

In this Issue:

- A Study of Strikes - - p. 2
- The Press & the People p. 3
- Trends in Social Psychology - p. 3

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"It is impossible to legislate for the future. All we can do is to vaguely guess its essential tendencies and clear the road for it,"
—KROPOTKIN
(Modern Science & Anarchism)

Vol. 13, No. 44

November 1st, 1952

Threepence

FLOGGING

ONCE again the question of flogging is occupying prominent space in the newspapers in response to an apparent increase in crimes of violence. It will clearly be many years before humaner judgment and the extinction of the idea of vengeance on a criminal will cease to flourish in our society. No doubt it seems simple enough to apply brutal punishment to brutal crimes. To people brought up on the religious idea of sin and its atonement, on the conception of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, such logic seems sound enough. It may be true that some religious teachers struggle to impress a higher morality, but they are all too few—how rare it is to find churchmen in advanced progressive movements!—and they have to struggle against the body of Old Testament teaching. Such a religious background gives sanction to the expression of repulsively vindictive ideas and makes them respectable to their bearers.

Cadogan Committee's Findings

The idea that flogging was an efficient method of reducing crimes of violence by its deterrent effect was exhaustively examined by a governmental enquiry, the Cadogan Committee, in 1938. A leading article in the *Times* of October 22, summarizes their findings:

"This claim was subjected by the Cadogan Committee to close statistical analysis, and in each separate instance the argument failed to stand up to the test. The Committee reached two main conclusions. Among men convicted of crimes for which they could suffer corporal punishment, the subsequent record of those actually flogged was neither better nor worse than that of those merely imprisoned, so far as the repetition of that class of crime was concerned; their record for crime was decidedly worse. As regards the supposed deterrent effect on men hitherto un-

convicted, the flogging campaigns were never followed by a significant fall in the statistics of crimes of the relevant class. Sometimes there was a slight rise."

Other voices have been raised against the clamour of the floggers (led, as we have come to expect, by Lord Goddard, Lord Chief Justice), and have pointed out that a man who has been flogged is apt to be admired by his fellow criminals and so received encouragement as well as further brutalisation from this form of punishment. It is also plain that where brutal crimes are committed out of a psychopathological hatred of society—represented by the victim, especially if elderly—such a hatred can only be nourished by a returning brutality on the part of society.

All these are obvious points. Yet it is obvious also that they are of little validity to those who are determined to make punishment an expression of vengeance. It has repeatedly been stated in this country that the purpose of punishment is preventative, deterrent and reformatory, but not retributive. Yet most judges interpret their office as the exacting of vengeance by society.

Newspapers' Role

How little the Cadogan Committee's findings, or a higher and humaner outlook mean to the average newspaper is shown by the *News of the World* (not by any means the most reactionary paper for all its curious position in Sunday journalism), which begins an article advocating flogging in this com-

pletely question-begging way.

"A very simple, fundamental question was posed in the editorial column of this newspaper last week. Do YOU, we asked, prefer the rule of the cash to the corrective of corporal punishment?"

The Cadogan Committee's evidence is of little appeal to editors who, in the teeth of evidence, speak of corporal punishment as "corrective".

We have noted before the rôle of newspapers in whipping up rather discreditable emotions (disguised, as usual, under virtuous indignation) rather than leading public opinion by stressing the evidence and a considered judgment. We have also drawn attention to the significance of these "respectable" outbursts of hardly concealed sadism, and there is little need to go into them now.

A Higher Morality

Paradoxically, on the question of flogging, the Government has adopted a more progressive and advanced position than public opinion, or the judges—for as the Lord Chancellor remarked in the House of Lords last week, judges have not always been the best judges of this sort of question.

In this article we have drawn attention to the evidence against the efficacy of flogging. But we must stress that the anarchist attitude, as of any higher morality, is independent of the question of efficacy. We are opposed to flogging, as to capital punishment, because it is in itself plainly wrong, and brutalises those who inflict it, whether the prison officers directly concerned or society which is vicariously responsible. These outmoded brutalities must be condemned not because they are ineffective but because they are wrong and degrading.

KENYA: The Basic Question

POLICE rule, backed by army and naval units, is now the chosen method of administration in Kenya since the onset of the "disturbances". Newspapers have been suspended, and representatives of African aspirations everywhere arrested. It is of little value for government spokesmen to claim that these steps are necessary: they are always reactionary and tyrannical, and the necessity for them only argues the failure of the administration to deal with local problems in the past.

Long-felt Discontents

The discontents of the large African population of Kenya have been expressed by their own spokesmen for many years and have been well known to students of colonial imperialism. But they have also been brought to the notice of the administration by government officials and enquiries and reports. Here is an editorial writer in the *Observer* (26/10/52):

"Land hunger is to the African what unemployment is to the European. Six years ago an official report on conditions in the Kiambu district of the Kikuyu Reserve said that 40 per cent. of its population were landless, and gave warning that some 90,000 persons in Kiambu 'might become without means of support within a short time, something which cannot be faced with equanimity'. Again, the 1951 annual report of the Kenya African Affairs Department, said of the Kikuyu: 'It is necessary to protect the loyal majority from being exploited through their genuinely-felt grievances over land'. These warnings, from unimpeachable sources, were not acted upon."

There can be no doubt that the present situation could be seen coming. That it has arrived in such violence and turmoil in itself absolutely condemns the white administration.

We have quoted the *Observer* in

order to show that even moderate opinion in this country can see the main issues and draws conclusions from them not very different from our own. In other words, the attitude of FREEDOM on the events in Kenya is not an extravagantly extreme one, but is based on facts which are recognised in reformist quarters.

Causes of Unrest

With the same object in mind, let us quote the *Observer* again on the question of the causes of this present unrest. "The Kenya fire," the editorial declares, "draws its fuel from three sources: land-hunger, the growth of a slum living and often workless African proletariat in the towns and the 'colour-bar'."

Not merely the *Observer* but all informed commentators on Kenya have pointed to these questions before. But when they are stated thus starkly, it begins to become apparent why nothing was done about them: for to deal with such problems requires that the whole principles of imperialism be cut through and jettisoned.

Land hunger requires a basic revolution in the property holding system. But it is also said that there is not, in Kenya, enough land to go round even if it were distributed. "The problem is one for the East African High Commission, which should be empowered to give Africans the means to move from Kenya into much less crowded territories, especially Tanganyika." (The *Observer*.)

The question of a town proletariat is linked with that of the landless peasantry. Just as the

Continued on p. 4

"Peaceful Anarchist" Fined 5/-

AS reported in last week's FREEDOM, Philip Sansom, one of the speakers of the London Anarchist Group, appeared last Monday at Gt. Marlborough Street Magistrate's Court on charges of wilfully obstructing the roadway and the pathway, and obstructing a police constable in the course of his duty.

The laws about obstruction in London are such that it is practically impossible to get off on a charge. If one stands still on a pavement, one is—legally—causing obstruction, and the mere setting up of a platform in the street, without actually holding a meeting, constitutes obstruction. Meetings are allowed to be held by the grace of the police and the right of public assembly applies only as long as the police decide not to bring charges of obstruction.

However, the police themselves operate strictly according to the regulations governing their procedure, and one is not obstructing a police officer if in fact he is not proceeding according to those regulations.

Comrade Sansom was able to argue, and bring witnesses to prove, that the constable who charged him had not given him warning that he was liable to be charged, and had in fact acted in an excited and arrogant fashion. He was therefore acquitted on the second charge—of obstructing the police. On the first charge he was fined the

purely nominal sum of five shillings! This can only be regarded as the nearest possible to a complete victory, the obstruction laws being what they are.

The policeman in his evidence had wildly exaggerated the number of people present at the meeting at the time he arrived. He said that pedestrians were being forced out into Charing Cross Road to get past the crowd in Manette Street (which is practically a cul-de-sac off Charing Cross Road) and that he saw several cars trying to get into Manette Street but not being able to, owing to the crowd.

Our comrade's witnesses, John Bishop, Rita Milton and R. Murray-Edghill, of the London Anarchist Group, and one independent witness, all gave their evidence firmly and well, and were able to testify that at the time the policeman arrived the crowd numbered not more than a dozen, that no pedestrians had been inconvenienced and no drivers frustrated in their attempts to enter the street.

The hearing last Monday had been adjourned from the previous week, and the comrades concerned had wondered whether the magistrate, Mr. Paul Bennett, would use the intervening week to read up on anarchism. This rather seemed to be the case, for he appeared better informed at the second hearing, questioning comrade Sansom on the anarchist attitude to law and order, to which Sansom replied that anarchists were not opposed to order but were opposed to law. Mr. Bennett also mentioned (of course!) the bomb-throwing of the past, but Sansom pointed out that he was not being charged with throwing bombs. He agreed with Mr. Bennett that he was a peaceful anarchist!

Philip Sansom conducted his own defence and handled well all his own witnesses and the policeman, who could not think of a single question to ask any of the witnesses although their evidence gave the direct lie to what he had said! The members of the group declined to take the oath on entering the witness-box, but instead read the secular affirmation.

There were several policemen in the Court, smiling broadly at the magistrate's little jokes about anarchists, peaceful and otherwise, but the smiles were quickly wiped off their faces when Mr. Bennett gave his decision.

Incidentally, the group held a bumper meeting at Manette Street the week after the arrest; there was no obstruction and it was perfectly orderly—without a single policeman in sight.

Meetings will continue there as long as it is possible.

NOTICE

INDOOR MEETINGS
CHANGE OF TIME AND PLACE

The present series of indoor discussion-lectures will continue at the premises of the British Drama League, 9 Fitzroy Square, London, W.1 (off Warren Street, Tottenham Court Road).

The meetings will be held on TUESDAYS at 7.30 p.m.

First meetings:
TUES., NOV. 3—Albarracín on
A DOCKER MAKES A SURVEY
TUES., NOV. 11—S. E. Parker on
ANARCHISTS & ASSASSINS

ENGINEERING WORKERS An Insulting Pay Offer

THE engineers have now an opportunity to reap the benefit of their union leaders' efforts on their behalf. Strangely enough, they do not seem particularly grateful for what those leaders have done, for the pay offer the employers have finally, grudgingly, made the unions is of twopence an hour—7s. 4d. per week!

Our previous guess, therefore, that the employers would offer 7s. 6d. was not far out—in fact, the shipbuilding employers have offered the extra 2d. It would seem, however, that the employers are a long way out if they imagine the workers are prepared to accept what they regard as an "insulting" offer.

The difficulty in the negotiations is that the spokesmen of the workers are not themselves affected by the increases for which they—allegedly—argue. The union leaders are not paid the same wages as the men they are supposed to represent—they are paid much more. Not for them, then, the feeling of urgency which the worker feels when the cost of living is continually pushing at his pocket. Not for them the personal interest in getting a substantial increase on the basic engineering wage.

For them, sitting around a conference table in a board room, with the cigarettes circulating it is far more a matter for them to point out to the employers that they've got to keep the workers quiet somehow. And the union bosses and the capitalist bosses try to strike a bargain on how little will keep the

workers quiet.

But the rank and file among the engineers are not so easily kept quiet. They have been waiting now for five months—since last May—for an increase that will really mean some noticeable improvement in their conditions. Small wonder if they are beginning to get restive.

And they have now smelt blood. It was not lost on the workers that it was at no time the masterly pleading of their leaders that shifted the employers from their obstinate stand of making no offer at all, but purely and simply the threat of direct action in the form of the proposed ban on overtime and piecework.

This ban was due to start on Oct. 20, but was called off when the employers showed signs of giving way. It is likely to be called on again very soon, however, if the employers do not give way considerably further.

Last week, the district officials of the Amalgamated Engineering Union in London, Birmingham and Manchester (three of the A.E.U.'s most important districts) have expressed their determination to press for an immediate application of the ban. The executives of the 38 unions in the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions are meeting in London on 30th October to discuss their reaction to the employers' offer. Their decisions can only be awaited with interest.

A STUDY OF STRIKES

STRIKES: A Study in Industrial Conflict, by K. G. J. C. Knowles. (Blackwell, 42s.)

PROSPECTIVE readers attracted by the title of this volume—none will be attracted by its price!—will be disappointed if they expect to find therein graphic descriptions of the workers' struggle in its most dramatic form. The book is a monograph issued under the auspices of the Oxford University Institute of Statistics and is, in fact, a painstaking survey and statistical analysis of British strikes mainly in the period 1911 to 1947. Parts of it make tough reading and a good deal of the analytical section will be understood only by those versed in the use of statistical techniques. Nevertheless, it would be a pity if anarcho-syndicalists dismissed it as simply an expensive attempt to justify the misguided labours of an academic "theoretician"; the work of a man who, safely ensconced in the ivory tower of Oxford, can afford to play about with the impersonal statistics of events which often spell misery, hardship and self-sacrifice for the workers involved in them. There is a lot of nonsense talked about strikes and it is not only confined to the columns of the capitalist press. If some of our comrades still harbour romantic notions of the strike as the pitched battle between the heroic armies of the proletariat and the dastardly armies of the capitalists, a reading of this book will have a salutary effect.

The first part of the book, which deals with the nature of strikes, the legal and other restrictions on them and the general influences affecting industrial militancy, is likely to prove of most interest to the non-academic reader. The general picture which emerges from the survey of this period (1911-47) is well known to the syndicalist, who, indeed, has been among the first to point it out. "Strikes, to-day," says Knowles, "are very different from what they were 25 years ago. Yesterday they were battles; to-day, few of them are more than protest demonstrations." The tightening of trade union discipline has tended to restrict the length and size of strikes at the cost of an increase in the number of strikes and particularly in the number of unofficial strikes. It is in discussing the reasons for the tendency of trade unions to restrict the use of what was once considered to be their chief weapon

RESISTANCE TO EDUCATIONAL REFORMS

IN a lecture last week, Mr. A. S. Harrison, of the University of London Institute of Education, discussed the "sales resistance" of many teachers to the reform of the curricula and methods of teaching in schools.

Reforms had percolated through during the last 50 years, he said, but basically the pattern of teaching was still the same. Conservatism was partly responsible. Teachers were crippled by "administrative arthritis". For example, when the junior schools had been about to follow the kindergartens in reforming their curricula they had been stopped by the introduction of the "selection at 11-plus" examination, which they considered left them no time for trying new ways.

Educational reformers, Mr. Harrison thought, were also to blame. They had tried to reform the curriculum piecemeal. Instead of replanning the whole they had devised means of overcoming individual weakness, and had then sought, not always successfully, to fit these into the old pattern.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

Men and Gods Rex Warner 2/-

Thirty-two of the most famous and most beautiful of the Greek myths retold from Ovid.

The World Scene from the Libertarian Point of View 2/6

Among the authors of the twenty essays in this collection are M. P. T. Acharya, Gaston Leval, Albert Meltzer, George Woodcock and David Wieck.

The British Worker 2/6

Ferdinand Zweig A social and psychological study of the industrial worker at home, at work and at play.

Psychiatry To-day 2/6

David Stafford-Clark The problems of mental illness and abnormality, its causes, its treatment, its medical and social implications.

Obtainable from

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

that the author provides us with some pertinent observations. This is a period which sees the growth of great employers' organisations, the development of national conciliation, joint consultation and arbitration machinery, and the participation of the State in the control and management of industry. The effect of the latter is of the utmost importance. The functions of the State begin to overlap the traditional functions of the trade unions; the State becomes the greatest employer of labour; and the unions themselves acquire "something of a niche in the edifice of administration". The result is that "the strike, instead of being a conflict between two disputants regulated by a theoretically impartial State, is becoming more and more frequently a conflict between State and individual". Mr. Knowles is no syndicalist: he is a sound Fabian who thinks that "strikes are always regrettable but not always reprehensible". We appreciate all the more, therefore, this confirmation of the truth in the anarcho-syndicalist contention: the struggle of the worker to-day is and must be primarily directed against the State.

Other factors in the decline of industrial militancy which the author deals with at some length are the developments in trade unionism itself. Summarising this section, he states: "The Trade Union movement has been becoming more heterogeneous in composition and therefore, probably, less inclined to take mass strike action; the Union's friendly society functions have on the whole acted, as was originally argued, as a stabilising factor; the permanent trade union official, who has developed as a negotiator rather than a strike leader, has grown in authority; and the control of strikes—or at least the scale and duration of strikes—by the Union executive has become easier to exercise. The development of the T.U.C. as the general staff of the unions as a whole, and the shifting of the strategical field from that of mere wages and conditions to include

the most comprehensive political objectives, have, for the present at any rate, made massive and stubborn strikes obsolete. The resistant, militant elements in the unions, although they have always given life and enthusiasm to the movement, have proved less and less able to dominate it. Nor has it been much affected by the activities of outside bodies"—such as the Communists and the Catholics. With these facts, if not with the jejune judgment on the obsolescence of strikes, we can all agree. So, too, can we agree with the author in fixing the date of the General Strike

CLINGING TO THE TYRANT

BUT now I come to a point which is the secret and the source of domination, the support and the foundation of tyranny. Those who think that the halberds of the guard, the existence of the watchmen protect the tyrants, are very much mistaken in my opinion; I believe that the latter make use of them as a matter of form and for fear rather than that they should trust in them. The archers prevent the coming in of people who have no means of existence, and of those armed men who might perhaps undertake something. It can easily be proved that the Roman emperors a greater number have been killed by their guard than escaped danger by the assistance of their archers. It is not the horsemen, not the footmen, nor the force of arms that protects the tyrant; but, though it is scarcely credible at first sight, yet it is true, it is always four or five people who maintain the tyrant, four or five who render the country subject to his order. It was always five or six men who had the ear of the tyrant, and they came to him or were called by him to be the accomplices of his cruelties, the companions of his amusements, the mates of his voluptuousness and his comrades in plundering.

as marking the turning point in British trade unionism; or, as we would put it, the degeneration of British trade unionism. It was, he points out, the collapse of the General Strike more than anything else which accelerated "the change of heart" between employers and trade unions in industry as a whole. Since 1926 and especially since the downfall of the second Labour Government in 1951, official trade unionism—and here he is quoting G. D. H. Cole—"has endeavoured, not to challenge capitalism, but to make terms with it; and it has regarded as its worst enemies not the employers, but those trade unionists who have endeavoured to recall it to a more militant policy". And, incidentally, if

there are still some misguided readers who believe that the General Strike demonstrated the futility of syndicalism, we commend to them the statement of the General Council of the T.U.C. quoted on page 112: "The General Council does not challenge the Constitution. It is not seeking to substitute unconstitutional government. Nor is it desirous of undermining our Parliamentary institutions. The sole aim of the Council is to secure for the miners a decent standard of life . . ." As the author rightly observes elsewhere (p. 8), the General Strike was "not so much a revolutionary general strike as a peaceful demonstration of civil disobedience". Apart from its long-term effects, the inherent importance of the General Strike lies not so much in what it was as in what it might have become if only the rank-and-file workers had been prepared to act for themselves instead of putting their trust in men like Thomas, Dukes and Bevin—men who were only too scared that it was developing into a threat to the Constitution.

The book is concerned to state and to analyse the facts rather than to draw any general conclusions. It is only in the author's closing remarks that we find any hint of a theory of strikes. Commenting on the development of trade unionism from "irresponsible" independence of employers and Government to "responsible" dependence, he argues that, so long as political methods of achieving social and economic objectives remain open to the workers, strikes are not likely to return to official favour. Ceasing to be an instrument of trade union policy, they nevertheless, he thinks, fulfil the function of calling immediate attention to the weaknesses in the ever-more-complex machinery by which industry is regulated and, analysed statistically, provide a certain measure of these weaknesses and, more generally, of the distrust felt by rank-and-file workers of the system of regulation as a whole. In this, he concludes, is to be found the justification for permitting them to occur. Syndicalists are not likely to agree with this comfortable Fabian conclusion but it does serve to underline the need for a re-statement of the syndicalist theory of the strike in the light of the recent development of the managerial socialist society. It is not so obvious as we should like to think that, in the modern world, the anarcho-syndicalist objective—workers' control of industry—can be achieved mainly through the use of the strike and other allied weapons. In any future reformulation of our theory this empirical and statistical survey—the first of its kind to be published in Britain—will be of the utmost value.

I hope that enough has been said to convince the reader that this is an important book for all those interested in recent industrial history and in the workers' struggle for emancipation. It should, however, be added that it is liberally laced with quotations—many of them from syndicalist sources—which the propagandist will know how to use to good effect. G.N.O.

MARX AGAINST THE PEASANT

MARX AGAINST THE PEASANT, by David Mitrany. (Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 25s.)

THIS book can be recommended to all who are not well-acquainted with the peasant movements of this century, and for anarchists it is of special importance on account of the attitude of the peasant to his little farm and owing to the fact that the peasantry is—on a world scale—probably the biggest section of our modern society—or at least more numerous than the workers in industry.

The author introduces the reader to the struggles for existence of the European peasantry, and proves that the conceptions of Marxism are incompatible with the psychology, the aspirations and the economical basis of the peasants. Hence the enmity of the peasants for Marxism, and of the Marxists for the peasants.

Marx and the Marxists misjudged the economic basis of peasant life, blinded by their biased conception of economics, i.e., that all property would automatically concentrate in the course of time into relatively few hands, and that all artisans, peasants, etc., would have to give up their occupations and become wage-earners. This has come true to a certain extent in industry but in agriculture the prediction of Marx has turned out to be contradicted by the facts: the peasants refuse to die the economical death predicted by Marx. They are well able to compete on the markets with the agricultural products of big farms and land-estates in price as well as quality.

The reasons for the abilities of the peasant are his organisation of his work and his view of life, i.e., his view of his farm, because the peasant's life is his farm. He works his 5 to 15 acre farm with his family in a sort of family co-operative, and tries to make the best he can of his farm for himself and his family. He takes good care of the soil and the crops so that on the average he raises more on an acre than the big

neighbouring farms with their agricultural machinery, though of course that often means long hours of work for him. His farm is to him not a simple piece of property, but, in the first place a safeguard for his existence and independence, and insurance for old age and sickness, a sure provider for everything he needs; in short, a precious possession, sometimes more precious to him than his own family. He would consider the loss of his farm as the worst calamity which could befall him, and would fight any system which would endanger his property rights. And he would wholeheartedly support a system which helped him to get land, because the peasants are always land-hungry, and their continual aspiration is to get more land.

The aspirations and the attitude of the peasants to their property has shaped the history of several countries in this century. The Russian peasants supported the Bolsheviks because they gave them the land of the divided feudal estates. Later, they were expropriated and enslaved on their own soil. The same occurred in China, and the same ultimate fate awaits the Chinese peasants. Without the support of the peasants, Hitler and Mussolini would not have come to power: the peasants were scared that the Marxists would expropriate them, so they sought the protection of these dictators. The list could be continued. Every reactionary movement could draw help from the peasantry whenever it was

JOURNAL OF SEX EDUCATION

THE September-October issue of the *Journal of Sex Education* (Vol. 5, No. 1), 2/6, contains tributes to the Journal's late editor, Norman Haire and an account of his life and work for sexual enlightenment.

There is also a note on the future of the Journal, which had been financed, edited and published by Dr. Haire personally.

The remaining contents of this issue include the text of a talk by J. C. Flugel on "Sublimation," a further instalment of René Guyon's "Sex Offences in the Future Penal Code," an article on "Homosexuality: Active and Passive" by D. W. Cory, "Some Notes on Nudism" by A. M. Poznanski, an article on "The Right of Abortion" by Stella Browne, and Hans Lehfeldt's "New York Letter." There are also the usual questions and answers, book reviews and correspondence.

The *Journal of Sex Education* can be obtained from Freedom Bookshop for 2/9, including postage.

These six do the work so well for their principal, that in the eye of the world he is the evil-doer not only of his own wicked deeds, but also of theirs. These six have six hundred, who profit under them, and these six hundred do what the six do for the tyrant. These six hundred are the masters of six thousand, whom they have trained in such a way that they are able to govern the provinces or to manage the financial matters on the understanding that they attend closely to their cupidity and cruelty, and that they put these into practice whenever it be thought necessary; and that, for the rest, they commit so many wrongs that they cannot remain in office but under the protection of their masters and cannot withdraw from the laws and from punishment but by their assistance. The consequences are very considerable. And if anyone should like to unwind the thread, he would find out that not the six thousand but hundreds of thousands, millions of people cling to the tyrant by means of this thread, helping one another, just as in Homer, Jupiter boasts of his power to draw all the gods towards him by pulling one string.

—DE LA BOETIE: *Voluntary Slavery* (16th Cent.)

in danger, provided that it could inculcate in them the idea that their property was in danger.

This book is less important for its account of the historical fights between Marxism and the peasants than for the problems it poses for anarchism, i.e., the attitude of anarchism towards the attitude of the peasants to their property. It can therefore be recommended to every anarchist who is concerned with practical steps towards social revolution.

WILLY FRITZENKOTTER.

[We hope to publish shortly a further study of this important book, by a student of Eastern Europe.—EDITOR.]

Magistrates Reject Re-introduction of Flogging

AT the annual meeting in London yesterday of the Magistrates' Association, a resolution favouring the re-introduction of corporal punishment was defeated. It advocated the repeal of Section 2 of the Criminal Justice Act, 1948, which abolished the power of courts to impose a sentence of whipping. An amendment stated that the association, while regarding with concern the prevalence of crimes of violence and supporting the view that such crimes demanded severity of punishment, noted that particular crimes for which corporal punishment could previously be imposed had decreased since its abolition, and recommended that the association should not be prepared at this time to lend support to its re-introduction. The voting was 166 for the resolution and 219 for the amendment.

Mr. T. F. Marron (Eccles), who moved the resolution, said the menace of crimes of violence was growing and the courts were now unable to deal adequately with it. A high proportion of crimes involved brutality and the public were entitled to protection.

"Retrograde Step"

Mr. W. Provost (Birmingham), seconding, said that the abolition of corporal punishment was one of the most retrograde steps ever taken in the annals of British justice. He did not believe that hardened criminals cared "two hoots" about corrective training of five years in prison.

Mr. W. W. Llewellyn (Warcham), who moved the amendment, said he had been a house master and governor of Borstal institutions for 27 years. He believed that a great many of the crimes of the

sort they were considering were caused by the desire of young offenders to "look big" in the opinion of their fellows. What could give a lad higher standing than to be able to say he had been birched? The prestige of a man in prison who had been flogged was very great. It was his contention that to reintroduce corporal punishment would not prevent crime but increase it.

Not a Deterrent

Alderman George Hale (Burnley), seconding the amendment, said brutality could not be cured by brutal methods.

Mr. C. Royle, M.P., said the adoption of the resolution would be a retrograde step. The 1948 Act was an experiment and had not had the opportunity of a full test. It would be many years before it could be properly proved. The suggestion contained in the resolution was a barbarous one; it would mean a reversion to the policy of "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth".

The State should never reply to barbarous behaviour with barbarous legal practices. An addict of violent action could not be cured by his being given a demonstration of violence. The aim of the law in modern times was deterrence and reformation rather than punishment. Suffering would not reform. It created a desire for revenge on society in the mind of the criminal and therefore could not be a deterrent.

Mr. John Watson spoke of the experience of juvenile courts when boys had been ordered to be birched. He thought there would be a good case for birching if it prevented boys from becoming criminals. In point of fact it did not have that effect.

THE PRESS AND THE PEOPLE

MR. Aneurin Bevan has recently renewed his contemptuous criticism of the British Press—not, in our opinion, without cause. The way in which the Conservative papers, especially the Beaverbrook press, have sought to exploit the Bevanite controversy for party purposes has shed much more light on the papers concerned than on the particular case. For in it can be seen that attitude, almost universal among newspapers the world over, which regards the news not as facts of proved veracity, but as material to be manipulated to serve a particular end. The fact that readers are misled and the cause of truth not served at all is plainly of little consequence to such papers.

When statesmen address the press, or representative journalists speak at public functions, they represent the newspapers' duty as informing public opinion, and draw derivative contrasts with the totalitarian press whose purpose, they rightly say, is the moulding of public opinion to suit an official political line. In practice, however, the press in the western world shows no kind of sincere adherence to a duty of informing the public about facts, about truth.

Presenting the facts is one thing; but another aspect of any paper's activity is comment on news and current events. Here again "the duties of the Press" as expounded on official occasions is a very different thing from the daily practice. Few instruments could exert a more powerful influence for progress than a national daily paper. Yet how rare in history does one find a progressive cause taken up and materially assisted by the press? Instead of wise and informed counsel, one finds a pandering to the lowest denominator of public opinion.

The question of flogging will serve as an illustration. It is obvious that liberal progress, which has seen the abolition (in this country) of torture, of public execution, of slavery, will eventually, if permitted to proceed, secure the abolition of flogging. Yet with almost no exceptions, the penny press has played up the sadism, the vindictiveness, the very lowest emotions involved, in an attempt to get flogging restored to the statute book.

It seems that public opinion is overwhelmingly in favour of the cat and the birch. Yet how is one to assess such "a public opinion" when the press which should be presenting facts and profound arguments, merely seeks to inflame emotions and play on repressed sadistic tendencies? The *News of the World* makes great play of the fact that their correspondents on the subject favour flogging by 50 to 1. But when we see the totalitarian press abroad "creating" public opinion and the government then "accepting the verdict of the people" we can only feel disgust and revulsion. The whole art of demagoguery consists not in serving the real wishes of the people (about the things that matter to them, in their daily lives) but in making it appear that the government is the servant of "the people" and simply carries out their wishes.

Now anarchists believe that people in general are the best judges of their needs and are quite capable of running their own lives. But this does not mean that they accept the rule of the majority, still less that the majority is, of necessity, right. Even if we disregard the effect

The Revolutionary Significance of the May Days

[In last week's instalment we dealt with the government provocations which resulted in the Barcelona "May Days", the attitude of the Communists to this struggle which cost the lives of more than five hundred workers, and finally we referred to documents which indicated that the "May Days" were part of a plan by the Catalan separatist movement to eliminate the revolutionary elements in Catalonia and, with the aid of foreign powers, to establish a Catalan State. Though the National Committee of the C.N.T.-F.A.I. did not implicate the Communists as being equally responsible in the conspiracy, and though their objectives might not have been those of the Separatists, the fact remains that they were on the same side of the barricades.]

★
WHETHER or not the May Days were part of a carefully prepared plan does not seem to have been established with documentary evidence. In his book, *I Was Stalin's Agent*, General Krivitsky maintains that he was aware of the approaching May Days. Reports he saw, in Moscow at the time,

"... made it clear that the O.G.P.U. was plotting to crush the 'uncontrollable' elements in Barcelona and seize control for Stalin. . . . The fact is that in Catalonia the great majority of the workers were fiercely anti-Stalinist. Stalin knew that a show-down was inevitable, but he also knew that the opposition forces were badly divided and could be crushed by swift, bold action. The O.G.P.U. fanned the flames and provoked syndicalists, anarchists and socialists against one another."

Krivitsky also states that Negrin had already been selected by Moscow as Caballero's successor some months earlier, and that one further purpose the May Days were to serve was to provoke a crisis in the Caballero government and force the "Spanish Lenin" to resign. All the may be true, but no palpable evidence is brought forward, for instance, by Peirats* who supports this view but limits himself to lengthy quotations from Krivitsky. If then, the attack on the Telephone Exchange was to be the signal for the Communists and their allies to attempt the armed liquidation of the revolutionary movement in Barcelona, it seems to have grossly misfired. Rodriguez Salas and his men arrived there at 3 p.m. on May 3rd. The attack was halted, and in Peirats' words: "... the cry of alarm by the besieged workers was answered by the workers in the suburbs and their energetic intervention initiated the bloody struggle at strong points and at the barricades." Souchy†

* J. Peirats: *La C.N.T. en la Revolución Española*, Vol. 2 (Toulouse, 1952).
† Augustin Souchy: *The Tragic Week in May*, English Edition (Barcelona, 1937).

in his detailed account of the struggle points out that negotiations were opened between the C.N.T. and the Government, and lasted until six o'clock on the morning of May 4th, adding: "Toward morning the workers began building barricades in the outer districts of the city. There was no fighting during this first night but the general tension increased." Only when the Palace of Justice was occupied by the police did the fighting begin, and even then negotiations were proceeding between the C.N.T. Regional Committee and the government.

The government refused to accede to the C.N.T. demands that the police be withdrawn and that Salas and the Minister, Aiguadé, be dismissed, nor would it negotiate until the streets were cleared of the armed workers. This was obviously a critical moment for Companys and the politicians. By acceding to the revolutionary workers they would be admitting that when it came to the point their power was based on a myth and that the armed workers were as strong, and the government as weak, as on that memorable July 19th, when Franco's carefully prepared *putsch* met more than its equal in the badly armed workers of Barcelona. It would mean that all these months of intrigue, of political sleight of hand, of manoeuvring could be undone in one day. There was only one course open to the government: no compromise with the revolutionary workers.

Their task was made all the easier, and their final success ensured, by the co-operation of the leaders of the workers' organisations, whose rôle throughout the struggle was a conciliatory one. Once the government refused to negotiate, they appealed to the workers to lay down their arms using in the process the all too familiar jargon of the politicians—what will the boys at the front think, or, such action only helps Franco, etc. Meanwhile, the government resigned, and a provisional one composed of one member from each party and organisation previously represented in it was formed (in this way it was possible to drop Salas and Aiguadé without any loss of face). By that time a delegation had arrived from Valencia, composed of the Secretary of the National Committee of the C.N.T., Mariano Vázquez, and the "anarchist" Minister of Justice, Garcia Oliver. They were later joined by the "anarchist" Minister of Health, Federica Montseny. Also from Valencia came members of the Executive Committee of the U.G.T. Their efforts were directed at pacification at all costs—at least so far as the C.N.T. leaders were concerned. And this attitude was certainly not based on a situation of inferiority at the barricades. According to Souchy, reports came in on the second day from all

parts of Barcelona and from the provinces of Catalonia to the effect that:

"... the overwhelming majority of the population were with the C.N.T., and that most towns and villages were in the hands of our organisations. It would have been easy to attack the centre of the city, had the responsible committee so decided. They only had to appeal to the defence committees of the outlying districts. But the Regional Committee of the C.N.T. was opposed to it. Every proposal of attack was unanimously rejected, including the F.A.I."

The attitude of the C.N.T.-F.A.I. leaders was that the enemies of the revolutionary workers had wanted this struggle as an excuse to liquidate them, and that they should therefore refuse to play the enemy's game. On the other hand, there were a large number of militants who took the view that the C.N.T.-F.A.I. had been playing the government's game too long, at the expense of the social revolution and the struggle against Franco, and that what was now happening in Barcelona was a "show-down". Souchy—who adopted the "leaders" position—admits in his account that "perhaps at some other time, this assault upon the Telephone Building might not have had such consequences. But the accumulation of political conflicts during the past few months had made the atmosphere tense. It was impossible to stem the indignation of the masses" (our italics). Peirats also refers to the fact that the workers of the C.N.T. could not carry out the often repeated appeals by the leaders for an "armistice", for "serenity" for "a cease fire". "Discontent among them was increasing. An important section of opinion began to express its opposition to the attitude of the Committees. At the head of this extremist current were 'The Friends of Durruti' (*Los Amigos de Durruti*). This grouping was based on elements who were hostile to militarisation, many of whom had left the units of the newly-formed Popular Army when the voluntary militias were dissolved." Their organ of expression, *El Amigo del Pueblo* (The Friend of the People), conducted a campaign against the Confederal (C.N.T.) ministers and Committees and advocated a continuation of the revolutionary struggle started on July 19th, 1936. The Confederal Committees immediately repudiated the "Friends of Durruti". "In spite of this, they did not disappear," comments Peirats somewhat cryptically. It is to be especially regretted therefore, that to this "important section of opinion" the historiographer of the C.N.T. devotes but 18 lines.

Continued on p. 4

Is it "human nature" or a sick society?

TRENDS IN SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

DO you change society by changing the individual or do you change the individual by changing society? Further thoughts on this perennial question are offered by a recent survey by the *Times* of modern trends in psychological thought. After discussing the various schools of thought among Freud's disciples, the article turns to the "Cultural" school within the psychoanalytic school influenced by field anthropologists and the "Behaviourist" school in academic (i.e., non-Freudian) psychology. Of the Cultural school, the survey writes: "As far back as the 1930s, Bronislaw Malinowski, on the basis of his own researches and field work in the Trobriand Islands, had suggested that some, at any rate, of Freud's observations, might prove to be artefacts of western European culture rather than universally applicable truths about human nature. In other words, it was alleged that Freud, generalising from his own experience and times, had wrongly attributed to 'human nature' many features which were simply characteristic of the patriarchal middle-class society of western Europe in the 1890s.

of the press in moulding public opinion, and suppose that a vast majority of the people of this country favour flogging that does not make flogging right. It still remains a barbarous, shameful procedure, and no amount of majority support can alter that.

It is of the greatest possible importance that individuals should retain the desire and the ability to proclaim the truth and struggle towards progress, whatever the majority think. And anarchists will do well to remember this not only in a world which pays so much lip service to the "voice of the people", but still more in a time of revolution when the glorification of the people can only too readily stifle the ideals of the social revolution itself. At such times, as always, the proper function of the press is the pursuit of truth and devotion to ideals of human progress.

"Furthermore, while Freud, with his individualist and biological orientation, had believed that man was dominated to a considerable extent by his instincts, was innately aggressive and basically at odds with the civilisation he had created, the Cultural school emphasized the importance of learning and cultural training. Miss Clara Thompson, in a recent book, *Psychoanalysis: Evolution and Development*, summarises the basic thesis of the Cultural school as follows:

"Man's lust for power and his yearning for submission . . . are not basic biological needs but attitudes developed out of the raw material of human nature by a specific culture. When predominating trends in the culture are destructive, the individual in it becomes frustrated and also destructive of himself and others. So man's most compelling problems have to do with needs his society has created in him. These, not sex or aggression as such, create his greatest difficulties."

★
Turning to the Behaviourists, the survey continues:

"Whereas the orthodox Freudian view has always been that personality was a creation of the first five years of life, the modern tendency is to assert that, although certain attitudes developed during these years tend to persist, adult behaviour is to a large extent influenced by the groups within which the individual has to function and the social rôles he has to play. Even his nuclear personality, however, the relatively stable aspect of the mind developed during the first five years of life, is a creation of his culture as it has reached

C.B.C.O.

THE 13th Annual Report of the Central Board for Conscientious Objectors, just issued, gives statistical and personal information about conscientious objectors to military service for the year ended 31st March, 1952.

A sign of the times in the report is the sentence, "We have . . . thought it right to approach the West German Government in anticipation of the re-introduction of military service there, with the suggestion that they should draw on the experience of this country in its handling of conscientious objectors."

The report costs sixpence and is obtainable from the C.B.C.O., 6 Endsleigh St., London, W.C.1.

him through the mediation of his 'parents. It is bluntly stated that 'personality is the subjective aspect of culture,' or, in the words of G. H. Mead, that 'it is absurd to look at the mind simply from the standpoint of the individual organism; for although it has its focus there, it is essentially a social phenomenon' (Carlo Levi, the Italian novelist, has intuitively grasped this point of view when he describes the mind as 'il luogo di tutti rapporti,' the meeting-place of all relationships.) The problem of instincts in man, once a major issue in psychology, is treated by this school of thought with equal iconoclasm. Thus, in his *Social Psychology*, Robert Faris writes:

"It does no good to search for the elements of behaviour in the physiological nature of man, because the elements are not there. . . . [They] will be found not in the biological organism but in the social process."

"The biological and individual approach to the problems of neurosis is, in the minds of many of the younger generation of psychiatrists, giving place to the concept that neurosis is the result of 'defective interpersonal relationships' which, in their turn, are the reflection of a 'sick society'. Dr. L. K. Frank is expressing a fairly general attitude (although one which is more popular in the United States than in Europe) when he writes:

"If we could regard crime, mental disorders, family disorganisation, juvenile delinquency, prostitution and sex offences, and much that now passes as the result of pathological process (for example, gastric ulcer) as evidence not of individual wickedness, incompetence, perversity or pathology, but as human reactions to cultural disintegration, a forward step would be taken."

THE PRICE OF FREEDOM

is 17/- (U.S. \$3) for one year, 8/6 for 6 months, 4/6 for three months.

This is just a reminder to those who have not yet renewed their subscriptions!

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.
Voie—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 Man. 1s.
- RUDOLF ROCKER :
Nationalism and Culture. cloth 21s.
- ALEX COMFORT :
Delinquency 6d.
Barbarism & Sexual Freedom. paper 2s. 6d., stiff boards 3s. 6d.
- 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.
- ★
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.

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

POWER, GOVERNMENT, ANARCHISM, etc. . . .

ON reflection, I must admit that the editorial repudiation of my "authority-delegation" theory of anarchist organisation in Britain is justified. But let me return to the main issue with some comments.

Editors' Reply: para. 1: I have not tried to show that "power is not dangerous if properly used"; in this context, it is always dangerous.

The man who holds a loaded gun is not necessarily using it for coercion; however, I am prepared to coerce anyone, with or without a gun, with or without preliminary "hair-splitting" persuasion, whenever I see fit.

The Editors are entitled to oppose this view; they may look askance at "people who have the means, and who are prepared in the last resort to impose their wishes on others by force if necessary"; but such high ideals sound strange from advocates of the "social revolution", who are ready to meet with violence the violence of the ruling classes, presumably in the hope of winning the struggle and imposing their desire for a new society on the minority who desire the old.

Para. 2: The entry of "anarchist" ministers into the Spanish Government did not morally commit anarchists and syndicalists; only their agreement or acquiescence could commit them. In fact, the movement as a whole acquiesced. Therefore, it was an anarchist movement in no more than name. The main mistake here is not in "anarchist tactics" in joining the Spanish Government, but in describing such tacticians and their supporters as anarchists. Anarchists have more in common with non-anarchists like Wilhelm Reich and A. S. Neill than with these "pseudo-comrades".

I agree that the Swedish syndicalists, by their action, gave moral approval to the institution of government, or, more accurately, to the principle of administration of social affairs by an executive body. They have my full support in this. But it would be ridiculous to suggest that a man who elects representatives with the explicit proviso that he does not authorise them to formulate laws and impose them by force is morally responsible if those representatives use the legal authority granted by the central government to enforce their decisions.

An anarchist could elect representatives only on the understanding that they were not "assuming the authority for the existing laws, and for the administration of justice"—in the usual sense of those words. However, I must insist (thus modifying my previous statements) that the existence of laws, the use of coercion to enforce executive decisions, and the existence of a police force to carry them out, may be desirable in an anarchist society. Let us suppose that the society has unanimously agreed that anyone reasonably suspected of having committed a murder shall be detained until the society or its authorised representatives (*i.e.*, a jury and/or criminological experts) have decided what shall be done. The society may legitimately authorise its executive to act on information received, decide whether "reasonable suspicion" exists, and instruct police to arrest and detain the suspect.

If this is described as State machinery, I have no objection except to say that the term "anarchist State" would then not be self-contradictory. There would be no deterioration to the level of government as we know it so long as the society was aware of the social forces which can cause such a deterioration.

The use of powers (legal or otherwise) by a minority or a majority to impose its will is not necessarily immoral. Each case must be judged on its merits.

Para. 3: The institution of government, limited by the absence of authority to formulate punitive laws, is neither useless nor necessarily harmful, although every government must have authority and may have a police force.

Para. 4: Here the fundamental differences in our attitudes can be seen. The Editors look forward to the mythical "social revolution" and "the destruction of those institutions which are the basis of privilege," etc. These institutions can only be forcibly destroyed by destroying the men in whose minds they are rooted, *i.e.*, by mass murder. They serve a social need, which remains despite the destruction of buildings and documents, just as a weed remains after it has been cut off at ground level.

There can never be a successful

anarchist revolution. It demands a majority of anarchists for its success, and if anarchists are already in the majority before the revolution, the old form of society will have ceased to exist, and there will be nothing to revolt against. Those who think that a minority of anarchists can "educate the people" during the revolutionary period, before the new institutions arise, fail to understand the irrational foundations of non-anarchist social institutions. Such failures in mental functioning as superstition, prejudice, and irrationality in general, are deep-rooted and cannot be persuaded away; but they can be prevented (as by the free education of A.S. Neill) or cured (as by the therapy of Wilhelm Reich).

It follows that progress towards an anarchist society must be gradual, and that old-fashioned, unrealistic revolutionaries who neglect the practical preventative and curative remedies of to-day for the millennial success of to-morrow are merely hindering that progress. I do not wish to imply that the Editors are guilty of such neglect, but the importance they attach to the destruction of institutions suggests that they are confusing the symptoms with the disease.

The rational man is necessarily an anarchist, whether he admits it or not;

unfortunately, the self-styled anarchist may not be a rational man. Despite the Editors' extensive experience of the "hard realities of life", there are men—rational anarchists—who will never misuse power. Power corrupts only those who are already corrupt. The greater the number of these men—and women—and the greater the power in their hands, the nearer shall we be to the free society. Leicester, Oct. 19. P. L. LEWIS.

"THE speech of the herd has become vain and hollow, a lame and undependable limb which, like a worn-out piece of machinery, functions less adequately every day . . . too clumsy to deal with . . . inner meanings." Thus the philosopher, Van Eeden. The words

Editors' Reply:

[We will use comrade Lewis' analogy of the gun in order to explain to him very simply what we mean by the anarchist social revolution. In present-day society, a minority by pointing a gun at the majority is in a position to coerce and exploit that majority for its own benefit. The aim of the anarchists is not to possess that gun but to destroy it. We do not hope to win the struggle in order to impose our desire for a new society on a minority who desire the old. All we want to do is to free ourselves from the physical and mental coercion and exploitation of others. It is true that as a result those who desire the existing society will be deprived of the human material on which their privilege and power was built. By refusing to continue to be exploited by them are we coercing them? Yet that is in fact what comrade Lewis now maintains.

Our correspondent refuses to see that once you give "executive powers" to anybody, they are no longer your representatives, in the syndicalist sense of that word. The executive, by definition, is the body charged with the administration of a government. Comrade Lewis supports the action of the Swedish Syndicalists who gave moral approval to the institution of government. Our dictionary does not give the hidden or the personal meanings attributed to government by our two correspondents. "The act of governing, or the state of being governed, especially authoritative administration of the affairs of a State or other community; control, direction or restraint exercised over men in communities."

Comrade Lewis dismisses the Spanish experience without drawing the real lessons; namely that the participation of the C.N.T.-F.A.I. in the Central and Catalan governments was the inevitable and logical outcome of their participation in all the institutions of the State. Once you start collaborating, where do you draw the line? Comrade Lewis tries to place conditions on such collaboration; hence all the contradictions in what he has written, which are too obvious for us to underline again.

"There can never be a successful anarchist revolution," says comrade

authority, power, government, are used irrespective of the meanings hidden under daily glibness.

Each of them contains a kernel implying leadership not imposition. Authority is not force. It implies originality and self-moving in its derivation. Power is not force. It implies ability arising out of self-training and is a quality of being. Government is not force. It implies in its derivation guidance, as if a helmsman. To quote Van Eeden again: "The power which controls the needle of a compass-needle is infinitesimal; nevertheless a great ship is guided by this small degree of power." None of the above qualities can be bestowed by others. They are inherent, or cultivated by a man's self. They are effective from within, not from without. London, Oct. 20. EPHRAIMA ANATOLE.

Lewis and then proceeds to say that for its success the anarchists must be in a majority, and that if they are there will be no need to revolt as the revolution will have already been made! Is he echoing what we meant when we wrote: "we think that a social revolution which could be achieved in its initial stages without violence is the one which has the greatest chances of a successful outcome . . ." But society does not evolve in this simple way. The ruling class does not permit such thoroughgoing revolutionary education, nor do the workers always have the patience to wait until a counting of heads shows they are in a majority. Revolutionary situations are not manufactured in cellars, nor do they follow any particular pattern. Our ideals can only profit from revolutionary situations if there are at the time sufficient anarchists, with clear ideas and with principles—and we insist that there can be no bartering of principles for expediency—who will play their part in the workers' struggle refusing all collaboration with the politicians. Indeed, it is the task of the anarchists to warn their fellow workers of the dangers they incur by allowing the initiative to pass into the hands of the politicians. How can they do this effectively with unclean hands?

One final word. To our minds the only people who would not misuse power are those who refuse it!—EDITORS.]

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
See front page

NORTH-EAST LONDON

DISCUSSION MEETINGS
IN EAST HAM
Alternate Wednesdays
at 7.30 p.m.

NOV. 12—Julian Pilling
"FOLK LORE"

LIVERPOOL

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

GLASGOW

INDOOR MEETINGS
at
CENTRAL HALLS, 25 Bath Street
Every Sunday at 7 p.m.
With John Gaffney, Frank Leech,
Jane Strachan, Eddie Shaw,
Frank Carlin

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

KENYA: The Basic Problem

Continued from p. 1

man-power needs of the industrial revolution were met in this country a century ago by the Rural Exodus, so the needs of industry in Africa are met by landless peasants who migrate to the towns because they cannot get a living on the land. A radical solution of the land problem would deprive industry of its supply of cheap native labour.

Needless to say, the colour-bar is also entrenched in the social and economic distinctions between white and coloured population. Radicalism in the approach to the economic needs of the Africans would require the abandonment of white privilege and hold over the administration. Any radical change here would affect not Kenya only but the whole precarious balance of colour relations in Africa as a whole. Numerous instances—notably the Seretse-Khama marriage and the appeasement of Dr. Malan—have shown what the settled policy of Whitehall is on this issue.

Imperialist Impasse

An imperialist administration may see the outstanding problems, but its very nature prevents it from doing anything about them. This is why the warnings went unheeded, and why the "remedies" of imperialism consist in police rule and martial law. As we have seen, even moderate opinion in

this country can see the issues and knows what the solutions are. Such a process is nothing less than the unmasking of imperialism and shows once again, that those who oppose imperialism because it is wrong in principle and on moral grounds have also the most practical case.

Rôle of Native Educational Establishments

It is now being said that the Kikuyu Independent Schools Association have been inculcating anti-European sentiments as against mission and government-aided schools. (It is not, however, pointed out that these latter schools extol imperialism and the advantages of Christianity). Whatever form the anti-European teaching of the Kikuyu takes, it is clear that it will derive its force from the attitude of Europeans and their position of privilege. No doubt the government will seek to suppress such schools or re-staff them. But unless the reality of white power and privilege is altered, anti-European sentiments will continue to flourish.

To sum up: the Kenya situation is inherent in imperialist economic and social structure. But the grievances of Africans could be solved by the application of revolutionary principles of social economy and human relations. It does not look as if anything short of this will be sufficient.

Lessons of the Spanish Revolution - 16

Continued from p. 1

According to a Trotskyist writer, "The Regional Committee of the C.N.T. gave to the entire press—Stalinist and bourgeois included—a denunciation of the Friends of Durruti as agents-provocateurs".³⁵

Just as the defence of Barcelona in July 1936 was a spontaneous movement of the workers, so in May 1937 the decision to be on the *qui vive* against possible attacks once more came from the rank and file. The leaders in July, as we have already shown, concerned themselves with containing the movement. They were afraid that the impetus which so decisively routed Franco's troops would carry forward the social revolution to a point where it would be outside their control. This attitude of the C.N.T. leadership was not lost on the politicians. What greater condemnation of the leadership than the reply given by Companys to a foreign journalist who had predicted in April 1937 that the assassination of Antonio Martin, the anarchist mayor of Perigerda and three of his comrades would lead to a revolt: "[Companys] laughed scornfully and said the anarchists would capitulate as they always had before."³⁶

³⁵ Felix Morrow: *Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Spain* (New York, 1938). Soucy mentions that on May 5th a "newly-founded group called 'Friends of Durruti,' functioning on the fringes of the C.N.T.-F.A.I., published a proclamation declaring that 'A Revolutionary Junta has been constituted in Barcelona. All those responsible for the *putsch*, manœuvring under the protection of the government, shall be executed. The P.O.U.M. [the anti-Stalinist Marxist Party] shall be a member of the Revolutionary Junta because they stood by the workers.' The Regional Committee decided not to concur with this proclamation. The Libertarian Youth likewise rejected it. On the next day, Thursday, May 6th, their official statement was printed in the entire press of Barcelona." Soucy does not give the text of the statement, and at the time of writing we have not been able to consult the files of *Solidaridad Obrera* to check the statement made by the Trotskyist writer.

³⁶ Lister Oak in *The New Statesman & Nation*, May 15, 1937.

C.N.T. workers. Soucy writes: The members of the C.N.T. saw that they had been betrayed and immediately informed the Regional Committee [which] intervened with the government. They demanded the police be withdrawn . . . Half-an-hour later the Generality replied: the *fait accompli* cannot be recalled. And Soucy continues: "This broken agreement aroused great indignation among the workers of the C.N.T. Had the workers in the outlying districts been informed immediately of this development, they would surely have insisted upon taking further measures and returned to the attack. But when the matter was discussed later, the more moderate point of view won out." (our italics). Once again information was being withheld from the workers, and decisions taken at a higher level. And, in the words of the Generality, "the *fait accompli* cannot be recalled". Once more the workers had been betrayed. Their compromise did not end the fighting. All it did was to make their task more difficult, for now with the telephone exchange out of their hands, their means of communication were limited to the short-wave radio station located in the C.N.T.-F.A.I. headquarters from which only orders to return to work, and capitulation could be expected.

When, by Friday, May 7th, the fighting had ceased but for occasional unimportant skirmishes, the Government itself strong enough to disregard any of the demands put forward by the workers. Several thousand troops had arrived from Valencia, and with them the control of the fighting units and the forces of public order in Catalonia passed to the Central Government. Hostages taken by the government during the fighting were not released, in spite of solemn promises to do so. Indeed, after the fighting had ceased many further arrests were made. A strict press censorship was imposed, and the various decree laws that had provoked the crisis in April was put into effect. The bourgeoisie had gained a signal victory; the social revolution had suffered a decisive defeat.

(To be continued) V.R.