

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"There is hardly less torment in the government of a family than in that of a whole State."

—MONTAIGNE, *Essais*. (1580).

Vol. 14, No. 42

October 17th, 1953

Threepence

Why the Warships?

THE action of the British Government in sending warships and troops to British Guiana; in declaring an Emergency; in sacking the Guiana government and suspending the Constitution, has caused alarm and despondency among those Western democrats who take "democracy" too literally, and who in welcoming the new Constitution granted to British Guiana, which resulted in the general elections of last April, closed an eye to all the loopholes which vested the real power in the hands of the Governor, who is the representative of the British Government.

The statement issued by the Colonial Office alleges that the B.G. Government was composed of Communists who by "their intrigues" since they took office are threatening "the welfare and good administration of the colony". It adds that: "If these processes were to continue unchecked an attempt might be made, by methods which are familiar to some other parts of the world, to set up a Communist dominated State. This would lead to bloodshed."

It would appear that these "intrigues" include the active participation of members of the Government in fomenting the recent strikes in the sugar plantations and the organising of a petition to the Queen to amend the constitution by the abolition of the State Council, curtailment of the Governor's reserved powers, dismissal of the Speaker, appointed by the Governor in favour of one elected by the House of Assembly, and removal of the official members from the House. This

petition was reported as having the backing of the People's Progressive Party (P.P.P.), which polled more than half the votes at the April elections. The *Times* points out that were these amendment to be permitted it "would leave the colony open to single party rule by the People's Progressive Party". To this one might add, that as matters stood before the Constitution was suspended, the Government—which after all was elected according to the rules of the game laid down by the Colonial Office—proposed, but the State Council and the Governor—who are not elected by the people of British Guiana but nominated from London—disposed. In effect it was single party rule with the only difference that it was the right kind of "single party" camouflaged by the semblance of government by the "people's representatives"!

It has been pointed out in certain sections of the British Press, as argument against the P.P.P. that though it won 18 out of the 24 seats in the House, it represented only 51% of the votes cast at the April elections. The implication of such arguments is that the distribution of seats was unfair, and that by attempting to push through its "extreme" left programme the P.P.P. was antagonising a large section of the population. Such an argument might have some force if one were to see similar criticisms directed against the present distribution of seats in the British House of Commons where the Labour Party is represented by fewer members than the Conservatives though they secured a majority of the popular vote! And what is the action of the British Government, if not single party rule?

As to the workers in the sugar plantations striking, what it shows, if nothing else, is that the Governor and the Sugar Barons have all along been determined to maintain wages at the starvation rates of the past (£2 weekly) and to resist all attempts to organise Trade Unions which did not work hand in glove with them. For this reason the plantation owners recognised the generally unrepresentative Man Power Citizens' Association but refused to recognise the Guiana Industrial Workers'

Union. As Fenner Brockway points out, (*Reynolds News*, Oct. 11) while it is true that members of the Government openly sided with the strike and, it is alleged, even participated in them, it is equally true that the Governor and the State Council were against the strike and, it is alleged, the Governor facilitated lorry-loads of blacklegs.

As a way out of the strike deadlock, the B.G. Government introduced a Bill "requiring recognition of a union when the majority of workers on a plantation supported it. In a doubtful case, a plebiscite was authorized" (Brockway, *Reynolds News*)† It was over this Bill that the clash with the Governor and his officials occurred, and the petition to remove the limitation on self-government, drawn up. It was also the moment for Mr. Lyttleton to reveal his hand.

†For the record one should mention that opponents of the P.P.P. in British Guiana say that the Bill was "an attempt to put into law something the party had failed to obtain by means of a strike" (*Manchester Guardian*, Oct. 6). From this statement we are to understand that demands obtained by strike action only are valid now, and that laws passed by a majority in the House are not? This would indeed be a most revolutionary innovation, and one might even suggest that the warships have really been sent to protect the B.G. government from these Right extremists!

Continued on p. 3

Two Low Tides at Margate

ONLY a strong sense of duty persuaded me to sit down and attempt to wade through the pile of newspaper cuttings about the Labour and Conservative Parties' Conferences at Margate. Only the feeling that FREEDOM ought to comment upon these two vitally important gatherings of frightfully important people urged me on through the mass of verbiage to find something interesting enough to be worth commenting upon to the politically conscious readership of this journal.

And for the life of me I couldn't find it. Some consolation however was to be gained from the fact that professional journalists, presumably far abler than I, had quite obviously found it equally difficult to produce interesting copy.

This may have been because apparently the most outstanding feature of Labour's gathering was the wide measure of agreement among Attleists and Bevanites—and it is dissension that makes news.

One or two headlines strained at the leash to report a storm or two—but they

were only teacup storms after all, arising from the bombastic bullying of Arthur Deakin rather than from any real division of opinion. For the big boss of the T.U.C.—who carries block vote power in the Labour Party too—threatened a division between the party and the unions if the former pressed too hard for more nationalisation.

So the Labour Party, like the T.U.C. just before, went on record against further nationalisation. Our social democrats and representatives of the industrial workers are agreed that the present balance of State- and private-controlled industries is just right—and for their purpose—of making capitalism as efficient as possible—they are probably right.

The following week at Margate the Conservatives gathered—and since they announced no more de-nationalisation plans we take it that they too are satisfied with things as they are.

The Tories all being little gentlemen, there was not even a storm in a teacup at their conference. It was all beautifully stage-managed, leading up to the climax when the old war horse himself made his entrance and delivered himself of his first speech since he went sick six months ago.

Everyone was delighted to hear that Sir Winston still had high hope for a 4-power meeting "at the highest level".

The two conferences showed us how narrow is the gap between the two parties to-day. But what is disconcerting is that these groups have power to decide the fate of millions. These two organisations—the one in power, the other hoping for it—have it in their hands to lead the world to destruction. It is a terrifying thought—and practically the only interesting one that these two low tides at Margate uncovered. P.S.

A TRAGIC REMINDER

There are 23,000 limbless survivors of the 1914-18 war, of an average age of 63, and through the British Limbless Ex-Service Men's Association they have recently sent a letter to all M.P.s asking for a revision of their allowances. Their grievance is that the assessments for amputations remained fixed for life according to the number of inches of amputated leg remaining, and this does not change with the increasing disability that comes with age.

They claim that medical evidence is not needed to prove that the burden and discomfort of artificial limbs are a much greater handicap after 35 years.

Trieste and Nationalism

AT the time of going to press the Anglo-American announcement that they will evacuate Zone A and hand it over to Italy has provoked a counter declaration from Marshal Tito. Yugoslavia, he says will send troops into the zone as soon as any Italian troops enter it. Meanwhile Yugoslav troops have occupied Zone B. It has been pointed out that as British and U.S. troops are at present occupying Zone A, it will be they rather than Italians who will have the task of dealing with the situation if Tito's threat materializes.

Zone A is said to be predominantly Italian, though it contains some villages which are Slovene. Zone B, to the east and South of Trieste itself, contains relatively few Italians, and these are now experiencing the dangers and difficulties which, in the modern world beset the dwellers round disputed frontiers. A News dispatch on 12/10/53 relates that

"Many Italian families have crossed from Zone B to Zone A. They said that they had been menaced by Yugoslav demonstrators and, having been told by the authorities that they could expect no protection, had decided to leave."

Artificial Dividing Line

This division between Zones A and B is said to be on an ethnic basis one being predominantly Italian and the other Yugoslav; but incidents like the above shows how every political crisis tends artificially to separate off the different nationalities. And similar actions in the past make any such demarcation arbitrary and unnatural in the eyes of one or both of the disputants. Thus Mussolini's policy after the annexation of Fiume was to Italianize the whole area by encouraging Italians to move in and penalizing Slavs so that they moved out. That Zone A is predominantly Italian is therefore no argument to Yugoslav nationalism, and Tito has persistently derided the Italian claim that the fate of the Zones should be decided by plebiscite.

It is not difficult to see that in this way discussion and argument finds little place in this kind of dispute. Both governments want the territory with the economic and strategic advantages which go with it and they are ready to "appeal to history" for reasons. Where an area has been disputed for centuries such an appeal has little rational value.

Whipped-up Nationalism

It does however serve another governmental purpose. By harping one-sidedly on past wrongs they do succeed in inflaming nationalist feeling to the utmost not merely in the area concerned but throughout their territories. Nationalist feeling, patriotism, loyalty to a geographical area is a most valuable instrument for glossing over the economic and class inequalities and rivalries within a nation. It also tends to submerge the feeling, quite strong in frontier dwellers where such nationalism has not been artificially whipped up, that frontiers are not important and that one people is very much like another. Nationalism always carries with it more than a hint of hatred for the foreigner and hence is an obstacle to

healthy relations between peoples.

Such nationalistic displays serve therefore to allow governments to pose as champions of the "rights" of "their people", and place critics under suspicion of being agents of the rival power. This aspect of these outbursts is exploited to the full.

Divide-and-Rule Again

Finally, there is the question of the British and American rôle. The United States is fairly new to this business but partition has long been a British method of dealing with various problems, and it has a history long enough to allow one to be fairly sure that certain results are likely to flow from it. In our own time partition has been used to "solve" the Irish problem, and the Indian problem to name only the outstanding examples. In both cases the effect of partition has been to prolong a political difference indefinitely rather than to produce a satisfactory solution either immediately or in any reasonably short time.

It must be granted that given the concept of nations and national frontiers there can be no satisfactory solution to these disputes, but this fact has never turned governments into campaigners for the abolition of the nation-state concept. On the other hand partition has had other advantages to the intervening powers which have absolutely nothing to do with the rights and wrongs of the question at issue. The partition of Ireland created a permanent division of the country which obscured the question of total secession from British rule. Such division weakened the Irish cause immeasurably and the gainer was—British imperialism.

The case of India is similar. While India and Pakistan are busy at each other's throats they both remain that much the more dependant on Britain. And so no doubt it is with Italy and Yugoslavia. Each looks to Britain and America to advance their own cause, and such hopes provide bargaining power for the outsiders.

In such a dispute the various governments all seek to derive power and advantage: the people who take the knocks and merely wait for the next showdown are the unfortunate inhabitants.

POLITICAL DEATH PENALTY

IT is now officially announced that Dr. Mossadeq, the former prime minister of Persia is charged with crimes for which the penalty, if he is found guilty, is death by hanging. On the face of it the Court will have no difficulty in bringing home its charges. *Reuter* reports that:

"The charges, drawn up by the Army prosecutor after 12 days' investigation, said that the policy of the Mossadeq Government, "based on weakening the constitution and weakening the people's belief in the Islamic religion," led the Shah to issue a decree dismissing the Prime Minister. He "refused" to obey the decree, and encouraged the people to arm and rise against the dynasty. The result was "the murder of a large number of people".

Mossadeq is said to be contending that the Shah's powers are purely formal (Western commentators are fond of stressing his European education and inclination towards "constitutional" aims) and remarks that when the decree was issued the Shah was in Rome.

Such points serve to show how unreal and absurd legal points are in such a connexion. But even if the legal case against Mossadeq were absolutely cast iron, it would still be necessary to protest against these political trials where each faction seeks to liquidate the other. Anarchists regard politicians in power as the worst of criminals, but they do not therefore relish the use of the death penalty against them when they fall from office.

Clemency in Egypt

General Neguib, acting through the Council of Revolution has commuted the death sentence passed upon Ibrahim Abdel Hadi, a former prime minister, to life imprisonment. This is no doubt in deference to liberal and progressive opinion in the outside world, for many of Neguib's political supporters demanded the death sentence itself.

RUSSIAN PRISON CAMPS

THE figures for the numbers of prisoners in the Russian prison camps have always been a matter of speculation. In the early days of the Five Year plans, twenty years ago, the so-called "liquidation of the Kulaks" provided a vast army of forced labour for the colonial development of Siberia. Ciliga, who spent nearly 10 years in Russian prisons, gave an estimate of between five and fifteen millions.

After the release of many Poles under the Sikorski agreements between the wartime Polish leader and Stalin, more estimates were made by some of those who returned. One such Polish socialist estimated the figure then at 25 millions and used to marvel at the unwillingness of politically minded people in Britain to accept such a gigantic figure.

Nevertheless, the works carried out by the M.V.D.—the secret police—which uses this unknown prison population in its labour camps—have been so vast that these tremendous figures have begun to be accepted more readily. Now a new release of prisoners, this time Germans and eight years after the end of the war, has given rise to further estimates.

According to a *Times* report (5/10/53):

"Willibald Weise, a general of the labour service, who since the spring of 1950 has been in a Moscow prison, said that he had had many opportunities to talk to high Soviet officials also under arrest. They told him that, 'on a cautious estimate,' 20 million men and women of all nationalities were behind barbed wire in Russia."

These high figures therefore are tending to be quoted more and more as reasonable estimates. But there is another factor which has to be taken into account. All descriptions of life in the prison camps agree on one aspect, the enormous mortality which goes on in them and in the public works they provide labour for. To maintain such enormous totals with continuous wastage through deaths, the rate of replenishment must be tremendous. But if one recalls that every trial of a Rajk or a Slansky is preceded or followed by mass arrests of thousands and that deportations to Russia are continually going on, one realizes that the Russian system provides plenty of sources for the replenishment of such camps.

GREETINGS TO A. S. NEILL

ON October 17th, A. S. Neill is 70, a fact which is rather startling to those who know Summerhill and Neill himself. For both the man and the school he founded are as active and as dynamic as ever, and it comes as a shock of surprise to reflect that Summerhill is nearing its thirtieth birthday while Neill occupies the dominant position in progressive education at an age when most men have retired from active work, perhaps to write their memoirs.



mass of grown-ups and their official educational representatives regard as their duty to surround children with.

Neill's work with difficult children has obscured to some extent his ideas about normal child development. It is probably true however, that it is working with disturbed children (and, of course, their disturbed parents as well) which has provided this insight into the normal. Neill himself in no sense regards his work as being bounded by the cure of emotionally ill children. He is concerned much more deeply with the larger problem of providing an environment which permits children to develop normally—for of course it is the thwarting of this natural development which produces the "maladjusted" child.

The other great distinguishing factor in Neill's work which makes it of even greater revolutionary significance, is his insistence on the right of children to their own sexual life. For most adults the extension of love and approval to this aspect of children's activity represents the most difficult break with their own early anti-sexual and obsessional training. It is not surprising that this is the side of Neill's work which has received the most bitter opposition—an opposition which he has received with good humoured and sceptical detachment, avoiding entanglements in polemics which are quite pointless because of the emotional involvement of the attackers.

In this work Neill has found himself drawn to another independent worker who has also made his life work in the struggle for healthy emotional development, Wilhelm Reich. It is one of the stupid tragedies of our world that officialdom has prevented these two men in latter years from working in closer collaboration.

Neill's name is execrated by a few, unknown to the majority of his fellow countrymen. But among those who know and are inspired by his work he is loved and revered as few masters have been by their disciples. In saluting him on his seventieth birthday we salute a very great man indeed, and one whose ideas are influencing his age. J.H.

Neill has, however, written his memoirs as he went along, so to speak, for there is no better account of the school and the ideas behind it than in that long series of rambling discursive books with their many fascinating accounts of individual child histories. But to those who have assimilated Neill's ideas a visit to Summerhill brings even more insight into the real life of children—that closed and unknown territory into which so few adults ever penetrate.

The writer is not qualified to attempt an account of Neill's ideas, still less to convey that enormous experience based upon an intuitive understanding of children which lies behind those ideas. But in saluting him it seems fitting to refer to the outstanding aspects of Neill's work which have made him the father and adviser of almost all the progressive work in a certain aspect of education in this country. His personal influence has reached far beyond his books, and the ideas which have made Summerhill have affected all who have worked there, and those other schools which have sought to extend the work. Then there are the parents and the children themselves, not all of them completely clear about Neill's aims, but all devoted to the man himself and quite certain of one thing—that his work is of first class importance.

Love and Approval

The guiding principle of Neill's work can be presented in the (frequently misunderstood) phrase "love and approval". It is the emotional development of children which constitutes education in Neill's system and the first necessity for all children is to feel affection from those around them, and also to receive support in what they do. This is in stark contrast to the usual conceptions of "guiding" children mostly

by prohibitions—"don't do that, you mustn't do this". Whether they are pressed with kindness or with brutality this—and it is the normal—method seeks to mould a child to fit the adult world rather than to allow it to find its own development.

Neill's intellectual courage is shown by his readiness to carry love and approval even to those children who behave worst. But it is a courage which is self-maintaining because it has brought such handsome dividends, for Neill's ideas have been brilliantly successful in the most disturbed and maladjusted children. His success in this field has been a demonstration that the ideas that guide him can be applied in the most desperate of all cases and be triumphantly vindicated.

Such work also has required social courage, for love and approval is an open condemnation of all the conventional disapproval and ordering about and moralizing which the vast

Down With Aesthetics!

THE failure of the recent attempt to stop the erection of a new fourteen-story building on the site of Bucklersbury House, to the east of St. Paul's Cathedral, shows once again how little regard the authorities have for public sentiment. The proposed new block will completely obscure the view of St. Paul's from one direction and contribute still further to the ruin of the London skyline. In spite of considerable protest, however, Mr. Macmillan, the minister responsible, has given permission for it to be built. The only benefit from the protest is that, to maintain the English tradition of compromise, one or two minor excrescences have been purged from the design.

The cynic will no doubt say that as London is for the most part made up of ugly buildings the erection of one more monstrosity will make little difference. And critics of anarchism may think they have found yet another inconsistency in our regret that someone has not been prevented from doing something. In a free society, it will be argued, anyone will be able to put up a building as ugly as he cares to make it. The answer to this, of course, is that anyone who finds it too hideous will be able to knock it down. This at once conjures up a picture of the sort of chaos that for many is synonymous with anarchy. But the knowledge that anyone who dislikes a building will be free to raze it will, we may hope, deter all but the most headstrong of architects from giving concrete form to their designs until they have made sure of the reception they are likely to get. The dynamiting of such horrors as the Albert Hall and St. Pancras Station, which will be among the benefits we can expect from a revolution, will provide a salutary lesson for architects.

Fortunately there are fewer architects than one might suspect who require such an object lesson. In many cases it is not they but their clients who are responsible for much of the ugliness that surrounds us. Their clients, more often than not, are commercial enterprises.

It was not coincidence that the decline of architecture in Britain began with the Industrial Revolution. Some of the buildings of the Eighteenth Century and before are still with us, and their elegant proportions and clean lines seem as beautiful to us to-day as they doubtless did to those who watched them take shape. By the middle of the nineteenth century, however, the growing number of buildings reflected all too clearly the expansion of commerce and industry that had called them into being. Indeed, the only London building of any merit to be erected in the Victorian age was King's

Cross Station (which was designed by an engineer) and few people to-day would guess that it was a product of the middle nineteenth century.

The chief characteristic of commercial architecture is its pretentiousness. The imitation Graeco-Roman banks and counting-houses with their fake Doric columns were intended to impress on-lookers with their solidity and symbolize (not always with justification) the financial soundness of the enterprises they housed. The gothic nightmares that arose in every town were meant to convey something of the romance of business. With the growth of nationalism state architecture, too, has become pretentious and ridiculous.

Even to-day commerce and the State still shackle the architect's invention. In spite of the pioneer work of such men as Frank Lloyd Wright and Le Corbusier and the inspiration of such movements as the Bauhaus school the bulk of modern building remains tawdry and gimcrack. For even though an architect may successfully dissuade his commercial clients from some of their more exuberant fancies he is unlikely to shake their determination to have something as conventional and uninspired as possible. His clients will also, with sound commercial instincts, tend to prefer the designer who can enclose the largest amount of space for the least outlay of money.

The Festival of Britain, which bequeathed to us the Festival Hall, gave us a glimpse of what a twentieth century architecture could be like if imagination were freed from the bonds of convention and the question of cost not allowed to cripple the design. But for all the influence the Festival has had on our public building it might almost as well not have been. The Government continues to erect monstrous brick boxes to house the hordes of bureaucrats, and the captains of industry are still raising their villainous piles of masonry. Indeed, our public buildings show few signs of artistic improvement. Nor will they so long as commercial and economic motives continue to dictate the sort of building we are to have. So long as we allow the sordid doctrines of capitalism to dominate our society so long shall we condemn ourselves to walk through streets of ugly, squalid buildings. Only in a free society shall we ever find ourselves in harmony with our architectural surroundings. For only in a free society will it be possible to make buildings that will give pleasure to those who have to look at them. In an anarchist society no-one will "take up" architecture because he has to make a living somehow and a respectable profession is better paid and considered one of the least degrading ways of doing this.

EDWIN PEAKE.

Revolutionary Failure

SINCE the laying down of the famous twenty-one conditions by the 2nd Congress of the Comintern in Moscow, the decisive argument in winning or justifying the allegiance of idealists and workers to a communist party has been that the November revolution was the only one to succeed, and that even if leaving much to be desired it should be defended and copied all over the world. Aims and methods that differed or did not emanate from the Bolshevik example were deemed utopian and doomed to failure. It was alleged that they caused a division and wastage of revolutionary energies, and thus played into the hands of the enemy.

As communist tactics and propaganda have made the most of this argument transforming it almost into an axiom, and seriously affecting the recruiting power of former revolutionary ideologies and movements it is pertinent, and perhaps not too late, to re-examine the problem of what constitutes a successful revolution. If communist blinkers are not applied the obvious answer is that the success of a revolution consists in the emancipation of the oppressed, and in the freedom of the once oppressed to organize their lives without oppression. The attendant necessity of exercising for a longer or shorter time a power of revenge against the oppressors, and the ability to cope with or forestall actual or potential counter-revolutions may be means to revolutionary success, but it is fatal to mistake them for revolutionary achievements.

Communist misrepresentation and falsification of history has led thousands to believe that it was thanks to the Bolsheviks that the Russian masses were emancipated and their conquests safeguarded. The truth is that the old régime was overthrown by the masses themselves, and that most of what they conquered

was lost again at the hands of the Bolsheviks at a cost in lives of peasants, workmen, and revolutionaries almost as great in number as that caused by famine or by war against the Whites. The latter, moreover, was not waged by Bolsheviks alone but by men of all parties or with no party affiliation; the Bolshevik régime was saved not so much by Lenin's genius as by Foch's victory in the West; and it must not be forgotten that Allied intervention failed mainly because of geographical distance, war-weariness, and workers' pressure on their governments. If the Red Army fought heroically during the long struggle, the Bolshevik Party acted cynically, ruthlessly and dishonourably against parties, armies, soviets, and unorganized workers and peasants whose desire was to complete and not to exploit the revolution.

Thus the Bolshevik victory, apart from external factors that made it possible, turns out to be not a revolutionary success, but one of power politics and power tactics. It is not the masses' will that triumphed since the Bolsheviks derived them in theory and practice of any genuine means of initiative and expression, nor was it the Bolshevik ideology since it was changed and reversed many times according to circumstances and to the temper, the rivalry and the blunders of the Kremlin autocrats. What triumphed was merely a special and constantly improved technique for seizing and maintaining power over and against the will of the people—a technique that proved equally successful without a communist ideology when adopted by a Hitler or a Chiang Kai-shek.

★
THERE is a mystique of revolution, an over-reliance on the spontaneity and good sense of the masses that may be

accompanied by passive expectation of a miracle, and by foolish, suicidal action when the seeming miracle comes. But there is also another mystique, of a sordid and more dangerous kind, which in rational disguise and transforming the various pieces of a sophism into organizational realities, and confuting objections by the political and often physical destruction of the objectors, falsifies all revolutionary issues, and while preserving and perfecting the mechanism of revolution vitiates its motives and mars its results. It is the mystique by which the industrial proletariat is made the only class endowed with genuine revolutionary spirit, the communist party the localized and articulate conscience of the proletariat, and the highest hierarchs of the party the infallible directors of this conscience.

The first mystique gives martyrs to the revolution, and the second its executioners. In the historical praxis it is only natural that the revolutionaries should come to identify their victory and survival with those of the revolutionary cause, and anarchists, with few and obsolete exceptions, never developed clear ideas on the rôle of the revolutionaries. But if, as with communist parties, revolutionaries have been selected and organized into a bureaucracy, a conspiratorial army and a caste with special privileges as well as special tasks, and with predetermined plans in the execution of which the will and temper of the masses will be taken into account only insofar as they lend themselves to be manipulated, a revolution will have no other aim and will achieve no other essential result than the seizure of power by the professional revolutionaries with the most fraudulent and violent disregard for the hopes of the masses in the name

and with the lives of which a revolution is made.

The aim of revolution is not only to bring oppression to an end, but to create social and political security that will prevent it from arising under another form. This the Bolsheviks did not achieve nor intended to achieve. They only replaced one form of oppression by another, and a body of oppressors with themselves. What the masses gained from the change could have been achieved without revolution as it was in most European countries through the passage from feudal to capitalist society. What they lost, instead, the power of discontent, organization and rebellion, is perhaps irreparable. If a revolution is to serve the cause of the oppressed and the cause of freedom it must leave the initiative to the masses and go against only those sections of them that would turn into oppressors of others. Moreover, it must cater for the existing masses and for the revolutionary generation, not for the masses of the future whose will nobody can interpret and who must not be deprived of the right of shaping their own destiny. To sacrifice the revolutionary generation for the supposed happiness and welfare of the one to come, as it was done in Russia, is a procedure that might boast of the most impressive achievements but which does not differ in substance from the happiness and welfare achieved in America after the extermination of the Red Indians or from what the Nazis might have achieved for the German people by the annihilation of the Jewish race.

Continued on p. 3

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

OPEN 10 a.m. to 6.30; 5.0 SATURDAYS

New Books . . .

The Free Child A. S. Neill 9/6
Community and Environment

E. A. Gutkind 12/6

Some Second-hand Books . . .

Cleanliness & Godliness
Reginald Reynolds 7/6

The Spirit of Place
D. H. Lawrence 5/-

Essays from Tula Leo Tolstoy 3/-

The Russian Enigma Anton Ciliga 7/6

A Chance for Everybody
Hyacinth Dubreuil 3/-

The Paradox of Oscar Wilde
George Woodcock 7/6

Our Plundered Planet
Fairfield Osborne 3/6

The Terror in Russia
P. Kropotkin (1909) 5/-

Fields, Factories & Workshops
P. Kropotkin 7/6

Anthony Comstock
Heywood Brown 5/-

Guiding Human Misfits
Alexandra Adler 4/-

Equality Edward Bellamy 4/-

The Man Within Graham Greene 5/-

South Riding Winifred Holtby 3/6

Darkness at Noon
Arthur Koestler 2/6

Martin Eden Jack London 3/-

Anthem Ayn Rand 3/6

Sempel the Seeker
Upton Sinclair 2/6

Talks to Parents & Teachers
Homer Lane 5/-

Publications . . .
Prometheus No. 2 6d.
Resistance 6d.
Encounters No. 1 2/6

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

BRITISH GUIANA

Continued from p. 1

WHATEVER the Colonial Office might say, it certainly could not give as an excuse for sending troops to British Guiana that the colony was in a state of bloody revolution. The Press was unanimous in describing the situation there as calm. Indeed after the state of Emergency had been declared, the government sacked, and meetings banned, the situation was still calm enough for the Governor to announce that the state of emergency was not going to interfere with the inter-Colonial cricket match with Trinidad which began last Friday! Perhaps in this new Elizabethan era, such a gesture was meant to remind us that we have lost none of the spirit of Plymouth Hoe. And in so far as the then protagonist, Drake, is now recognised for the pirate that he was, perhaps there is something in such a gesture!

The alleged reasons for the expeditionary force were given by the Colonial Secretary himself at the Conservative Party Conference at Margate last week:

"In British Guiana it has become clear that the present elected Government is inspired by Communist principles and is determined to apply them regardless of the interests of the mass of the population. Her Majesty's Government are not going to allow a Communist State to be organised within the British Commonwealth. Our friends can take that as a definite statement, and our enemies can attach to it all the importance that I think they should."

In a speech in Herne Bay Mr. Lyttleton also said:

"Ministers in British Guiana, while holding their portfolios, were organising the strikes on the sugar estates, the principal industry of the colony," Mr. Lyttleton went on. "They attempted to organise a general strike. The economic life of the country is menaced, imports into it have fallen by half, the flow of capital from overseas has dried up, but more than that, the life, liberty, and happiness of the ordinary men and women in British Guiana are menaced."

The British Government still had a responsibility—not only to seeing that peace and order were not disturbed, but, after the present troubles had been forgotten, "in a plan to improve the social conditions, the housing, and the standard of life of the 400,000 people who inhabit British Guiana."

"This is a happier task than the suppression of disorder and revolution, and we shall pursue it, as we have during the last two years, with all our energy and resources."

An analysis of these two statements allows one to begin to see something of the true situation since the elections of April, 1953. It seems clear to us that the intention of the P.P.P. when it took office was to supplement some of the promises of reform they had made, and which won a majority of votes for them at the elections. To achieve these reforms was not going to be merely a matter of legislation, since the real power of the country was in the hands of the sugar barons. The fact that the P.P.P. supported and encouraged the striking workers is an admission by these politicians, that the real power with which to fight the plantation owners resided not in the House of Assembly but in the hands of the toiling masses. This has nothing to do with Russian Communism. It is something which has been realised ever since man has been exploited by man.

The disastrous economic situation to which Mr. Lyttleton referred reminds one forcibly of the situation that followed the election in France in 1936 of the Popular Front Government. It may be recalled that then the answer given by the "200 families", to what to them was a deep-red Government, was to seek its overthrow or submission by financial strangulation. It was cer-

tainly not the French workers then, any more than the Guianese workers now, who are responsible for these sudden financial upheavals which according to Mr. Lyttleton "menace their life, liberty and happiness". (We pass over with contempt the suggestion contained in Lyttleton's statement that a half starved, ill-housed, illiterate people—in spite of 150 years of British rule—have hitherto been enjoying "life, liberty and happiness").

★

FOR the reasons given above the situation in British Guiana is one potentially explosive in character. The situation in all colonies is potentially explosive simply because of the manifest injustice of a *herrenvolk* shamelessly living on the backs of the mass of the people. But the situation is obviously exacerbated when for one reason or another these people are given the illusion that their grievances and their miserable conditions are going to be righted by granting them status as citizens, only to find that the framework through which this is to be achieved is in fact an illusion.

We think Mr. Lyttleton and his advisers are right in feeling worried about the future of British Guiana, as was his predecessor who appointed the Commission to draft a constitution for that country. His game has misfired—assuming our interpretation of recent developments is a correct one. Modern Imperialist policy is to seek a solution to the triangular problem of, on the one hand, the growing political and social awareness of the indigenous populations with, on the other, the *herrenvolk* attitude of the generally minute white populations bitterly resenting any concessions to native rights which might endanger their security. Between these two forces stands the Colonial Power making sure that any political changes do not endanger their privileged economic interests. This difficult marriage of interests in which the privileged class retains its privileges, and the "natives" are given the illusion of an improvement in their conditions, is sought through the encouragement of native government (with the governor standing in the background with the big stick), by which it is felt the (often unconscious) revolutionary impulses of the people and the "rabble rousers" (as Dr. Jagen is described by the liberal *News Chronicle*) will be curbed by the "sense of responsibility" that self-government brings with it.

Where we think Mr. Lyttleton's game has misfired is in that in the first place he must have hoped for a coalition government led by the much more amenable United Democratic Party. And that when the P.P.P. instead won the day the Sugar Barons decided to make no concessions to the new situation. Their one intention was to drive out the new Government. The Jagens who obviously are not the kind of people to play at governments while the real government operates behind the scenes, retaliated by making their appeal direct to the working people. And this the British authorities would not tolerate; to appeal directly to the people is really taking democracy too far! But they could not publicly admit this. Hence the Moscow Red Herring, which, as we have pointed out in other connections, is in the post-war world a justification for the perpetration of every kind of injustice.

We have no illusions about Dr. Jagen, his wife or the P.P.P. leadership. Their political connections are a pointer that they are not much better than their would-be persecutors. It happens that at this stage in their struggle for power it is in their interest to align themselves with the Guianese workers and against the Sugar Barons and the Colonial Office. But we do not doubt that once secure in their power they would behave as all politicians in all countries do in similar circumstances.

"Worker Priests" & Catholic Power

IT has been the policy of the Catholic Church in the last century to encourage workers to take active part in the trade union movement, either by forming separate catholic unions as in France, or by working within existing unions but in addition having an association of catholic workers as in this country.

This policy has been intensified in post-war France to the extent of forming a special seminary at Limoges for the purpose of training "worker priests" whose aim was to set up "catholic communities of industrial workmen within the social forms they had already created for themselves". To this end these "worker priests" took jobs in factories in an attempt to identify themselves with the industrial worker.

From the beginning however, the priests were faced with such difficulties as having to participate with other workers in activities which were frowned upon by the hierarchy, and which eventually culminated in two priests being beaten up by the police when demonstrating with communists in an "anti-Ridge-way riot" last May.

This incident and the possible consequences have obviously been the subject of much thought in the Vatican. Last week, the Pope, through Cardinal Pizzardo, Prefect of the Sacred College of Seminaries, formally forbade the priests continuing with their policy of taking jobs in factories with the order that the preachers of the Limoges seminary should be sent back to their dioceses.

This action has caused more than a flutter among the French Hierarchy and even among those Bishops who were critical of the scheme in its origin. The leading catholic papers have also been expressing doubts as to the correctness of the move. It is difficult however, to really assess the extent of the opposition because of the fact that no catholic will openly express strong criticism of the Pope's policy. The catholic review, *Actualité Religieuse dans le Monde* goes as far as any when it says:—

"To-day it seems that the whole future of the experiment is at stake. The Church will be judged. We must, however realise that as far as human eyes can see, it is perhaps our last chance that is in danger of disappearing."

"We must measure the consequences of this collapse. It would be above all a profound discouragement, not only for the working class but for all classes. How many Catholic intellectuals and indeed unbelievers are not following this god attempt with the deepest sympathy? Henceforth there would be a dangerous temptation to say: 'There is nothing to be done; the abyss is too deep; Christianity cannot reach the working class.'"

Archbishop Feltin of Paris gives a more orthodox point of view in a lecture published in the *Semaine Religieuse*, and indicates the arguments that will be adopted by the Pope in the final decision taken after this month's meeting arranged between the Pope and two French Cardinals. Archbishop Feltin says that the priests concerned need "more prayers and criticism and that the dangers of their task were fourfold":—

1. Mistaking the character of the missionary apostolate, which must not be confused with temporal action;

2. Falling into error as to the idea of the Church itself;

3. Falling into error as to the law of charity, which is the essential law of Christianity (where justice was at stake, and in particular circumstances, and alliance with members of other denominations might well be right, but it must not become a rule, the Archbishop said);

4. Error about the vocation of the priest, who must preserve the spirit of obedience and humility and resist the temptation of blindly following his personal conscience, which would produce precisely "that neo-protestantism which the Holy Father fears so much."

(M.G. 2/10/53.)

These arguments couched in such careful language are familiar to us all, and as we have so often pointed out

bear strong resemblance to the arguments advanced by the pundits of the communist church

Apart from the fear of the catholic hierarchy that "worker priests" through their example of collaborating with non-catholic workers will give the green light to other catholics and so spread the idea that workers should unite against the common enemy whatever their creed, it must be remembered that the support for the church in France largely comes from the middle and the property owning classes. There is little doubt therefore, that if the Pope does not decide to completely squash the experiment it will be radically altered in form. That it is not worth losing the support of the money classes to risk the slightest sympathy being established between communist and catholic workers will undoubtedly be the decision of the Pope.

From the anarchist point of view such a decision would be all to the good. The longer workers go on believing that the Church is concerned with their welfare the harder is our task to convince them that when the Church speaks of "getting among the workers" it is not for moral or humanitarian reasons but to further the power of the Catholic Church.

R.M.

MORAL REARMAMENT

ONE of the most interesting groups struggling for influence in the industrial and social fields is the organisation known as M.R.A., or Moral Rearmament. Interesting, that is, in the way that the creatures one discovers under a stone make an interesting study.

Moral Rearmament started thirty-two years ago when Dr. Frank Buchman began by giving house parties and by some undefined means became able to influence people to mend their sinful ways and to announce the fact through public confession. Here was not the hole-and-corner confession in the ear of a priest—here was an appeal to exhibitionism and masochism at the same time, for the saved sinner came before an audience and told of his sins and how he was saved.

Catching on among Oxford undergraduates, the movement became known as the Oxford Group, and very soon it moved from being concerned with the salvation of individual souls to being mainly an anti-Communist organisation and by 1938 and during the war it had settled into its present pattern of preaching class collaboration and harmony between worker and boss.

This organisation is world-wide and well-financed. Where its money comes from is not difficult to guess, for among its supporters are members of the boards of directors of many large and influential commercial and industrial concerns. Its literature is printed in many languages,

produced in an attractive fashion on a lavish scale and its message is always of the love that should exist between worker and boss, and very much opposed to direct action.

M.R.A. makes a point of trying to gather to its ranks well-known working-class militants, and in its illustrated brochures can be seen the photographs of ex-Communist dockers and miners who have seen the light. To help them see the light, M.R.A. gives free holidays at their centre in Caux, in Switzerland, and in Florida. It runs film-shows, plays and concerts. (The Westminster Theatre, London, for example, is owned by M.R.A., and there they produce plays with the message).

In some places M.R.A. has succeeded in forming yellow unions; in others it has contented itself so far with infiltrating the official unions. Like all such outfits, M.R.A. has a leadership who clearly do well out of it, and a rank-and-file who are equally sincere and believe that they are doing good.

And so they are—for the bosses. All attempts at harmonising social relationships in a class-divided society can help only the class in power. The rank-and-file of M.R.A. may or may not be consciously trying to do that, but their leader, Dr. Buchman, is not so vague. He knows what he is after and we can judge what it is from his statement before the war: "Hitler or any Fascist Leader controlled by God could cure all the ills of the world."

Revolutionary Failure

THE realist, strong with the evidence of all past experience, will affirm that a revolution to end all oppression is a practical impossibility. The idealist, also strong with the evidence of all past experience, affirms instead that history never fully repeats itself and can be constantly impregnated by human will and dreams. The idealist has unlimited faith in the latent possibilities of mankind, and the ethical needs and aspirations stirring in his mind are for him a sufficient token of the reality of such possibilities. The more vigilant and exacting his intolerance of all forms of oppression, the more unlikely is his revolution going to materialize, and it may well be that a revolution ending all oppression is inherently doomed to failure. Faith in a genuine revolution, meanwhile, will give a meaning to his life that nothing else can, and a meaningful life is what matters most. After all, even the most striking success the realist can achieve will not put a stop to history, but will suffer from the instability of all human affairs, and be reversed or superseded, and eventually extinguished. Is it worthwhile, then, to water down and finally dissolve the idealism that gives meaning to a man's life for the sake of a half-revolution that will ensure success only to some revolutionaries, and only by changing them into oppressors? If ideas have to be sacrificed so let all revolutionary activity be sacrificed as well. A revolution that is not against any state *in fieri* as well as the actual state will show a balance sheet in which its antisocial acts will never be compensated by any specific form of oppression it may bring to an end or any economic improvement it may foster.

The success of a revolution is, then, to be measured in terms of meanings, of spiritual realities, and I would even say, of idealist actualism. When a system of oppression has been exploded or overthrown, then and then only is revolution successful. The goal is attained, life exalted, and revolution triumphant. There is no other success to look for while counter-revolution is kept at bay, and no revolutionary party has yet developed enough strength to exert its own oppression. Failure begins when the revolutionary initiative is centralized and monopolized, when it is turned against the revolutionaries and the very classes for whose sake the revolution was made. The struggle against counter-revolution is still part of the revolutionary movement, and perhaps the happiest death is the one met in defending a reality of freedom newly conquered. The saddest death, on the other hand, is certainly the one met for a revolution that has already been betrayed, and in the name of freedom which is known already to be but a mask to the power of a new set of oppressors.

Instructed by the Russian, the Spanish, and other experiences, the anarchist should, in my opinion, refuse to fall an easy prey to the slogan "no enemy on the Left", and will be for a revolution doomed to failure or for no revolution at all rather than for one which under the name of realism and the lure of success will only result in a state of things that will demand another revolution under conditions in which the revolutionary spirit will have been severely mortified, and practically stamped out.

GIOVANNI BALDELLI

FREEDOM PRESS

E. A. GUTKIND :

The Expanding Environment 8s. 6d.

V. RICHARDS :

Lessons of the Spanish

Revolution 6s.

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.

Vol. 2, 1952, *Postscript to*

Posterity paper 7s. 6d.

TONY GIBSON :

Youth for Freedom paper 2s.

Food Production and Population 6d.

Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.

PHILIP SANSOM :

Syndicalism—The Workers'

Next Step 1s.

ERRICO MALATESTA :

Anarchy 6d.

Vote—What For? 1d.

M. BAKUNIN :

Marxism, Freedom and the State.

paper 2s. 6d., cloth 5s.

HERBERT READ :

Art and the Evolution of Man 4s.

Existentialism, Marxism and

Anarchism 3s. 6d.

Poetry and Anarchism

cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d.

The Philosophy of Anarchism

boards 2s. 6d., paper 1s.

The Education of Free Men 1s.

RUDOLF ROCKER :

Nationalism and Culture

cloth 21s.

GEORGE WOODCOCK :

Anarchy or Chaos 2s. 6d.

New Life to the Land 6d.

Railways and Society 3d.

Homes or Hovels? 6d.

What is Anarchism? 1d.

The Basis of Communal Living 1s.

F. A. RIDLEY :

The Roman Catholic Church

and the Modern Age 2d.

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

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

Can You Help Franco's Victims?

WHILE the Government of Franco Spain pursues its negotiations for loans and treaties with at least some representatives of the "Free World", the Spanish police and courts have resumed their systematic persecution of fighters for freedom.

Another group of free trade-unionists, active members of the C.N.T., will have to face a Military Court early next month. Their only crime is that they are inveterate enemies of the Franco régime and have been trying to maintain and strengthen the clandestine trade union organisation, which the dictatorship keeps outlawed. Among the thirteen accused there is the General Secretary, Cipriano Damiano González, and the delegate to the C.N.T. centre abroad, Emilio Quiñones; the eleven others are alleged to have been delegates or liaison officers of the underground organisation in the various Spanish regions. One of them, Pablo Borjas, has already been sentenced in connection with the strikes of last May.

The prosecution demands in some cases the death penalty, in others

imprisonment for life. The presiding Judge, Sr. Enrique Aymar, is notorious for their ruthlessness with which he condemns his political adversaries to the firing squad. There is the greatest danger that the sentences for which the prosecution clamours will be passed by the Judges and carried through—unless the prompt and resolute intervention of free parliaments and democratic governments prevents this. The Franco Government is by no means independent of world opinion, least of all at the present moment of delicate negotiations; the Spanish Military Courts are no independent organs of justice, but instruments of governmental policy. This means that, for instance, questions in the British House of Commons, and a clear indication that public attention is focussed on the proceedings at the Military Court, would have some effect. They may save the lives of our C.N.T. fighters. Is it too much to expect that those who care for freedom and human decency raise their voices, remembering that they enjoy the privilege of free speech for which the political prisoners in

Spain have risked their lives?

The names of the C.N.T. members who are to stand their trial in October are:

Cipriano Damiano González
(General Secretary)

Emilio Quiñones
Celedonio Pérez
Enrique Sanz
Miguel Muñoz
Pablo Borjas
José Aparicio
José Torremocha
Pedro Torremocha
Juan Saña
Ignacio Serra
Benita Bárcena.

In their name, and in the name of the oppressed workers for whom they have been working and living, I appeal for help.

For the Delegation,
M. SALGADO,
Secretary.

Confederacion Nacional Del Trabajo
M.L.E.
Delegacion en Gran Bretana,
11 Minford Gardens Mansions,
London, W.14.

URBAN COMMUNITIES

THE two main aims of an anarchist community venture should be to raise the standard of living of the members by their co-operative efforts, and to act as a propaganda group showing the superiority of an anarchist form of society over the present society.

If, as has been suggested in your columns in recent weeks, a group of anarchists, the majority probably without any experience of, or inclination to, farming, purchase a farm in some out of the way country district and attempt to set up an anarchist community they will achieve neither of these aims.

By retiring to some small rural district they will cut themselves off from the people who might be influenced by a successful community. By taking up farming with the aim of self sufficiency they will almost certainly be forced to accept a lower standard of living than they have at present.

To ask a predominantly urban dwelling group of people to take up subsistence farming far from the urban amenities they are accustomed to, will make the failure of the venture almost certain, however great the initial enthusiasm of the group.

A community venture centred in a town would have a greater chance of success and could also be brought into being by stages. The venture could start by the members moving to the town of their choice where they would follow their own occupations and contribute a proportion of their wages to the community for the purchase of food and clothing, which could be bought wholesale. They could gradually acquire homes near to each other and as their confidence in the venture grew could contribute more of their wages to the community.

a community wanting anarchism before we can get it—and we haven't got that here and now.

Similarly, I have no immediately practicable alternative to the Health Service here and now, which is why I am not so sour about the present one, although I devote a considerable amount of my spare time to propagating ideas upon which an alternative can be based—the ideas of mutual aid, voluntary association and so forth. But unlike S. E. Parker I recognise that our appeal must be couched in terms that will find response here and now, and which are capable of being applied as a beginning. Which is why I am an anarcho-syndicalist, since I believe that offers us our greatest opportunity, and propagate that all those who work in the Health Service should organise themselves along syndicalist lines in order to take over the control of the Service themselves and run it freely, without the bureaucracy and the State.

At this, however, S. E. Parker begins to suffer from pyramids before the eyes (if he will forgive the dying gasp of my witless sarcasm) although I am still waiting for his alternative to anarcho-syndicalism, for which I asked him at least a year ago.

Finally, may I deviate as S. E. Parker himself did, and comment on his attitude to FREEDOM? He tells us that if he wrote every time he disagrees with something in FREEDOM he would need the paper to himself every month or so, but he hasn't the time or the money for the paper and ink that would require.

It is amusing to note, however, that he has the time, paper and ink to write to papers, 2,000 miles away, and to correspond with convinced anarchists all over the world, but not to contribute regularly to a paper on his own doorstep to propagate anarchism to the unconverted under his very nose. The columns of FREEDOM have always been open to S. E. Parker to put forward his conception of Anarchism alongside those of deviationists like J.H. and myself, but he prefers to adopt the rôle of critic and sage, putting us right where we go wrong, rather than pitch in with original regular contributions of his own, to put his ideas before the readers.

Somehow or other the editors of FREEDOM manage to find time to write every week (and to provide themselves with paper and ink) as well as earning a living and carrying out other functions for the movement—the humdrum office work in the background, or the more noticeable public speaking.

For S. E. Parker and the other critics with whom he is not alone, the solution is quite simple: if the writing that you want to read is not appearing in FREEDOM—why don't you write it?

London, October 11. P.S.

The community would in time own the homes of its members and supply their requirements from a community store. By co-operating in this manner it should be possible to achieve a noticeably higher standard of living. This in itself would lead to people viewing anarchism in a more favourable light.

If the community reaches this stage it will be able to attempt more ambitious projects.

Modern houses could be built by the members for the community.

A school could be started for the children which would be run on anarchist principles and which might attract children of non-anarchist parents in the district. A community centre could be established where anarchists and non-anarchists could meet together for social and sporting activities and so inevitably anarchist ideas would permeate to an ever widening group of people. A farm could be bought near to the town which would supply the community with farm produce and would enable those members who like to be out of doors to spend some of their spare time helping on the farm.

This of course is a long-term policy but the establishment of an anarchist community within an established community would have far greater influence on the public than a struggling farm community far away from any centre of population.

Rosendale, Sept 21. W. GREENWOOD.

NO ALTERNATIVE HERE AND NOW

I AM indeed sorry if my witless sarcasm has offended the susceptibilities of S. E. Parker. While assuring him that I have no nerves exposed in his direction, I shall nevertheless try in future to answer his strictures on my straying from the path in the dull and earnest tone which is apparently the only true tenor for the discussion of anarchism.

In the first place, let me point out that I do not defend the compulsive State's organisation of the Health Service. In the paragraph to which S. E. Parker originally objected (FREEDOM 26/9/53) I maintained that "those reforms which should be fought for as an educational practice should be those which carry immediate benefits for workers... the Health Service has meant access to benefits which has improved the well-being and every-day life of millions."

The general trend of my argument was that the greatest value in fighting for reforms came from the experience and self-confidence to be gained by workers, rather than the actual reforms themselves, which I was at pains to point out were temporary and often illusory. That is why I wrote "should be fought for as an educational practice."

Now I still maintain that the Health Service has carried immediate benefits for workers, the old, sick and infirm, and I do not think that one is straining

Anarchist theory to support the actual, physical operation of the Health Service while at the same time criticising, and being opposed to, the bureaucracy and the compulsive methods of payment. In the same way one supports wage claims by workers while at the same time opposing the wage system.

S. E. Parker looks back with nostalgia to the good old voluntary schemes. Last week, correspondent M.P. made some points about those. Here are some more:

The Hospitals Saving Association, of which S. E. Parker speaks so highly, provided one-tenth of the income of voluntary hospitals. Where did the remaining nine-tenths come from? Some came from charity—the flag-days to get pennies from passers-by—and, more spectacularly, the large donations from public benefactors, like Lord Nuffield, who made his millions from the exploitation of his workers. The rest came from local authorities, paid for out of the rates—compulsorily collected!

But certainly, nobody was compelled to pay their threepence a week towards the one-tenth of the cost.

And what a lovely service was provided! Every hospital was begging for funds (except those specially run by wealthy organisations like the Free-

maçons—for Freemasons), every local authority rigidly practising economy. With the result that there is recorded a case from Surbiton where an injured man was left to bleed to death in the street because he was 70 yards on the wrong side of the Urban District boundary and the driver of the only ambulance available had had strict instruction not to cross that boundary!

I do not believe that could happen to-day, but the vastly superior accident and ambulance service that does operate now has to be paid for—and so has every other feature of the Health Service. The threepence a week paid to the H.S.A. voluntarily in the 1920's and '30's would mean an equivalent at to-day's values of about 9d.—which is, I believe, not far away from the amount taken from National Insurance contributions to-day towards the Health Service. The remainder of those contributions go towards unemployment benefit, old age pensions, sick pay, etc., and the rest of the cost of the Health Service is made up out of taxation—much as it was before.

But no doubt S. E. Parker will say all this is beside the point, which is that the N.H.S., being compulsory and organised by the State, is reactionary, and that it would be far better if Health Services were organised by voluntary, mutual aid groups. As an Anarchist (still!) I couldn't agree more about the superiority of voluntary endeavour—when it is organised. But it wasn't and isn't, and since I want to see a Health Service I would rather see it organised as at present than not at all. And it is, as I see it, only those who elevate theories higher than human beings, who would say otherwise.

S. E. Parker asks me if I have any practicable alternatives here and now in place of capitalism (which, incidentally, is not what we were discussing). I'm sorry to say that my answer must be "No". Like S. E. Parker, my alternative to capitalism is anarchism, but I am far too practical to kid myself that it is practicable here and now. We must have

Special Appeal

Sept. 16th to Oct. 10th

Ince: E.H. 3/-; London: L.B. 13/8; Glasgow: A.R. E2; Bromley: C.O.D. 3/-; Hounslow: W.M.E. 10/-; London: A.G. 11/6; Cambridge Anon* 5/-; London: C.J.B.* 2/6; New York: S.G. E3/2/6; Bristol: R.G.W. 6/-; Hayes: N.D. 3/-; Wallington: L.C.M. 3/-; Leeds: J.A.Q. 1/6; Toronto: A.M. E1/16/0; Edinburgh: T.O.M.* 5/-; Park Sympathisers: 9d.; London: Anon 6/-; Glasgow: A.McD* 4/-; Birmingham: A.R.L. 13/-; Torino: G.I. 2/7; Bredhurst: W.S. 6/6.

Total	11 18 6
Previously acknowledged	349 6 8
1953 TOTAL TO DATE	£361 5 2

GIFTS OF BOOKS: Croydon: A.V.; Stroud: L.G.W.

* Readers who have undertaken to send regular monthly contributions.

Is the Health Service Reactionary?

The impression I received from reading the letters of P.S. and John Hewetson was that the N.H.S. was a good thing because it provided something for nothing.

We all know that the N.H.S. is not given free; that the State cannot provide us with more than it has withdrawn from us in taxation, but there are many who do not realize that the Health Service provided is a most inferior article and cannot be otherwise.

The really harmful feature of the N.H.S. is the contract relationship between doctor and patient. The doctor agrees to treat at all times those who are on his list. Good medical attention cannot be given on such a basis.

The adequate treatment of all medical cases requires the time to take a careful history, to make a thorough examination, to explain to the patient, if possible, the reason why his trouble arose and what measures are to be taken to avoid such an illness in the future, and the giving of advice necessary to help him out of his present difficulty.

This procedure which must be gone through with each patient in turn takes time, at the least from half to three quarters of an hour. Any curtailment of the process makes for inefficiency. The mere provision of free medicine, drugs and appliances is the least important aspect of medical practice.

A doctor practicing, as just outlined, could hardly see more than 40 patients daily even if he deprived himself consistently of food and sleep.

In trying to provide such a service, I find the utmost difficulty in limiting the applicants for medical attention to manageable numbers. I find it necessary to turn away the surplus in order to maintain the only standard which I find satisfactory.

Now one cannot turn away a N.H.S. patient; he must be seen because he is on your list. By seeing all, one is forced to cut down on the consultation time, already in the case of most doctors far below the minimum for satisfactory care. I practice outside the N.H.S. and find it the only means of conducting a worthwhile practice. It would probably amaze P.S. and J.H. to know how many patients (many of them poor) will travel long distances to consult a doctor who provides non-N.H. Service.

The haste of patients in 1948 to get spectacles, hearing aids, etc., was not entirely due to a genuine need for these appliances but was due in large measure (as in the case of the crowds who attend sales) to the desire to get something that is going cheap.

I have had the greatest difficulty persuading many deaf people to use the free hearing aids they got in the early days of the service.

In my fifteen years of practice before the inception of the N.H.S., I had never seen or heard of a patient who had been deprived of hospital attention because of lack of means.

I heartily agree with S. E. Parker in his labelling of the N.H.S. as a reactionary measure.

Sutton, Oct. 4 MEDICAL PRACTITIONER.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting
HYDE PARK
Sundays at 3.30 p.m.
TOWER HILL
Tuesdays at 12.30 p.m.

NORTH-EAST LONDON

DISCUSSION MEETINGS
IN EAST HAM
Alternate Wednesdays
at 7.30 p.m.
OCT. 21—ANARCHISM, COMMUNISM & CHRISTIANITY.
A Symposium on the "Prometheus" Article.

TYNESIDE ANARCHIST GROUP

A group has recently been formed in this area and will hold meetings on alternate Sundays at 7.30 p.m. at the home of D. Boon, 53, Louvaine Place, Newcastle-on-Tyne to whom enquiries should be addressed.
The first meeting will take place on October 10th at 7.30 p.m.

GLASGOW

OUTDOOR MEETINGS
from now until further notice
at
MAXWELL STREET,
Sundays at 7 p.m.
With John Gaffney, & others

LONDON

"The Anarchist Way to Combat Religion"

A talk on the above subject will be given by PHILIP SANSOM to the National Secular Society (West London Branch) on SUNDAY OCT. 18, at 7.15 p.m. at the "LAURIE ARMS", (Crawford Place, Edgware Road, W.1.) Admission Free. Discussion.

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