

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"There are only two principles, freedom and equality, and without them we are nothing. The absence of the one involves obligatorily the corruption of the other."

NORMAN MAILER  
("Barbary Shore")

Vol. 13, No. 50

December 13th, 1952

Threepence

## AFTER TITO'S CONGRESS

(From our Balkan correspondent)

LESS than a month after Generalissimo Stalin, Marshal Tito held the congress of his own C.P. The hand-picked delegates listened to the monotonous speeches, cheered or jeered when required and even acted as chuckers-out when the secretary-general of Tito's government accused a member of the Central Committee of "stealing" his wife. All the resolutions were passed unanimously and the party statutes modified. (As in the Soviet C.P., the term "Politbureau" was abolished and certain, purely terminological changes introduced because the old ones no longer served their purpose).

The congress had, of course, a marked anti-Soviet tendency. The same speakers who a few years ago could not pronounce the word "Stalin" without adding the adjective "great" or make a speech without singing the praises of the "citadel of socialism" now accused the same man and country of betraying the working-class and using imperialist methods. All this was contrasted with conditions in Yugoslavia where—according to them—the classless society was almost in sight provided everyone was prepared to make additional sacrifices and maintained "monolithic unity". Around Marshal Tito, of course.

The latter used the occasion to precise his attitude towards the West: he needs its arms and financial aid, but refuses to accept the form of government which exists there. The reason for this is quite simple: the former he needs to remain in power, while a general election would show his widespread popularity. It is much safer for him to stick to the methods he used to gain power and keep himself there against the opposition of most of his fellow-countrymen who have

### Very Un-British

MR. Charles Lawson told a judge at Tunbridge Wells: "The situation is so un-English that it might better have taken place behind a certain curtain."

Mr. Lawson appeared for Mr. George Alfred Payne, of the Pembury Dairy, Pembury, who is claiming damages from the Ministry of Food.

This is the story as told by Mr. Lawson:

Mr. Payne bought milk from the Ministry, who charged him extra because it was sold as Channel Islands milk. So he sold it at 34d. per half pint, the price payable for Channel Islands milk, which is required to have a 4 per cent. butter-fat content.

The Ministry bought back half a pint of the milk and then summoned Mr. Payne because it was deficient in butter-fat.

Mr. Payne was fined £5 with six guineas costs. Because of the conviction he had lost business.

There is only one way a dairyman can buy milk—from the Ministry of Food, said Mr. Lawson.

Mr. Angus Forbes, of Lamberhurst, the farmer from whom the Ministry bought the milk, is co-defendant in the case, which was adjourned.

—News Chronicle, 6/12/52.

It is very popular to think that bureaucratic fumbling like this can only exist in other countries. But can it not be admitted that bureaucracy anywhere is hamfisted and wasteful?

fewer illusions about Tito than American generals. Tory members of the House of Lords or Socialist M.P.s These gentlemen are capable of telling their audiences after a week's stay in Yugoslav what fifteen million inhabitants think and want.

### The Bureaucracy

The bureaucracy and the secret police, dominated by Communists, are the main pillars of the régime. Together with the officer corps. Kept together by a common past, joint interests and big privileges, they are, on the surface at least, for Tito though some of the more far-sighted ones try to make private arrangements with Stalinist agents or anti-Communists. In spite of much talk about decentralisation and the withering away of the State their total number shows no sign of decrease. On the contrary, as may be seen from the following figures: while the total labour force increased by only 2% since 1934 the bureaucracy augmented by 30%. In capitalist Yugoslavia the ratio between white collar and manual workers in industry was 1:10; in 1948 it was 1:3.4, and two years later 1:2.8. Their number and "needs" as well as their inability to solve the basic economic and social problems are one of the main causes for the present hunger or the "drought" as Tito prefers to call it.

### The Secret Police

The everyday work of the unpopular bureaucracy would be of little avail without the secret police (UDBA) in the not too distant background. Its concentration camps and torture cells have had several hundred thousand "guests" whose crimes ranged from the failure to hand over the right quantity of wheat, to belonging to the wrong sort of guerrilla band during or after the war. Some even did a few months of "socially useful labour" simply because they cracked jokes about Tito or maintained before the quarrel with Stalin that American planes were faster than Russian. On the other hand, successful police bosses obtain all sorts of jobs. For example, the commander of the UDBA in Macedonia was "elected" president of the trade unions there, the assistant head of the UDBA became Minister of Metallurgy and then got transferred to a post at the Yugoslav Foreign Office. The head of the espionage department was put in charge of the Shipping Ministry

while one of his associates who sent thousands to prison was for three years Tito's representative at the Commission for Human Rights at the United Nations!

### How the People Fare

During the party congress, Tito and his henchmen confessed that the economic situation in Yugoslavia is very bad. They put the blame on the Soviet Union, the drought and the lack of sufficient dollar aid at the right time, without mentioning of course that their own methods were the main cause for the serious food shortage in a country which before the war was an exporter of it. The measures taken by them to combat the crisis included the doubling of rent, higher taxes for the peasants, the freezing of wages and even the lowering by 10% in more than 1,500 enterprises. A few days after these spartan decrees were promulgated, the Communist press was full of reports of workers everywhere agreeing of their own "free will" to surrender a part of their wages to help in the struggle against the drought. (Needless to say, none of Tito's numerous ministers or generals made a similar statement).

In spite of all the legislation by the Communist dictatorship, food prices have been going up steadily. Nor can there be any doubt that they will be higher still in March when Marshal Tito pays his State visit to London. Still, in the absence of bread the people of Yugoslavia will be supplied with long-distance circuses in the form of lengthy articles about the welcome accorded to "their far-sighted and beloved leader".

## The Dilemma of Mapam

THE burning of the Jerusalem H.Q. of the Communist Party one night recently, obviously reflected a considerable indignation against the anti-Semitism revealed in Prague, to which we referred last week. For some time the Communist Party in Israel has largely depended for its support on the Arab minority, dissatisfied with its position in the new State, and in seeking to exploit racial dissensions for the benefit of Soviet Imperialism the Stalinists have followed, as in so much else, a path worn for them by the Tsarists. (In Turkish Palestine, the Russian Orthodox priests carried out much the same activity as the Stalinist priests do to-day, building up a cadre of support for the never far-distant Empire under the mask of ideology.)

Events will soon enough come along to show the anti-imperialist Arabs the falsity of "Communist" anti-imperialist pretensions. Meanwhile, the Jerusalem incident reveals that amongst the Jewish citizens of Israel such revelations are beginning to be made, but it is not enough, and Stalinism must be driven away altogether. There are working-class organisations in Israel which can take the lead in opposing Stalinism there and likewise blackening and dishonouring it throughout working-class Jewish populations in other countries, where it seeks to implant itself on a basis similar to that which it does amongst the Palestinian Arabs.

First of all, however, Mapam must be dealt with. The Czech trials have caught it out in a very interesting manner. In Israel there exist two Labour parties, Mapai and Mapam; the former being orientated more or less on British "Socialist" lines, the latter similar to perhaps the "Nenni Socialists" of Italy, supporting Stalinism in every other country. (This is not so illogical by British standards as it seems—does not the British Socialist support Republicanism in every other country?) Stalinist foreign policy is consistently praised by Mapam, just as it was in England from time to time by various so-called "Leftists" who

sooner or later came to heel, or who will eventually do so. They sent their fraternal representative to the "New Democracy" of Czechoslovakia, the name of the stooge being Mordecai Oren. Alas, it is all very well to support Stalin but first be sure that Stalin supports you! Mordecai Oren was arrested in Prague alongside other "Zionist-Imperialists" and agents of Wall Street and "international Jewry".

Poor old Mapam is caught out hopping on one foot. True to its usual line it denounces all opposition to the trials, but then, if the trials are not phoney, it stands condemned itself! So they try weakly to maintain that the trials are genuine, the confessions are true... all but Mordecai Oren! He is the one mistake made by Prague, the innocent man wrongly condemned by well-meaning Communists, a lone lamb amongst Zionist-Imperialist wolves! All the rest deserve all they get, and all the other allegations (with the grosser anti-Semitic slanders laundered out) are detailed by Mapam. But only one mistake has been made! Mordecai Oren was innocent, and Mapam is not really a tool of Wall Street!

Nobody is fooled by such nonsense and Ben Gurion scornfully attacked the hypocrisy of the Mapam representatives in the Knesset. What is believed by some is that Stalin hopes to divide and smash the Mapam, alienating the section he despises—that is merely the sort of shrimp fished up with "peace conferences"—from the section that is more Stalinist and may pass to the Communist Party proper. This section is perhaps less "Communist" than it is haunted by the fear of a Russian victory in the Middle East should a world conflict ensue (but then, what are "Communists" else these days?)

Whether that be the case or not, it is certain that once more the Kremlin has kicked its stooges in the teeth. It is to be hoped that public contempt in Israel will strip the Mapam of all pretensions to working-class support.

INTERNATIONALIST.

## The Docks: THE BRUSH-OFF

THE long-awaited scheme to deal with the unemployment situation in the docks has now been announced by Sir Walter Monckton, the Minister of Labour.

It is, of course, not a "solution" at all in the real sense of the word. It is simply a let-out for the Dock Labour Board, who found that their much-vaunted de-casualisation scheme, only worked well when things were going well—and when things went badly, the scheme was no good either.

We have pointed out often enough before how all the "advantages" which the Labour Government brought in were strictly dependent upon economic

prosperity. "Full employment" was not a result of efforts by the Labour Government, it was a result of the post-war trade boom. When the slump came neither the Labour Party nor anybody else could maintain employment at its 1945-49 figure.

And as long as there was plenty of work in the docks, our leaders could talk about the great advantages of de-casualisation. Now they are keeping quiet, and Monckton is able to tell the dockers that their unions have agreed to the Tory Minister's scheme for reducing the number of dockers.

Briefly, the scheme is this: the Dock Labour Board in each port are to open "dormant" registers. Any docker can apply to have his name entered in this register, when he will be released from the pool to seek work elsewhere. This release is to be regarded as temporary, and if his services are required during 1953 he will be given the opportunity of returning to the "live" register.

If, however, he wishes to remain at his new employment, he will be allowed to do so—during 1953. But if in 1954 he is recalled to dock work, he must return within six weeks, or his name will be removed from the register altogether.

If he is still on the dormant register on January 1st, 1955, he can on application be reinstated forthwith on the live register. But if he fails to apply before February 12th, 1955, his name will be

removed from the register permanently, and he will forfeit all rights of reinstatement.

So far the scheme is voluntary, and there is no doubt that plenty of dockers will take advantage of it. All those who would get more than £4 8s. in unemployment benefit and national assistance for instance, as well as those who have other trades at their finger-tips, although most of these will have left the docks already.

What is distasteful about the whole thing is the way in which workers can be simply brushed off when the bosses have no further use for them. But brushed off in such a way that when it suits the bosses, they can be called back.

One point to remember, too, is that the figure given as "surplus" labour in the docks is 12,000—16,000. During 1951, however, no less than 11,000 dockers were added to the register. But early in 1951, dockers were asking for the register to be closed.

If, eighteen months ago, the workers had been listened to, and the mad scramble to turn ships round had been considered in the light of its effects upon the workers concerned, to-day's present miserable situation could have been avoided.

But it is clearly too much to expect employers, Labour Boards or trade union officials to consider the interests of the workers. Day-to-day policies, the interests and profits of the hour have to take preference. The fact that the long-term effects of the system always operate against the workers, however, should be recognised and acted upon.

Or is it too much to expect workers to consider the interests of workers, and realise they gain nothing from reforms or schemes which come from above?

## REPRIEVE FOR THE PARTNERS

THE 10,500 "partners" in the John Lewis Partnership, can thank the general public for coming off their "buying strike" and thereby causing a sharp upswing of trade.

The improvement in retail trading—clearly a result of the fall in prices of textile goods, furniture and other goods affected by the slump—has enabled John Spedan Lewis, not-so-benevolent despot of the profit-sharing partnership, to announce that the cuts in wages and salaries (from 5 to 20 per cent.) which have already taken effect, could be restored as from February 1.

This will give heart to those faithful employees—sorry, partners—who stuck by the old firm when the cuts were announced last summer. It will give them the strength to face the Christmas rush and also the January Sales.

Whether trade will improve sufficiently

to enable the staff to view the Coronation procession through the Oxford Street store's windows without paying remains to be seen. (It was announced, too, recently, that they would be expected to pay for this privilege, as the possession of those windows represented an asset to the concern that Mr. Lewis thought should most definitely be turned to good financial account.)

On this point it is interesting to note that whereas a "progressive" profit-sharing partnership had to charge its workers for this, a frankly capitalist firm like Selfridges, and indeed other Oxford Street stores, were able to make arrangements for their staffs to see the Coronation show without any charge whatsoever. And have not announced any pay cuts, either. One may ask just where the advantages are, in profit-sharing?

Have you renewed your  
Subscription to FREEDOM?



## LITERARY NOTES:

## The Condition of the Little Review

REMEMBERING the rich crop of little reviews of the days before and during the war, and also the extremely important part which they played during the 'thirties and 'forties in the discovery and fostering of important literary movements in Britain, one is inclined to look on the present situation and lament the lapse, at least so far as England is concerned, of a form of periodical which is vital, in these days, when commercial publishers and magazines turn a steadily colder face towards good writing and daring ideas, for the survival of a living and growing literature. The state of affairs is perhaps a little better in America, but the conditions there are somewhat different and have little bearing on the English situation.

It is not, in reality, a question of the actual extinction of the little magazine as a form, for, though many have died and the economic difficulties of founding new publications have grown immeasurably greater since the days before the war when anybody with a spare ten or twenty pounds in his pocket could bring out the first number of a little magazine—and not find it difficult to get lively enough material to fill it. There are, as Alan Ross pointed out, still enough literary magazines, both in the little and large forms, to provide a fair choice for the reader and something at least of a choice for the writer.

Perhaps an even more serious falling away in the little magazines than their diminution in number is their decline in general quality. I have seen in the last two years nothing that was as good as *New Verse* or *Horizon* in their best days, or as, say *World Review* during Schimanski's editorship. I was never an uncritical admirer of any these reviews, but they did have a consistent quality and a sense of direction which most of the present little magazines lack.

Alan Ross attributes this situation to

## Paintings

## Ceylonese Art

AN exhibition of Contemporary Ceylonese Paintings by members of the 43 Group Ceylon, is being held at the Imperial Institute Galleries, South Kensington.

This group of talented Ceylonese painters was formed in contradiction to the moribund painting of the officially supported Ceylon Society of Arts. It was felt by the founders of the 43 Group that an influence such as that which emanated from this official body was not likely to be of much value to the younger Ceylonese painters, who were struggling to achieve a maturity based upon a revolutionary attitude, not only towards the prevailing standards of Ceylonese art in particular, but towards the decaying standards of a world disastrously involved in war. So it was that in 1943 this Group was formed, and examples of the work of its founders are to be found amongst those on exhibition. Perhaps the most impressive of these—for the exhibitors as a whole achieve a very high standard indeed—are the paintings of Justin Daraniyagala, George Keyt and Ranjit Fernando—the landscapes of the last-named being particularly interesting.

This is an exhibition which deserves the utmost support, and it is to be regretted that the wall colour and poor lighting of the hall combine to so effectively diminish the brilliance of so many of these extremely rewarding works. R.S.

Note: This Exhibition closes December 15th.

## FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

## New Books . . .

D. H. Stott: <i>Saving Children from Delinquency</i>	12/6
L. S. B. Leskey: <i>Mau Mau and the Kikuyu</i>	7/6
<i>Documents of Humanity</i>	5/-
<b>Second-hand . . .</b>	
Lewis Mumford: <i>Technics and Civilisation</i>	15/-
Lewis Mumford: <i>Condition of Man</i>	15/-
Boswell's <i>London Journal</i> (ex-library, rebound)	10/-
<b>Remainders . . .</b>	
Herbert Read: <i>Coat of Many Colours</i>	5/-
<i>Recollections of Alexis de Tocqueville</i>	3/6

## JUST OUT—

<i>The Anarchist</i> (duplicated)	4d.
<i>The Libertarian</i> , No. 2	3d.

Obtainable from

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

the lack of a sufficient standard of editorship. I am not sure that this is the case. Personally, I feel sure that if there is good material about, it will find its way to the magazines; the editor admittedly has a certain function, and can give his review direction and force—by the skilful commissioning of articles and the careful choice of other material he can create a unified body of writing which has a certain pattern and meaning. But he cannot work without a pre-existing body of the right material, and this is what the present magazines so often seem to lack. Their writing is cautious and conventional, for the most part, and even the established writers who appear in them, writers who made their name by bold experiments in thought or style, now seem to be writing with as little zest as their literary juniors. It seems as though, careful and competent as writing is to-day, it is lacking in vitality, in hope, in any progressive (in a literary sense) urge.

In a subsequent article in the *Observer*, Neville Braybrooke, who for a decade has been editing *The Wind and the Rain*, makes out a certain defence for the little magazine editors, by pointing out that the great mass of good writing waiting to be published is in fact a myth. From my own experience as editor of *Now* for some years, I completely agree with him. I found, as Braybrooke has found, that the majority of the material which comes out of the blue is extremely poor (and this applies particularly to the great floods of poetry which every editor receives). Braybrooke found that less than a half of the material he had published over 26 issues consisted of "submitted" items. The major part of each magazine always consisted of work which had "either been commissioned or personally requested". To test his experience by my own, I went recently through the last eight numbers of *Now*. Only a quarter of the material had come in through the mail—although we often had four or five months between issues in which to gather our contributions—and the rest consisted either of commissioned articles, or of items requested from established authors or shown to us by writers already connected in some degree with the magazine. Moreover, we were so eager to find material by new writers that sometimes we gave the benefit of the doubt to borderline material in the hope that the writer would produce something better; occasionally he did.

But, since the amount of good unbespoken material has always been slight, this does not explain the general decline in vigour of the little magazine. It seems as though even the writers—young and old—who have become sufficiently established to form part of the pool of little review writers are now working with caution and in a rather conventional manner; are, in fact marking time. Even, I should say, they are

## AGE OF INNOCENCE

To the question "Does God exist?" 96 per cent. of a Sydney school's pupils answered "No."

—*Sunday Express*, 26/10/52.

retrogressing to an extent, and certainly many of the literary magazines which seem to take the lead to-day have a dull and academic tone which did not characterise the magazines of ten or even five years ago.

Some of them are born already with an aged and tired look. This is the case with *Collonade* whose first number, after all the expectations that were aroused when it was first announced, is far duller than most American university quarterlies. It is at first rather difficult to put one's finger on the precise defect of the magazine, since technically the standard of writing is high—if rather too prim. I think it is rather a question of attitude—of a persistent nostalgia for the past that is almost completely unrelieved by a gleam of present life. These people, with their meticulous articles on past poets, their resurrections of horrifying examples of past architecture, their yearning towards lands where the atmosphere of ancient life is still heavy, seem to have turned their backs with a sigh of resignation, not only on the future, but also on the contemporary world as well. The attitude is so consistently maintained throughout the review that there is no mistaking it. It is a form of negativism parallel to that shown by a whole school of young American writers, but, in my opinion, considerably less fruitful.

Another first number is presented by *Chance*, a collection consisting almost entirely of short stories, written partly by established writers like Tom Hopkinson, Arthur Marshall and William Sansom, but mostly by young and little-known writers. Though many of the stories are charming and pleasantly written, there is little distinctive or memorable about them, and the same applies to the drawings which are interspersed among the pages. The better-known authors seem to have handed out rather unsaleable specimens of their work, while hardly any of the newer ones show an exciting potentiality. An exception among the stories to this general criticism is *The Day on the Island*, by Elizabeth Sheean, and among

## The Balmartin Crofters

Watched by the island's local police force (one sergeant and a constable) four North Uist crofters last week-end invaded an Englishman's prosperous farm and turned over several symbolic spits of earth. They drove in stakes, and etched out their initials on the frosty ground. The four crofters of Balmartin were "claiming" 100 acres on behalf of themselves and two others. They had come to the conclusion that their present six-acre plots were not enough to keep body and soul together. So, in the presence of Fleet Street's reporters, they acted. In all the publicity which the raid got, perhaps the strangest thing is that no one accused these highly individualistic Highlanders of being Communists; their declared intention is to farm the 100 acres collectively.

—*New Statesman*, 5/12/52.

the drawings there is a sketch of the Portobello Road by Susan Benson which seems worth mentioning. The writers of *Chance* are at least not deliberately turned towards the past like those of *Collonade*. They acknowledge the present and take occasional guarded peeks at the future.

Something of an exception to the general cautiousness of the new literary magazines is *Poetry and Poverty*, which attempts, with some success, to preserve the atmosphere of protest that was characteristic of the little magazines of the past. In the second issue, which I have beside me, there are good new poems by Kathleen Raine, C. Bushby Smith, Lawrence Durrell and Lynette Roberts, there is a trio of interesting and hitherto unpublished poems written by Herbert Read in 1919, and an article by Peter Viereck on the controversy over Ezra Pound and the Bollingen prize which, though I do not agree with its conclusions, certainly seems to me the most convincing of the "anti" arguments I have met in that complicated case. Also, there is an apposite note by Emmanuel Litvinoff on the very point I have just been discussing—present-day literary conservatism. The last two paragraphs seem to me well worth quotation:

"There is, indeed, an abrupt withdrawal from the moral conflict in society on the part of our poet. He has either abdicated or taken sides as indiscriminately as a fan at a football match. East of the curtain or west of the Elbe, he worries about his visas, the social 'smear', the state prison, and leaves the moral responsibility in the keeping of politicians. If he had erred in the past he must now become a public penitent and give guarantees of good conduct to the State Department. This seems to me one of the most pitiful aspects of a captive and imprisoned age. For the

## CINEMA

## IN THE LAND OF GOLD &amp; MISERY

"CRY THE BELOVED COUNTRY," directed by Zoltan Korda. (General Release)

THIS film, which derives from the novel of the same name by Alan Paton who collaborated in the film, is about an African minister in a poor village in Natal, who goes to Johannesburg to look for his brother and sister and his son who long before left the village and never wrote home. He is bewildered by the big city and by the ways of the white men whose enormous gold mines dominated the landscape on his journey, the gold from which is shipped to America and buried again. He stays at an Anglican community and with two other priests, one Negro and one white, he searches through the slum shanty towns around the city for his relations. He finds his sister is a prostitute but cannot find his son who has left his work and has absconded from a reformatory, though he does find a girl who is with child from him. The police are searching for three men who, disturbed while attempting to rob a house, have shot the owner who is a city councillor unpopular with his fellow whites

for his devotion to African welfare. The priest's worst forebodings are confirmed. Two of the men are his son and nephew. The son is hanged, the priest meets the councillor's father, a land-owner in Natal, who had always believed in keeping "the blacks" in their place. The two bereaved fathers are brought together to work for brotherhood between races.

The film is well acted, the old priest is beautifully portrayed by Canada Lee, and the unfamiliar background—the eroded village, the gold-mines seen from the train and the terrible shanty town around the city, is full of interest. There is one most moving scene when the old man goes back to his village and his congregation meet him singing. The Christianity which pervades the film is not obtrusive since it is perfectly true that many clergymen of the Church of England (one need only mention the Rev. Michael Scott and Canon John Collins) are playing an active part in the struggle against *Apartheid* in South Africa. What a change it is to see a film in which goodness and integrity are so unselfconsciously portrayed.

## Lessons of the Spanish Revolution—22

## Conclusions: ANARCHISM &amp; VIOLENCE

WE have all along considered that it was outside the scope of this study to engage in an analysis of the military aspects of the struggle in Spain, quite apart from the fact that such a subject is not within the competence of the present writer. But it would be shirking the responsibilities we have assumed were we not to attempt to deal with certain questions of principle arising from the development of the armed struggle.

Violence, contrary to popular belief, is not part of the anarchist philosophy. It has repeatedly been pointed out by anarchist thinkers that the revolution can neither be won, nor the anarchist society established and maintained, by armed violence. Recourse to violence, then, is an indication of weakness, not of strength, and the revolution with the greatest possibilities of a successful outcome will undoubtedly be the one in which there is no violence, or in which violence is reduced to a minimum, for such a revolution would indicate the quasi unanimity of the population in the objectives of the revolution. Unless anarchists declare that the only revolution, or insurrection that will meet with their support, is the one that will usher in the libertarian society, they must face the situation created by those uprisings, the objectives of which represent only a step towards the desired society, and declare what their position in such struggles will be. Generally speaking, their position has always been clear; that every manifestation of the people for their emancipation should be supported by anarchists as anarchists. That is to say, ready at all times to make concessions to the common cause but without, in so doing, losing their identity. We believe that such a position demands that anarchists should fearlessly expose what they believe to be the mistakes of the revolution, and at the same time by retaining their freedom of action, be prepared to withdraw their co-operation once they believe that the objectives of the struggle have been sacrificed to expediency.

The use of violence has been justified both as a principle and as a means to an end, hardly ever, however, by anarchists. At the most, anarchists have justified its use as a revolutionary necessity, or tactic. In view of remarks we made at the beginning of this study on this question we shall in the course of these conclusions enlarge on our meaning of revolutionary tactics. But before so doing we should refer to yet another piece of confusion for which anarchists themselves are in part responsible.

We refer, of course to those anarchists who call themselves pacifist-anarchists, or non-violent-anarchists, and who thereby imply that those not included in these categories, must be violent-anarchists. The fallacy, to our minds, is that of making non-violence a principle, when in fact it is nothing more than a tactic, since as we have already pointed out, there is no question of violence as a means or as an end in the philosophy of anarchism. Furthermore, the "non-violent" advocates fail to make a distinction between violence which is used as a means for imposing the will of a group or class, and that violence which is purely defensive. Thus, in his essay on *The Folly of "Revolutionary" Violence*, George Woodcock writes:

"It is an object of this essay to contend that not only are violent revolutions evils which in their nature cannot lead to human liberation, but also that they are unnecessary hindrances in attaining revolutionary objectives.

"Much more could be written on the moral aspects of violence, and particularly on the rôle of violence as a disguised form of power whose needs tend always to convert it into naked power. But my concern at present is to deal with the practicality of violence as a means

\* In the *Adelphi*, Vol. 23, No. 2, Jan.-Mar. 1947. This essay has been published in a Spanish translation in the journal *España Libre* (Nov. 16, 23, 1952).

of social improvement. There still survives so much romantic illusion about the barricades and guerrilla warfare, that we have to demonstrate, as clearly as we can that violent revolutions in fact possess none of the qualities assigned to them, and that the genuine self-sacrifice with which they are often initiated and maintained will lead inevitably either to failure in the actual insurrection or to a situation in which its objectives will, through so-called 'necessities' be lost more irretrievably than before . . ." (our italics).

Since George Woodcock includes Spain in his survey, we will use this example in an attempt to show how difficult it is to be dogmatic and to generalise in discussions of this kind, and to convert tactics into sacred principles.

In Spain the attempt to seize power by force was made by Franco and his military and Phalangist friends. To this end they had a carefully prepared plan to occupy all the important cities of Spain. What should the people have done on July 19? George Woodcock does not say but refers us to Bart de Ligt's work on *The Conquest of Violence* (London, 1937). The confusion that emerges in his analysis of the Spanish struggle reveals the weakness of the "non-violent" position when raised to the level of a doctrine. In Bart de Ligt's opinion the best way to "fight" Franco would have been for the Spanish people to allow him to occupy the whole country "temporarily" and then to have "let loose a great movement of non-violent resistance (boycott, non-cooperation and so on) against him." "But our tactics—Bart de Ligt continues—also include, and far more than modern military tactics do, an effective international collaboration. We are no party to the deceitful idea of non-intervention: wherever humanity is threatened or attacked, all men and women of good-will must intervene in its defence. In this case also, from the very beginning, a parallel movement of non-cooperation from the outside should have been organised to support that of inside, in an endeavour to prevent Franco and his friends from getting the materials for war, or at least to keep these down to the minimum." That the advocates of non-violence cannot be dogmatic is shown by what follows: "And even in the situation



## CAUSE AND EFFECT IN KENYA

IN this issue we reprint an article by Jomo Kenyatta which appeared in FREEDOM's predecessor, *War Commentary*, more than ten years ago. It describes conditions in Kenya—conditions which the more truthful and responsible journalists to-day recognise as underlying the present crisis.

But Kenyatta's article was written more than a decade ago, and the conditions he described were not new then. Although it was left for a minority paper to publish such a description, the facts themselves must have been well known to government officials and their advisers responsible for the administration of Kenya. It is important to remember this when considering practical politics in such a situation as the present one. The "crisis" may be new to the British public, but the situation described a decade ago by Kenyatta is the daily life of the native inhabitants of Kenya and of their fathers. The daily misery and poverty and injustice provides a basis and a background for their whole lives, but have for years and years evoked only indifference and inertia in the whole administration.

This is the situation which faces the man of good will when he tries to see what ought to be done in such a crisis. But always the answer must be that such a crisis ought never to have been allowed to develop. Injustice, both economic and social, should never have been allowed to develop, or be tolerated when it did develop. Once it has been tolerated—and indeed attempts to remedy it in the past have been steadily ignored or frustrated by the Administration—for years, the man of good will is in a hopeless position. If he is himself connected with the Administration he is compromised by its past crimes of omission and commission. If he is not he is an outsider, without power or influence on either the government or the governed.

The problems of African life—or indeed of life in any colonial country—are not being solved by the white administration. Nor would we hasten to add would they be by a mixed white and coloured administration on the same general lines. A solution is not to be found either in the complete withdrawal of Europeans, though it is not surprising that so many Africans (perhaps a majority) consider this, in the circumstances, to be the best solution. Ideally, what is required is mutual action on a practical level between Europeans and Africans to achieve a better life and living conditions in each village and township.

Colonialism, however, makes such a simple practical action impossible. The high-handed injustice of the white people and their assumption of superiority evoke not only fear and hatred, but also the colonial struggle with its nationalism, its own simplifications—ultimately its own system of injustice and repression in the terrorism attributed to the Mau Mau. (It should, however, be borne in mind that the extent of this activity is not so large in government figures as in newspaper propaganda.) When the situation has developed so far, ideal solutions are clearly impossible as practical, immediate politics.

But we have been assuming that the "man of good will" is in fact active in the present crisis. In fact, however, the men who have tolerated the perpetuated injustice, who have been indifferent in the face of African poverty and discontent, are now the men who are dealing with the crisis. Is it surprising that their methods are not those of redress, far-sighted reform, but instead of

# HOW KENYA IS GOVERNED

by  
**JOMO KENYATTA**

\* The article below appeared in *Freedom's* predecessor, *War Commentary*, in September, 1941. Present circumstances give it an especial interest.

IN considering the question of civil liberties and the effect of European civilisation on African tribal communities, it is necessary to have some ideas of how the African people lived before the advent of the Europeans. Cut off as they were from the outside world, they lived in their isolation with natural contentment, each group acting independently and satisfying its immediate needs and desires with material near at hand. As to their mode of government, they managed their own affairs as best they could, through democratic tribal organisations formed according to the local customs and the stage of development which the particular tribe had reached. Tribal affairs were in the hands of several groups or councils which every tribesman had the right to join. Thus they lived as the masters of their destiny, roaming freely within the boundaries of their own fertile territories, and enjoying the gifts which nature had bestowed upon them; fertile lands with favourable climatic conditions, and, in addition, with abundance of game of every kind.

Under the tribal system of land tenure, every tribesman had the right of access to as much land as he needed for the maintenance of himself and his de-

pendents; this was possible because land-ownership was not based on profit-making—as it is in European countries—but on the principle of producing materials necessary for the progress and happiness of the whole community.

When the Europeans appeared on the scene, bringing with them stronger weapons than those possessed by any of the African tribes, things began to take a different course. British Government in Kenya took possession of all the land previously owned and occupied by the African tribes, thus with one stroke of the pen, depriving the African of his sole means of production. The African legal position with regard to land is defined by the following quotation from a judgment of the High Court of East Africa, in a civil case heard in Nairobi in 1921: "In my view the effects of the Crown Lands Ordinance, 1915, and the Kenya (Annexation) Order in Council, 1920, by which no native rights were reserved, and the Kenya Colony Order in Council, 1921, as I have already stated is clearly, *inter alia*, to vest land reserved for the use of a native tribe in the Crown. If that be so, then all native rights in such reserved land, whatever they were under the Gethaka system" (the term refers to the system of inalienable freeholds among the Kikuyu tribe) "disappeared, and natives in occupation of such Crown Land became tenants at will of the Crown of the land actually occupied."

From 1895 to 1920, their territory was known as British East Africa Protectorate, and subsequently as Kenya Colony. In 1923 the following declaration of Native policy was made: "Primarily Kenya is an African territory, and His Majesty's Government think it necessary definitely to record their considered opinion that the interests of the African Native must be paramount and that if and when these interests and the interests of the immigrant races should conflict, the former should prevail." (CMD. 1022).

In spite of this declaration the history of native policy in Kenya shows clearly that the African, the man of sorrows in the human family, is the one who is shouldering the burden: especially with regard to the land and labour questions, for around this issue revolve all the trials, burdens, hardships and sufferings of the subject races in the Colonial countries. The present population of Kenya consists of about 19,000 Europeans, about 45,000 Indians and Goanese, 13,000 Arabs, and over 3,000,000 Africans. The Government is administered by a Governor, supported by an Executive Council made up of eight *ex-officio* members, and about four unofficial members. Besides this, there is a Legislative Council which passes laws, subject to the authority of the Colonial Office. It consists of forty members, including the Governor, who is the President, twenty official members, including one nominated Arab, 11 Europeans elected by the European non-official community to represent landed and commercial interest, five Indians elected by the Indian community, one elected Arab, and two Europeans nominated by the Governor to represent the interests of over three million

Africans! The Africans have no direct representative on the Council.

The Governor is subjected to great political and social pressure by the white community of Kenya. For this reason, his position is one of exceeding difficulty. If he acts according to the settlers' demands he is hailed with satisfaction; but if he devotes his energies to encouraging the development of the unrepresented African population he runs the risk of being denounced as "pro-Native". As it is pointed out in the Ormsby-Gore Report of 1925, few, if any Governors have been able to withstand organised white pressure, and, therefore, African rights have been violated and African interests neglected. The official members are under the order of the Governor who can not only order their votes, but can silence their criticism of legislative measures.

According to the Hilton Young Report, 1929, the eleven elected European members representing white constituencies, exercise large control over general legislation and Budget expenditure. Though in a permanent minority on the Council they are given far greater actual powers than their numbers would normally warrant. Their first duty is to their white constituents. They have little, if any, knowledge of the language, customs and home life of the Africans, and are chiefly interested in the African as a present or prospective wage-earner. It is obvious, therefore, that they cannot be regarded as representatives of the African interests.

The two Europeans who are nominated to represent (?) the Africans are usually missionaries. They have, therefore, a definitely specialised view of African interests. From the imperialist point of view they are a nuisance; from that of the Africans they are neither independent, disinterested nor equipped with sufficient knowledge of African needs, and as the Africans have no say in appointing them, they cannot bring pressure to bear on them to express their real desires.

Kenya administration as a whole is influenced in favour of European capitalist development in exactly the same way as the Governor and legislature. Heavy indirect pressure can be brought to bear on heads of Departments in the Legislative Council, by the Convention of Associations and the Press, to devote their main energies to furthering European development. In that direction lies their path of advancement, appreciation and popularity. Work done for the African carries but little outward reward. From the above observations, I can say definitely that Kenya as at present constituted, is not "primarily an African territory" in any but a statistical sense. The African Handbook (1935) gives the total of Native Reserves in 1933 as 48,345 square miles, or about 31,000,000 acres, which include arid desert or semi-desert tracts, such as Taru-desert. Here, are herded together the bulk of over 3,000,000 Africans, having among them at the end of 1933 4,965,963 head of cattle, 2,960,827 sheep, and 4,321,543 goats. On the other hand, there were 4,700 Europeans, holding among them at the

end of 1935, 5,206,264 acres of the most eligible land in the country, some of it originally granted to them free of all costs in 5,000 acre blocks, the bulk held in 999-year leases on merely nominal terms. Thirty years after the country was opened up for white settlement, and with a total population of 17,620, less than 12% of this land was under cultivation. Europeans held at the end of 1933, 256,157 head of cattle and 252,250 sheep. The Africans, who were pushed out of a large part of this alienated land to accommodate the Europeans are to-day crowded in Reserves with a density of ranging from 165 to 1,100 to the square mile. A report on Kikuyu Land Tenure published in November, 1929, states:—

"... a very large number of native holdings were alienated to Europeans in the days before the Reserve boundaries were fixed, and then a great many natives who had land rights on the holdings of their clans suddenly found themselves homeless and with no land on which they could cultivate in their own right."

The necessity to earn money is corollary of the whole land question, for, being landless, Africans are unable to maintain an independent economic existence. They are, therefore forced to go and work in the mines and on the farms owned by settlers or vested interest, in order to obtain money to pay their Hut, Head and other taxes, not only for themselves but also for their dependents. Even those Africans who can find a piece of land within the reserves, are not allowed to cultivate economic crops, such as coffee, which would enable them to find a ready market and thereby obtain their tax money. To-day every African male above the age of sixteen has to pay 12 shillings tax, and those who have more than one hut have to pay twelve shillings per hut. About 450,000 able-bodied African males pay £600,000 in hut and poll tax, or 27 shillings a head. In spite of the heavy taxation which the Africans pay, the education of their children is very poor. There is no official estimate of the number of African children of school age, but it can be safely said that there are between 500,000 and 600,000 children of school age. According to the Kenya Education Department Report, 1937, it is stated that there were 100,872 pupils in elementary schools in Kenya. Of these, 3,175 were in Government schools, 36,477 in aided schools (mission or church) and 61,220 in unaided schools, built and financed by the Africans out of their own scanty earnings, not only with no help from the Government but often against considerable discouragement. The Government spends about 8 shillings a head for the education of African children, while it spends £49,255 for the education of less than 2,000 European children. It seems therefore that the poor are taxed to pay for the education of the well-to-do. Most Europeans in Kenya are free from Income Tax, for it is only those earning over £700 who pay Income Tax.

This, briefly, is the kind of democracy which Mr. Churchill and his Labour Party colleagues ask us to defend.

## Lessons of the Spanish Revolution--22

as it is at present, all sincere war resisters should have intervened systematically on behalf of the Spanish people and especially on behalf of the libertarian revolution, by fighting Franco with the methods indicated above... whatever the methods used by the Spanish people to defend itself, it is in a legitimate state of defence, and this is truer still of those revolutionaries who—during the Civil War—are striving to bring about the social revolution.

"Once again the international working-class movement has neglected one of the noblest of its historic tasks by falling in with the deceitful measures of Imperialist Governments, either self-styled democracies or actually Fascist countries, and abandoning those who fought in Spain with unequalled heroism for the emancipation of the working-class and for social justice. If it had intervened in time, the masses of Spain would still have been able to dispose of the military clique in 1936 and to concentrate on social reconstruction. If it had done so, violence would have been kept down to a minimum and the possibility of a real revolution would have been so great as to change the face of the world."

Earlier in his analysis of Spain, Bart de Ligt pointed out that: "Considering the ideological traditions and the social, political and moral conditions under which this civil war broke out in July 1936, the Spanish anti-militarists could do nothing else than resort to arms before the military invaders. But by so doing they found themselves obliged to use the same weapons as their enemies. They had to engage in a devastating war which, even in the event of victory, must bring about conditions both objective and subjective as unfavourable as could be to the realisation of the social revolution. If we look at things closely we see here again a kind of dictatorship; if men wish to defend themselves against a violent invader, it is the invader who dictates to the defender what methods of combat he shall use. On the other hand, if the defender can rise immediately above violence, he is free to use his own, and really humane methods.

"It goes without saying that we would rather see victory go, if only partially, to those who fight for justice, peace and freedom, even with gun in hand, than to those who can only prolong injustice, slavery and war. But we must admit that the Spanish people, in its fight against Fascism, has chosen the most costly and ineffective method it could, and that it did neglect to get rid of the military clique at the proper time, which is to say, long before the Civil War broke out..."

Any Spanish reader of the above must be permitted to shake his head and sigh at the naivety displayed in this presentation of the non-violent case. If the international proletariat had supported the Spanish workers; if the military clique had been sacked and if a thousand and one other condition had been fulfilled... who knows what might have happened in Spain! But let us not forget the all-important sentence in what we have quoted above. If all these *ifs* had been realised, Bart de Ligt admits that "Violence would have been kept down to a minimum and the possibility of a real revolution would have been so great as to change the face of the world." In other words, an admission that under certain conditions violence need not degenerate, a position which George Woodcock sweeps aside with his generalisations and his carefully selected examples to prove his thesis.

Though this is now a matter of academic interest and is only raised in order to counter the point of view put forward by George Woodcock and other advocates of the non-violent tactic (that the insurrectionary revolutionary workers stand no chance against the organised military power which will be hurled against them), the accounts which we have read of the militarist putsch in Spain, lead us to believe that but for the treachery of high civil officials appointed by the Popular Front Government, and hesitation in certain sections of the workers' organisations, Franco might have been defeated in a matter of days. As it was, two-thirds of Spain was wrested from his grasp at the beginning. It is a point of view held by many well-informed Spanish militants and it is to be hoped that a documented study on this aspect of the struggle will one day be published.

It is when the use of violence is prolonged, and the armed struggle ceases to be related to its objectives, that we find ourselves on common ground with the so-called non-violent anarchists, and consider that anarchists in justice to themselves and to their fellow workers, must question the validity of the prolongation of the armed struggle. In Spain that situation arose after a few months. The delays in following up the initial successes and the failure to prevent the establishment of a bridgehead from Morocco, permitted Franco to re-organise and reinforce his army and to launch his large-scale offensive from the South and threaten Madrid with encirclement. Faced with this situation, the leaders of the C.N.T.-F.A.I. capitulated to the Popular Front point of view for militarisation. The consequences of this capitulation have been dealt with at some length in the course of this study. Could the C.N.T.-F.A.I. have acted otherwise? That is a question which perhaps one day our Spanish comrades will be prepared to face objectively and will answer.

We will limit ourselves to the expression of an opinion in general terms. We believe that anarchists can only participate in those struggles which are the expression of a people's will to freedom and justice. But when such struggles should be organised and conducted with the same ruthlessness as that of the enemy, with armies of conscripts schooled in blind obedience to leaders; by the militarisation of the rearguard, and the censorship of the Press and of opinion; when secret prisons are connived at, and to express criticisms is considered High Treason (as in the trial of the P.O.U.M. leaders); before that stage has been reached, anarchists who are not afraid of unpopularity or the "judgment of history" should declare their inability to co-operate and conduct their struggles against both régimes in whatever way they consider consistent with their aspirations and their principles. *Renunciamos a todo menos a la victoria* (Let us give up everything except victory) is not an anarchist slogan, for, in Malatesta's words:

"If to win it is necessary to erect the gallows in the public square, then I would prefer to lose."

(To be continued)

V.R.



## SYNDICALISM &amp; WORKING CLASS EXPERIENCE

## Mutual Aid at Euston

WORKING-CLASS experience since the war has shown us many examples of activity with a syndicalist basis.

The fact that it is unconscious, and that the workers concerned have probably never heard of syndicalism doesn't worry me in the slightest. They can call their activity what they like—or nothing at all, which is more usual—as long as it is syndicalist in character, I'm satisfied. For the time being at any rate; since sooner or later, to be finally effective, any working-class movement has to be conscious of its own character and, more important, perhaps, of its aims.

For although we can claim that in action workers unconsciously turn to syndicalist tactics and principles, it would indeed be foolish of us to therefore say that the British working-class is syndicalist-minded, with all its implications.

The aim of anarcho-syndicalism is workers' control of industry in a free society. Most of the industrial activity which we can legitimately term syndicalist in tendency, however, is a development from orthodox trade unionism. A revolt against it, perhaps, but one based much more upon impatience with the slowness and inadequacy of its workings than upon a real revulsion with its degenerate character. And since trade unionism has no aim but only a function within capitalism, so it is, so far, with the unofficial actions the workers have taken outside the union.

They are concerned with getting things done which the unions are failing to do, but like the unions, they are content with their function in the day-to-day struggle and do not look ahead to putting a final end to that struggle in the only way possible—the establishment of workers' control.

Such an organisation is the Railwaymen's Mutual Aid Society at Euston Station, London. The story of its formation as a breakaway from the National Union of Railwaymen has already been told in these columns,\* but a fortnight ago the organisation's President, Mr. Jack Rice spoke to the London Anarchist Group and explained more of the attitude of its members.

Jack Rice had been the Secretary of the Euston Branch of the N.U.R., and he told us that he found it much easier and quicker to deal with the many grievances that are always cropping up

on the railways at Branch level. He used to go to the Manager at Euston and get the business settled without relegating it to Head Office, and although that was clearly better for the men, it made the Euston Branch rather a thorn in the flesh of the Executive, who are jealous of any Branch autonomy.

When the dispute with Head Office came, however, in 1948, which led to the withdrawal of almost the entire Euston Branch from the N.U.R., they set up an organisation which showed they had learned their lessons well. And instinctively they based their organisation on syndicalist principles.

750 workers at Euston withdrew from the N.U.R. They decided that they needed an executive, so they elected, twelve of their members to that position, with one, Jack Rice, as President. They are unpaid, doing their work for the organisation voluntarily and in their spare time. If the work they have to do entails time off from their paid jobs, they are recompensed for that time at the rate for the job.

The Mutual Aid Society was founded with no funds. The regular contributions which its members pay are paid purely for running expenses. They have no offices, with rent to pay; their monthly meeting is held in a room over a pub. The organisation is directly under the control of the members, and it is their policy not to canvass for membership.

There is a reason for this last point. The N.U.R. would very much like to smash the M.A.S., and since the attempt last June to bring pressure to bear upon it from outside failed, probably the easiest way to smash it would be from inside—by packing it with N.U.R. stooges (dual membership is recognised by the M.A.S.) who could then betray it.

The Euston men have had letters from Manchester, Liverpool, Scotland and other parts asking them to enlarge their organisation. But so far they have resisted the temptation. A branch has been formed at St. Pancras, next door to Euston, but that is as far as they are prepared to go at the moment.

As Jack Rice put it: "I would rather

have 1,000 men I could know and trust than 50,000 I didn't know who could crush our organisation."

Here then, we see the basic principles of anarcho-syndicalist organisation being applied. Organisation on the job with a voluntary executive, elected directly by the members and responsible to them, paid only the rate for the job for time lost in organisation and keeping their working unit small enough to ensure it does not pass out of their hands. And, of course, non-political.

About a score of Euston workers came along to the L.A.G. meeting when Rice spoke, and in the discussion that followed, we were able to make a suggestion as to the requests from the Provinces and Scotland. Why not, we asked, encourage these workers to form their own Mutual Aid Societies themselves at their own places of work, with no legal or controlling connection with Euston?

There is general dissatisfaction with the N.U.R. and it should not be difficult to find the railwaymen who could do it. A Mutual Aid Society in Manchester, one in Liverpool, in Glasgow, Derby, Crewe, Swindon, Reading, at all the rail

## Special Appeal

November 21 to December 8:  
Chatham: W.S. 11/-; Preston: W.A.L. 5/6; Sydney Propaganda League: per D.L. £1; Sydney: P.B.C. per D.L. 5/-; Glasgow: A.M.C.D.\* 4/-; London: Anon. £3; Anon.\* 2/6; London: J.P.B.\* 5/-; Wooler: J.R. 2/8; London: F.E.D.\* 5/-; Bristol: G.N. 3/-; San Francisco: P.M. 7/1, S.L. 14/2, H.J. 14/2, P.P. £1/8/4, C.S. £1/1/3.

Total ...	10 8 8
Previously acknowledged ...	484 15 7
1952 TOTAL TO DATE ...	£495 4 3

GIFTS OF BOOKS: Rochdale: J.R.; London: C.W.; Stroud: M.K.; London: Anon; Stroud: S.L.R.  
\* Readers who have undertaken to send regular monthly contributions.

## SOME BOO AND SOME BATTLE

THE wizards of Westminster were in session the other day, when the Prime Minister started a hullabaloo with a few remarks directed at the ex-Minister of Defence and casting doubts upon the patriotism of this gentleman. Whereupon the supporters of Mr. Shinwell, with Socialist indignation at the accusation of unpatriotism, demanded the P.M. withdraw his remarks. This, the supreme dudder refused to do, and made to walk out to the accompaniment of loud booing from the Opposition. This infuriated the P.M. (whose hearing is not usually so acute), and making a clumsy return to his seat on the Treasury Bench, "almost crushing several Ministerial feet in his haste," he demanded to know if booing was not against parliamentary procedure. At which point came the snappy rejoinder from a Labour member, "What else can you say to a goose?" "Withdraw from the House," cried the Conservatives. But Herbert Morrison, not to be outdone, pointed out that if the P.M. could accuse an Opposition member of unpatriotism, he was entitled to be called a goose.

The Goose (whose first point has not been answered): "Is it not a fact that booing is an unparliamentary action?" The Committee Chairman: "It is grossly out of order in this House."

Mr. Morrison: "Point of order" (no one was paying any attention to him).

Conservatives (in chorus): "Shut up. Sit down."

The Goose: "I don't in the least mind being called a goose... it is this boing."

But it didn't matter whether he minded or not, because by this time it was discovered that the word "goose" was not on the list of forbidden parliamentary expressions.

Unfortunately, all their activities at Westminster are not quite so frivolous, or perhaps the British administration regard as amusing the photograph that appeared on the same page of one daily newspaper recording the above event, of a portable gallows erected in an open space and surrounded by Africans awaiting trial in Kenya.

Not far from where another miracle man plies his trade, the Italian Chamber of Deputies had a clash of opinion. But not for them tame boos to startle their Prime Minister into petulant protest; instead chairs fly and broken heads abound.

The trouble started over the new

electoral Bill, which the Christian Democrats, supported by the Republicans, Liberals and Social Democrats are trying to push through before the 1953 elections.

It really seems an enormous fiddle to safeguard their seats. The *Manchester Guardian* reports that: "The law abolishes Proportional Representation pure and simple. It introduces a new kind of Proportional Representation by which whatever party or group of parties wins 50 per cent. plus one of all the votes in the country, automatically receives the reward of 380 seats in a Parliament of 589 deputies.

"In 1924 the Fascist Minister Acerbo devised a similar electoral reward which the law called after him, but the majority of seats then went to whichever party won 25 per cent. of the total votes cast in the country."

The remaining 204 seats will be divided in proportion among the losing groups which may mean that the Communists with the extreme Socialists will be sharing seats with the Fascists. This is ostensibly the reason for the Communist outcry. The Bill in question has already had two thousand amendments.

On Friday night, the Christian Democrats proposed to a packed House that the Bill go before the Chamber at the week-end. It was put to the vote, and the Opposition asked that those in favour stand. A good tactic to get their opponents in line of fire. The left section then rushed them, a chair was hurled at them from the Christian Democrat section and was promptly returned. One Communist and one Christian Democrat were knocked out, which proves that equality can operate even amidst chaos. An innocent usher was knocked out by the top of a desk, and it was then that the sirens went to clear the public gallery. But the fight carried on, lasting fully sixteen minutes, a record even for the Italian Parliament.

Most of us would prefer if politicians would always get rid of their frustrations on one another instead of on the public, and if hot wars were fought in Parliament only, how much happier we would be.  
R.M.

centres in the country, could form a country-wide organisation on a decentralised basis, practising co-operation among themselves, guarding their interests at their work, without the danger of another centralised or bureaucratic structure like the N.U.R. growing up.

Why should they bother to extend themselves at all? Well, for one reason, that the N.U.R. still takes all the decisions regarding wages and national agreements. For another thing, numbers are still strength. A decentralised organisation would give the railwaymen the strength of numbers, without the disadvantages of centralisation. The M.A.S. has struggled before it; not only against the bosses, but also against the N.U.R.—one of whose weapons is the lying rumour ("The Mutual Aid Society is a boss's organisation," is one we have

## Preventive Detention &amp; Prisons

ON Nov. 25th, the Queen's Bench Division dismissed an application by Ernest Silverman for a writ of *habeas corpus* on the grounds that his detention in prison was contrary to the provisions of the Criminal Justice Act 1948.

Earlier this year, Mr. Silverman was sentenced to 10 years' preventive detention as an habitual criminal. The conception of preventive detention as originally envisaged by Parliament before the 1914 war had some liberalism in it. Men regarded by the Courts as habitual criminals were to be segregated from society for the protection of society and received longer sentences. But special establishments were to be set up within which much more liberty was to be permitted than in an ordinary prison. If society was going to segregate these men, it plainly ought to make their lives reasonably satisfying to them, and provision was made for this in the original Act.

What a sentence of 10 years' preventive detention means is shown in Silverman's case. His previous sentence was 7 years' imprisonment and this meant that earning one-third remission of sentence by good conduct, he actually served four years and eight months. Ten year's preventive detention carries no remission, however, and he will therefore serve ten years. Some justice might be present if this were in fact served in a special establishment which Parliament ordered provision for. But in practice Silverman will probably spend a few years in Wandsworth and then be transferred to Parkhurst, Isle of Wight, a long-stay prison.

Mr. Justice Hilbery, replying to Mr. Sofer, for Silverman, said, "If you are right, every person sentenced to preventive detention and so detained under the

## New Publications

*THE ANARCHIST*, Vol. 1, No. 1, Dec. 1952, 4d., is yet another duplicated Vol. 1, No. 1, which is described as "a journal of independent anarchism". The editorial states that it is "primarily intended for anarchists and is therefore designed more to further a clarification of anarchist ideas than to be a propaganda organ for non-anarchists. Its purpose is to expound the ideas of anarchism in a manner as clear and as forthright as possible."

The remaining contents are a poem by R. E. Murray-Edghill, a translation of part of an article of 1927 on "Anarchism as Individual Life and Activity," a fable from *The Selected Work of Voltairine de Cleyre* (1914), and a poem of 1897 about the Chicago Martyrs by Voltairine de Cleyre.

## INDIVIDUAL ACTION

IT seems strange that a country with as big a population as the United States has been unable to produce a single regularly appearing anarchist newspaper. This deficiency may be remedied by the appearance of a new fortnightly paper *Individual Action*, the first three issues of which have now reached us.

*Individual Action* is published at five cents a copy from Apt. 2F, 15 Sheridan Square, New York, N.Y., and can be obtained in this country from Freedom Bookshop at 3d. (by post 4½d.).

heard—and support from other rail centres would be very useful. But Euston should not control them, nor them, Euston.

The main difference between a solid anarcho-syndicalist case and the Railwaymen's Mutual Aid Society lies in the question of aim. Do they aim at Workers' Control? Well, these things develop gradually; they cannot be rushed. The Euston men have formed a syndicalist organisation because they found their experience led them in that direction. They did not do it to conform with pre-conceived theories.

When their experience points to the need to go towards Workers' Control, we can be confident they will do that, too. What they have already created is the basic organisation, and in our opinion is one of the most heartening of post-war working-class initiatives.

P.S.

\*FREEDOM, 28/6/52. A few copies of the article, which we reprinted as a handbill for the M.A.S., are still available.

rules as framed by the Prison Commissioner ought to be released, because he is unlawfully detained."

Mr. Sofer said he made no such submission, but in our view the judge's logic was right and the case fought on these grounds. It is quite indefensible to sentence a man to one kind of imprisonment regardless of the fact that there is no provision for such treatment. In no other profession but the law could such insincerity be tolerated.

We offer our congratulations to Mr. Silverman for standing up for the rights of men detained as habitual criminals in conditions which Parliament did not envisage.

N.B.—Although preventive detention dates from about 1906, the special establishments required have never been built. The 1948 Act merely continues the hypocritical façade.

## MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

## LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting  
HYDE PARK  
Every Sunday at 4.30 p.m.

## INDOOR MEETINGS

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.

DEC. 16—R. E. Murray-Edghill on ANARCHISM—A PERSONAL STATEMENT

## NORTH-EAST LONDON

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

## 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

## SPECIAL OFFER TO FREEDOM READERS

- ★ NEITHER EAST NOR WEST - 7s. 6d.
- ★ MANKIND IS ONE - 7s. 6d.
- ★ YOUTH FOR FREEDOM - 2s. 0d.
- ★ ANARCHY OR CHAOS - 2s. 6d.

£1 worth of Books for 10 - post free  
(U.S. 2.00 dols.)

These books will be a valuable addition to your bookshelves or suitable gifts for your friends.

This special offer is limited to 200 sets, and will in any case not be available after the end of this year.

All orders must be sent direct to:—

27 RED LION STREET LONDON - W.C.1

## 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 8744