues of August 9, 16 and 23.

IN this lecture I want to work out the essential connection between personal happiness and the revolutionary potential for changing the basis of our social structure. For it is my thesis that the sort of revolution which will overthrow the anti-social and inhuman institutions which dominate our society, must arise out of the striving for personal happiness which exists in every individual. It is the nature of our age that peoples are no longer oppressed by the sheer power of tyrannical individuals, but by institutions which invade their personal lives more and more. There have been eras of the oppression of slaves by slaveholders, oppression of the serfs by the barons, oppression of the proletariat by the bourgeoisie. Now the dominant note of our age is the oppression of the individual by impersonal institutions. Political parties have been the expression of the struggle of one class against another; anarchism has always been apart from this political struggle, and although it is founded upon the struggle of all usefully productive workers against forces which waste and limit their productive effort, anarchism has never been the expression of one class, as for instance, "Communism" claims to be the ideology of the proletariat. I think that it is important to bear this in mind, as the old economic classes are very much in the melting-pot, and the class which we are up against is the class of professional administrators who have a vested interest in government for the sake of government.

In regarding the practical possibilities for social revolution in our time, I find myself in substantial agreement with the ideas of the anarcho-syndicalists. The principles which Geoffrey Ostergaard put forward last night, do to my mind, provide the obvious method whereby a revolutionary change in the economic and social bases of industrial countries may be brought about, but I am concerned in this talk with the reasons why people should wish to change the basis of their living. It is not enough to say that they are discontented, and with good reason. It is not easy to get people to act for logical and obvious reasons—the motives for human action are largely of an emotional and highly personal nature. If this were not so, we would have got rid of the evils of capitalism and government long, long ago by the force of sweet reason, which such writers as William Godwin expected to prevail.

Most people view the sorry state of things around them and agree that something is wrong with society. What I want to emphasise is that nowhere does this derangement, this crisis, exist except in the thwarting of our own personal lives. And that nowhere can the social revolution take place except in the experience of our own lives. This to me is the hard core of anarchism which must be appreciated before the wide thesis of anarchism can be understood and acted upon. The social revolution is not a future event, ushering in a golden age of anarchy; the revolutionary process is a current and contemporary thing which we take part in in our own lives. And if we here, you and I, are to experience the society of anarchy, we must live it as best we may in our own lives, for it will do us little good when we are rotting in our graves.

Of course, this is not a new idea which I am putting forward. It is implicit in the writings and the actions of all those men and women who have been outstanding personalities in the anarchist movement. For, me, I find the kernel

of anarchism most lucidly expressed in the egoism of Max Stirner, for without that honest grasp of self-knowledge and self-appreciation, it appears to me that anarchism can be misinterpreted into a messianic cult of the subjection of the individual to the abstractions of the welfare of Humanity. Many anarchists may say that they simply do not agree with the egoism of Stirner, or more subtly they may say, "Oh, yes, we know all that, but let's get on with more practical issues." In practice I find that those who would dismiss a thesis by saying, "Oh, yes, we know all that," are generally the very people who do not in fact know it. They may have read or heard such ideas, but they have inwardly refused to consider them because of the emotional discomfort which such ideas cause. When Sigmund Freud first put forward his theories on sexuality and the nature of the unconscious mind, he declared that if the medical profession and the lay public easily accepted them, it would be proof positive that his theories were wrong. To-day, half a century later, we may see how right he was.

I have said that I want to talk about personal happiness, and that the striving for personal happiness is the essential revolutionary drive. The only revolution that we can conceive of is a revolution in happiness. Moralists in the so-called revolutionary camp may talk of revolution to establish Justice, or Freedom or Progress. To me these abstractions are slightly suspect. We don't know when we are experiencing Justice, but we do know when we are happy. It is my conviction that any revolutionary movement which thwarts human happiness in order to establish Justice, Freedom, Progress or anything else, will produce nothing but frustration as the result of its activity.

What is happiness? It is something that one cannot hope to catch by consciously pursuing it like a butterfly. As far as I can see, happiness results from the fulfilment of one's own self. Max Stirner put it, "How does one use life? In using it up like a candle, which one uses in burning it up. One uses life and consequently himself, the living one, in consuming it and himself. Enjoyment of life is using life up."

I would say that happiness, that is the process of enjoyment of life, is founded upon two things, work and sex. The frustration of our urge to express ourselves in both these activities produces the condition of unhappiness, and looking at the frustrations implicit in contemporary society, it is obvious why most people are more or less definitely unhappy—which I think is no exaggerated statement.

I am aware that I am now on a rather big theme, work and sex, and that I cannot do justice to either, let alone both, in this one lecture. I have found that the anarchist movement, at least those elements with which I am in touch, is doing much good work in the clarification of the social rôle of work, and part of this Summer School has been devoted to a discussion of anarcho-syndicalism. I would like to expand the subject by a discussion of the necessity for the complete voluntariness and enjoyability of work, but I have not the time now.

For children, play is all-important; in play they use up the universe and develop themselves to become adult beings. In adulthood, however, work and sex are the two primary ways in which we fulfil ourselves. No way of living which does not continually satisfy both these needs can produce a balanced state of happiness. One cannot say that either work or sex is the more important; they react curiously upon one another. People who have a basically successful, happy pattern to their sex lives can remain in some degree of social and individual health even though they are denied the economic facilities for a successful fulfilment in work. They may be exploited wage-slaves, but they will not be supine wage-slaves; they will retain the vitality to resist economic exploitation both individually and collectively. We are all familiar with the sad tale of Euporean imperialism exploiting and destroying the cultures of primitive peoples; what is the more remarkable is the degree of resistance to such debasement shown by many native cultures which have a virile resilience in their own way of life. On the other hand, those people who are basically unhappy in the pattern of their sex lives are supine before economic exploitation, and show no effective organisation in their work-relationships. Even when they are economically favoured and have special opportunities for finding satisfying work, their sexual maladjustment makes them incapable of fulfilment and happiness in work. This phenomenon is all too common in our society.

It is therefore the question of sex which I propose to discuss now. Unfortunately, although one can always discuss work fairly calmly even with non-anarchists who are flatly opposed to our ideas, the question of sex arouses

much hostility and resistance even amongst otherwise enlightened gatherings. Again we meet the evasive attitude to which I have previously referred—"Oh, yes, we know all that, but let's get on to more practical issues." I can only say that this is a most practical issue, and a consideration of it is vital to any discussion of human happiness. Now I am well aware of the excellent work done by Wilhelm Reich in this connection, and the importance of such books as *The Sexual Revolution* and *The Mass Psychology of Fascism*, but neither Reich nor anyone else has spoken the last word on the subject. It is a difficult and for many of us an awkward subject to deal with, particularly in addressing the general public, but nevertheless it is one which needs continual attention.

Many people think of revolutionary change in the basis of social living while still retaining our present-day pattern of sexual behaviour. They may concede certain modifications when they talk of a desirable form of a free society, such as the disappearance of prostitution and the general tolerance of those people whose sexual aims deviate from what is usually considered normal, but very little consideration is given to the fact that a revolutionary change in social relationships implies a revolutionary change in sexual relationships; it cannot be otherwise.

Now I am going to state quite definitely that for the vast majority of people, happiness is dependent on sexual happiness. For a man, woman or child to live happily he must have a happy sex life, and sexual happiness is an active rather than a passive thing. When I talk about the struggle for happiness as being the dynamic of revolution, I know that I am considering a matter which is largely

Continued on p. 4

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 SANSOM :
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.
- GEORGE WOODCOCK :
Anarchy or Chaos 2s. 6d.
New Life to the Land 6d.
Railways and Society 3d.
Homes orhovels? 6d.
What is Anarchism? 1d.
The Basis of Communal Living 1s.
- WILLIAM GODWIN :
Selections from Political Justice 3d.
On Law 1d.
- F. A. RIDLEY :
The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age 2d.
- Marie Louise Berneri Memorial
Committee publications :
Marie Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute cloth 5s.
Journey Through Utopia cloth 16s. (U.S.A. \$2.50)
- K. J. KENAFICK :
Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx Paper 6s.

27, Red Lion Street,
London, W.C.1.

COMMENT

MORE TITLES PLEASE

"England is the last home of the aristocracy, and the art of preserving the aristocracy from the encroachments of commerce has been raised to quite an art."

"Because in America a rich butter-and-egg man is only a rich butter-and-egg man or at most an honorary LL.D. of some hungry university, but in England he is Sir Benjamin Buttery, Bart."

OGDEN NASH.

THE British monarchy preserved the aristocracy as best it could by bestowing peerages and knighthoods upon the money-grabbing capitalist class, while the aristocrats preserved themselves as best they could by a fortuitous series of marriages amongst the new rich, local and otherwise.

Continuing its delicate path along the tortuous road of social change, the monarchs now touch the shoulders of the workshop militants of former days, the fiery agitators of yesteryear, and the new class of public board administrators is gradually mingled together in a cohesive mass. Civil servants, capitalists, aristocrats are all content to welcome the Trade Union peer to their ranks, and no doubt before long they will be marrying off their daughters to him, particularly if there are a few more Labour Governments.

In the old days, the Labour leaders frowned on titles, and we were told that they only accepted seats in the House of Lords in order to strengthen the party's representation there. In those days, elderly bachelors and widowers and old married men without heirs were the likeliest candidates for Labour peerages, particularly if they held good, safe, solid working-class seats which one of the bright university boys had his eyes on. The objection has long since been waived, but even if the hereditary peerage is accepted, what are we to think of the swarms of trade union leaders accepting knighthoods, baronetcies, orders of various kinds, to which no political significance attaches whatsoever, and fighting like mad to get them quite as much as do the Tory and Liberal snobs?

To-day the Labour movement has resigned itself to this sort of royalist-socialism, although the rank-and-file seldom look on it with favour, and express themselves in forthright language as to what they think of this or that peer or knight who has used the Labour movement as his road to "honours", just as others have used the City board-room or the political backroom. Indeed, it is only the right-wing socialists and the Anarchists who have anything to say in favour of the system. The right-wing socialists usually favour it because they are in line for at least a garter themselves (otherwise they would be left-wing socialists). The Anarchists favour it as a quick and handy means of reference under the capitalist system. When Brother Higginbottom comes forward and tells the workers they should not strike, he may, as secretary of the union, be accepted as a representative, a militant, a sincere

union man. There cannot surely be such a mistake about Sir Jeremiah Higginbottom, M.P., or Lord Higginbottom of Pentwhistle, and we can only suggest the wholesale and rapid promotion of all trade union officials into peers, knights, barons, baronets, bassinets and anything else that can be thought of. Then perhaps the working-class movement will recognise precisely what their relationship to these distinguished gentlemen will be, and in addition to the Labour movement of officials, which will be exclusively composed of members of Debreth's Peerage, we shall have a Labour movement composed of members of the working-class without any officials whatsoever, not even plain Mistfers.

A.M.

REVOLUTION AND HAPPINESS

Continued from p. 3

sexual in character. One of the most obvious features of contemporary society is that it denies sexuality and hedges it about with various taboos and severe penalties.

I am reminded that Samuel Butler drew attention to the public enthusiasm evoked by the display of guns in the street during a military display (that is, the means of death) and contrasted it with the horror which would attend a similar public display of the sexual organs (that is, the means of life). There is no question about it, contemporary morality has embraced death rather than life. Drastic and barbarous laws are applied to adults in bolstering up the officially accepted sexual code, but even more drastic treatment is meted out to children. Various laws circumscribe the sexual behaviour of adults, but for children (that is, people up to the age of sixteen years) both law and social custom declares that they have no right to any such thing as a sex life! Many people would like to place this age-limit much higher, of course. All of us have been children; all of us have experienced this warping of our natural sexuality, even if we can remember very little about it to-day, and all of us have had our chances of happiness spoilt to a greater or less degree by the conditioning which we received in our early years. For it is nonsense to pretend that in adult life, once we are free from the restrictions of childhood and adolescence we can take to a free and happy sex life, as a duck takes to water. We cannot; in some degree we are warped and incapable of the happiness which was potentially ours.

Now first of all I want to outline just what the conventional view of sex is in contemporary society, and then to discuss the relationship between sex and revolution. If you find such an analysis too elementary for you, well, I must ask your indulgence. I don't think we should slip over basic essentials too lightly.

TONY GIBSON.

(To be concluded)

Group Marriage & Anarchist Principles

Continued from p. 2

than any other system, its function in modern society is radically different. In the family of to-day the child first learns the meaning of sacred Authority and of violence as a means of influencing behaviour. The omnipotent, omniscient parents are then supplemented by schoolmasters and priests, and are ultimately usurped by the State, which uses the habits of servile obedience that have been hammered into the child from the cradle to satisfy the ambitions of a small clique of megalomaniacs.

ANTHROPOLOGY & ANARCHISM

Let us see what significance this anthropological material has in relation to our present society with particular reference to anarchist ideals.

Several fundamental issues emerge. If, as the anarchist believes, we must evolve towards a lawless society, in what way will this society differ from the jungle? Are we to fight our way through aeons of ignorance, misery, brutality, stupidity, squalor and anguish only to end up where we started? Are we to believe that we are simply caught in a vicious circle of bloodshed and bestiality, famine and disease? To progress only to regress? No. This is the fundamental error of those who equate anarchists with bewhiskered bomb-throwers. The ideal society envisaged by anarchists differs in one radical respect from the jungle. It will be organised on a rational basis. All the advantages of a highly-developed technological civilisation are to be retained while the individual will be free. Instead of being a cog in a vast soulless machine, the individual will be emotionally outside it. No longer will he be the attachment that is plugged in to convert a capstan into an automatic lathe. Machines will serve the individual and not vice versa.

The analogy of an evolving society is not a vicious circle, but a progressive spiral. In the sense of there being no laws we will be back where we started, but there the similarity ceases. Laws will cease to exist, not because we prefer chaos to slavery, but because they will be no longer necessary.

This brings us to the second fundamental issue—one on which many anarchists come unstuck. How is it possible to have a highly-organised technological society without laws (i.e., violence or threat of violence) to keep it intact? So long as each individual member of society is brought up to believe that his overriding duty is to serve the interests of a particular bag of flesh and bones without regard to the needs of the remaining members of society, then the problem is insoluble. In seeking his own narrow ends a man does not of necessity further the interests of his fellows. Accept the premise that man is by nature incurably egocentric, whilst believing in the millenium, and you are caught in a paradox. It is only when the individual learns to identify himself with the whole of mankind that laws become superfluous.

Perhaps this sounds as if we are faced with the task of producing a race of saints. Let us not bilk the issue: a perfect society presupposes perfect individuals. But this need not occasion

despair. One of the great discoveries that modern psychology has to offer us is that, unlike the rest of the animal world, man's behaviour is, apart from a few simple reflexes such as sucking and swallowing, entirely learned. From this it logically follows that it is just as possible for him to learn social as anti-social behaviour. The problem revolves itself into one of how to provide the perfect education. Here again we may appear to be caught in a vicious circle. How can imperfect beings provide a perfect education and so produce perfection? And once again, to be ruthlessly frank, let us recognise that they cannot—not in a single generation. All that we imperfect beings can do is to try to provide an education for the next generation that is slightly less insane than the one that was inflicted on ourselves. The process is one of successive approximations.

REVOLUTION & EVOLUTION

A Bronze Age man could not, with the best will in the world, have produced a modern piece of precision engineering, for such a product implies the existence of machines almost as accurate as the ones to be produced. Nevertheless, precision engineering is an established fact, no matter how fantastic it would have seemed to the Bronze Age reactionaries. Hence the futility of bloody revolutions. The process is of logical necessity one of gradual evolution not cataclysmic revolution. The bomb-throwing brethren may find this prospect less emotionally satisfying, but it is none-the-less a fact, and we may as well face up to it. In the very nature of things we cannot hope to see our ideals realised in our own lifetimes. Our only realistic ambition is to throw our weight into the balance on the side of enlightened progress, while affirming our faith in the ultimate and inevitable realisation of our ideals.

All this has taken us a good way from the marriage system, but the relevance of the above discussion is quite clear. A lawless society would be a marriageless society, for marriage is a legal concept. In an anarchist society marriage would not exist because there would be no need for it. Exclusive ownership of another, body and soul, would be as unthinkable as all other forms of slavery. The anarchist is logically committed to free-love along with every other form of freedom.

PRIVATE OWNERSHIP OF CHILDREN

At this point we must meet the question "But what about the children?" Every child has the right to a family life. And some of the poor little devils get it, too; whilst society reaps the benefit in terms of criminals and lunatics. No! Let us face it. Unpopular as the conclusion may be to present-day tastes, private ownership of children would be as unthinkable in a sane society as would be the rest of our barbaric habits. Why should we adopt a particular emotional attitude towards a particular child just because it entered this world via a particular womb? In a perfect society all children would be equally entitled to our love and help. A child should be just as free to seek affection and protection most suited to its personal needs as adults should be free to give and accept love between

themselves. If this should sound an impossibly high ideal, let us humbly remember that the Samoan child has to this present day the privilege of changing his home if a square deal is not forthcoming in the immediate circle.

The details of a social system that would not only provide all the material needs of all its members, but also enable each individual to develop his or her creative ability to the full, cannot be expounded here. Nor can they be expounded anywhere. For such a system to work it must evolve along empirical lines. The dangers of cutting a society to match a doctrinaire template are all too clear to-day. The principles, underlying such a social fabric, however, are crystal clear.

CONSCIENCE OF SOCIETY

The individual is prior to society, for without individuals there could be no society. But for the individual to develop his fullest potentialities he must learn to feel for his fellow man and co-operate with him willingly. Co-operate not under threat of violence or economic pressure, but eagerly, because he can see the value of co-operation and believes in it as much to benefit his workmate as himself.

It is the function of the anarchist, not to foment bloody revolution with its consequent misery and disintegration of society but to press for progressive reforms in a hundred different directions. Always the emphasis must be on tolerance, sympathy, and a genuine desire to help the rest of humanity to see its chains for what they are. You do not help your fellow man by blowing his brains out, nor do you bring the precision lathe any nearer by smashing the potter's wheel. Progress depends on some element in society keeping the ultimate, ideal in view so that changes tend for the better rather than the worse. This, then, is the function of the anarchist to-day—to be the conscience of society. It is a thankless task, for no one likes being told he is a bloody fool, least of all by an anarchist. Yet if the anarchist is sincere to his ideals this is the least he can do—and the most.

BOB GREEN.

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.

NORTH-EAST LONDON

DISCUSSION MEETINGS
IN EAST HAM
Alternate Wednesdays
at 7.30

OCT. 1—SOCIAL EVENING

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

BRADFORD

OPEN AIR MEETINGS:
(weather permitting)
BROADWAY CAR PARK
every Sunday at 8.30 p.m.

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.

Lessons of the Spanish Revolution - II

Continued from p. 2

Justice) declared: "Are we interested in winning the war? Then whatever may be the ideologies or the credos of the workers or the organisation to which they belong, to win they must use the methods used by the enemy, and especially, discipline and union. With discipline and efficient military organisation, we shall win without a doubt. Discipline for those who struggle at the front and at the work-bench, discipline in everything is the basis for triumph."

Six months at the Ministry of Justice had converted this courageous and popular exponent of direct action into an apologist for government and work camps for political prisoners. At a public meeting addressed by him in Valencia on May 30, 1937, shortly after the fall of the Caballero Government and the dismissal of the C.N.T. Ministers, he gave an account of his activities in the Government.* It was a two and a half hour bolstering of Garcia Oliver, the value of legislation and the great potentialities of Government. In his opening remarks he said that the title of his speech could well have been "From the factory in Barcelona to the Ministry of Justice. That is, from a worker of the Textile Syndicate of Barcelona to the structuralising of a new Spain." Later he repeated the fact of his origin as a worker, adding: "But should anyone have any doubts about it, or should ignore it, the Minister of Justice, though a worker, was Garcia Oliver." And a few sentences later: "And I was the Minister of Justice, Garcia Oliver," modestly adding, "But do not believe that I did everything..." What is particularly significant in Garcia Oliver's speech is that not only does he display no embarrassment in expounding the Decree Laws drafted by him which included long prison sentences for those found guilty under them, or his proposals for the reform of the penal system, but he also demonstrates quite clearly the deep influence exerted on him by governmentalism, and his belief that the nature of governments is transformed when it includes representation of the C.N.T.—an argument which can only ultimately lead to the position where one will advocate, in common with the Socialists and reformists, that once Parliament consists of Anarchists, we will have anarchism!

"I wish to believe—declared Oliver—by interpreting the ordering of economy, that there are things which must be collectivised because they can be collectivised; that

there are things which must be municipalised because they cannot be collectivised from the point of view of economic efficiency or return; that there are things which must be nationalised, because in the economic circumstances of the moment, transitory or permanent, they can be neither collectivised nor municipalised. I wish to believe that there are things which must still be left to the free exploitation of the small proprietors and small industrialists. All the problems existing can, with a good government of people who work, of people who do not travel too much, of people who spend less time in politics and who solve the problems and who organise the work to be done, can and must find a solution."

Of the four C.N.T.-F.A.I. Ministers in the Central Government, only Federica Montseny has publicly "recanted" though, as one of the "orators" of the movement, one cannot be sure to what extent this is motivated by reasons other than those of principles. In a letter to Juan Lopez, written shortly after the "liberation" of France,† she expressed the view that the question of political collaboration or abstention was neither the only nor the most important that had to be discussed. "The problem is to make of the C.N.T. and the libertarian movement an organised and conscious force, with a definite 'line', with a programme of things to be carried out immediately and with a clear vision of the tomorrow and its possibilities both in Spain and outside... Perhaps we are not in agreement on all points, but I am sure we will agree on a fundamental question: in the necessity of preparing ourselves for the return to Spain with a moral equipment quite different to the one that existed in 1936. Experience must be of some use to us as well as the lessons to be drawn from events. And the C.N.T. must be really solid, massive, organised under a firm direction with discipline and realistic objectives, without for this reason losing sight of all our final objectives (notre ideal), if we are not to lose to the others [the political parties]..."

Juan Lopez, who rightly, we think, draws attention to the "authoritarian spirit" of this letter, has himself remained a supporter of collaboration. He welcomed the entry of a representative of the C.N.T. in the Spanish government in Exile (headed by Giral); supports collaboration with all the political parties opposed to Franco, with the exception of the Communists, and the necessity for a "realistic" policy by the C.N.T., including

participation in the government of the country. In his favour, it should be pointed out that Juan Lopez does not call himself an anarchist; he is a syndicalist who believes in politics and "revolutionary" governments. As we have earlier pointed out we cannot square his criticism of the "dictatorship" of the F.A.I. in the C.N.T., preventing real democracy and control by the syndicates, with his support of the "evolution" of the C.N.T. to governmentalism. He is surely not suggesting that governments can be controlled by the governed. We feel that by advocating the creation of what is in effect an Executive Council of the C.N.T. which will be responsible to the Government, and not to the organisation, Lopez shares that "authoritarian spirit" with Federica Montseny, the late Juan Peiró (another unrepentant political collaborator) and Garcia Oliver (now in the political wilderness advocating an Anarchist Party). And these are not the only ravages wreaked by power in the ranks of the revolutionary movement. It has had its effect on many a tuppenny-ha-penny councillor, factory manager, and ersatz editor. To what extent they will determine the future policy of the C.N.T. we do not profess to know. Perhaps the social experiment and achievements of the Spanish workers and peasants during 1936-39 have taught them the value of doing things for themselves without governments and "influential leaders". In which case the politicians and demagogues are going to have a hard struggle to mould the C.N.T.-F.A.I. to their will.

(To be continued)

* Juan Garcia Oliver. *Mi Gestion al Frente del Ministerio de Justicia* (Ediciones C.N.T., Valencia 1937). Extracts are quoted by Peirats, Vol. 2, but he unfortunately omits those remarks which from a psycho-pathological point of view are the most interesting.

† Quoted by Juan Lopez in "Los Principios Libertarios ante la Política Española" (*Material de Discusión*, Brighton, February 15, 1946).

CORRECTION

In last week's article, "Lessons of the Spanish Revolution—10," the first two sentences of the last but one paragraph should read:

"It is true the leaders could boast that the C.N.T.-F.A.I. alone among the organisations held many Plenums during this period at which the policies of the Confederation were discussed. But in reality these Plenums were no more representatives of the views of the rank and file than a House of Commons debate represents the considered views of the electorate."

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