

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Freedom cannot be granted.

It must be taken.

MAX STIRNER

Vol. 15, No. 3

January 16th, 1954

Threepence

Eisenhower's The "State of the Union" Speech

DEPRESSION IN UNITED STATES

FOR many years now FREEDOM has been pointing to the connexion between war and economy based on production for a market. Some readers may find such repetition wearisome, but the existence of such a link constitutes too powerful an influence on the lives of populations for us to neglect or forget or underestimate it.

The ending of the war against Germany and Japan brought some relief from the pressures of a war economy that had lasted for six years. But it very soon began to create problems of lack of incentives to production. The outbreak of the Korean War came just in time, and especially for America, for it partially restored a war economy, and provided Wall Street with a much needed stimulus.

During the course of the Korean War, FREEDOM drew attention to the problems which the 'threat of peace' raised in the minds of financiers and economists. Now the shooting war is virtually ended, depression is openly expected in America, and President Eisenhower, in his State-of-the-Union speech outlined measures designed to prevent an undue slump.

This speech contained some remarkable expressions of language. Thus Eisenhower's measures are directed towards stimulating private enterprise trading during the immediate future when government-spending is expected to drop by as much as £4,300 millions. These measures are clearly necessary because the economy no longer receives the stimulus provided by the war in Korea, and therefore expects a depression. But Eisenhower called this proposal "a transition from war-time to a peace-time economy". So it is, but as the president spoke of it, one might have thought it a beneficial

change to capitalist economy instead of anti-depression manœuvres. And he declared that "American economy was one of the wonders of the world", again a remark capable of two opposite interpretations.

The nature of capitalist depression was concisely hinted at as production at levels exceeding demand. "Referring to production of crops at levels far exceeding demands, Mr. Eisenhower said they could impose still greater acreage reductions or permit the market price to have a greater influence on the planning of production by farmers. The second was the sound approach." (Daily Telegraph, 8/1/54). The president then went on to underline this process which describes in a brief nutshell the nature and dilemma of capitalist economy.

"To make it effective, surpluses must be insulated from the normal channels of trade for special uses. These uses would include school lunch programmes, disaster relief, emergency assistance to foreign friends, and stockpiling. The aim

was to move food into consumption instead of into storage!"

Thus the "surpluses" are to be used to relieve one kind of poverty or another. Yet they arise from production "far exceeding demand". Demand of course does not mean need; it means capacity to buy. "Surplus" means unsold materials, not an excess left over after all needs have been met. Such purely market views of demand and surplus naturally lead to the solution proposed: the use of such goods for distribution to those whom the economic system makes needy—trying to give with one hand what is taken away by the other.

These language disguises however do not alter the reality—that the Eisenhower administration expects economic depression and that that depression is precipitated by the ending of the Korean War. Nor is the corollary less plain: that another way out of economic slumps (compare 1929-1939) is to go to war again.

(see Editorial, page 3)

HIGH LEVEL DISCUSSIONS IN BERLIN

THE antics of the Big Four representatives in Berlin cannot but make us smile. We are always being reminded by the believers in government that amongst the disadvantages of the Anarchist society would be the time taken over decisions. Only by some form of centralisation can decisions be taken speedily and effectively, they say.

Now on January 25 a Four-Power conference is due to take place in Berlin to discuss the German problem. As we write the four Berlin commandants have so far spent fifteen hours discussing... what? The agenda? Of course not. They have been discussing *where* to hold the conference. And after fifteen hours they had not reached agreement!

It is worth quoting from the *Manchester Guardian's* Bonn correspondent on this fiasco:

"Yesterday's meeting of the commandants was as futile as that which took place on Thursday, and eight hours of wrangling did not bring agreement any nearer. The commandants will meet again to-morrow.

At each of the two meetings which have already been held the Western Powers have offered two possibilities—

either that the conference should take place in the old Allied Control Council building in the American sector of the city or that only one in every four meetings should be held in the Soviet sector. In spite of earlier Allied statements that the place of the conference was "of little importance," it seems clear that the Western Powers will make no further concessions to the Soviet point of view.

Mustering all sorts of obscure arguments—including, it is believed, theories that the conference should be in East Berlin since the Soviet headquarters in Germany were there and it was a "capital city" in its own right—the Russians have asked first for all meetings to be in their sector and latterly for 50 per cent. of the meetings to be held there. The Soviet Commandant, General Dengin, has maintained that the best place for the conference is the Soviet Embassy in the Unter den Linden."

Moreover it appears that General Dengin wants all streets leading to the Allied Control Council building cordoned off by police. East German "People's Police" should assist in this operation, and officials of the Soviet secret police should be allowed free access into West Berlin while the conference is taking place.

MORE PAY FOR POLICEMEN

ONE more instance of the apparent contempt with which the Government regards the industrial working class was provided last week.

At a time when productive workers are being refused wage increases—or insulted by unacceptable offers—on the excuse that the country cannot afford them, the decision has been taken that the police are to get an increase of around £1 per week per head.

Through their appropriate association (hardly a trade union, since no-one could call police work a trade) the police had asked, like the engineers and the railwaymen, for an increase of 15 per cent. But unlike the engineers they were not turned down completely; unlike the railwaymen they were not offered a meagre 4s. a week.

No, these important members of our community have been awarded by the Police Council a larger rise than has been awarded to any other group of wage or salary earners (one cannot call them workers) for a very long time, with one exception—the judges!

The following are the pay increases, and what policemen in the various grades will now be paid:

CONSTABLES get £45 a year more—bringing their pay up to £445 a year when they start, rising to £550.

SERGEANTS: £50 a year more (£590 rising to £635).

INSPECTORS (outside London): £55 a year extra (£700 to £745).

CHIEF INSPECTORS (outside London): £55 a year extra (£790 to £830).

POLICEWOMEN, in each grade, get 2s. in the £ less.

Certainly, this is not quite what the policemen asked for. 15 per cent. would have brought an extra 24s. a week to a junior constable and 42s. 6d. more to a senior chief inspector. What the pay rise has done is to increase the pay of the raw recruit to the police by a higher proportion than that of the higher ranks.

This has been done in order to try and attract more men and women into the Force. Throughout the whole country the police are about 10,000 short of the desired strength, and the Home Secretary is very concerned about that. By the time a policeman has climbed to the rank of inspector or chief inspector he has, through length of service, more interest in the pension he is shortly going to enjoy, than in looking for a more congenial or better paid job.

The newcomer to the Force, however, faces 25 years of service before its security pays off, so that there is a greater wastage through resignations during the first few years than later on. And it is in order to try and get men and women into the police in the first place that a constable's wage has been made so attractive.

For where else, and in what *productive* occupation, could an unskilled and inexperienced new recruit start at nearly £9 a week at the age of 20? And for so little work and so little contribution to the wealth of society?

Not only is the pay good, but there are allowances as well. Not many productive workers have their working clothes provided by their employers. The police do. Uniforms are free, and so are two pairs of boots a year. Accommodation is provided at very reasonable rates in section houses, or if they live out, an allowance is given above their wages.

Not only pensions, after they have served their time, are provided. Welfare schemes and sports organisations are maintained on a scale none but the biggest private employer can match. In fact there are lots of inducements for

the young man and woman of to-day to join the forces of law and order.

But they don't. People are just not joining the police in sufficient numbers to satisfy the authorities, and those that do tend not to stay.

One very good reason is the increasing unpopularity of the police. This is not wishful thinking, for no less an authority than Sir John Nott-Bower, Commissioner of Metropolitan Police has said that the London policeman is losing his popularity—and we can only assume that the same applies to all large towns (and most small ones, too).

It is, of course, not altogether the policeman's fault. He has, says Sir John, "to enforce laws that do not altogether have wide public support"—an understatement, some would say. And Sir John instances the betting laws and traffic and parking regulations that provide the officious copper with plenty of excuses to be annoying to "otherwise law-abiding citizens".

It is really much deeper than that. To-day the words "Police State" have for all of us a very sinister meaning. This country has fought one war and is preparing another against Police States. Although by the usual definitions, Britain does not yet fall into that category, the consciousness that the State is creeping more and more into all our lives and

that first arm of the State is the police force, contributes to a growing dislike for them. Fewer and fewer Britons to-day think of Britain as a free country—and the police are the physical expression of the encroachments on our liberties.

This new pay award will only add to their unpopularity. It will not be lost upon the productive workers that while their standards of living are being reduced, those of the unproductive servants of the State are being raised.* And since everybody knows that there are big wage disputes on the way, "labour troubles" on a bigger scale than for many years—there may be sinister motives behind attempts to increase the police force just now.

The police do not exist merely to combat crime. They are a *class* force. A weapon of the ruling class. An enemy of the working class. Strike breaking and the protection of strike breakers is a duty of the police—and undoubtedly Sir David Maxwell Fyfe, Home Secretary, wants to have enough thugs at his disposal should that possible general strike materialise.

There is an old saying—"The Devil looks after his own". The State does the same. P.S.

*Pay increases for industrial workers are expected to be dependent upon increased productivity. How are the police to increase their productivity?

. . . But Lock-Out for Electricians

WHILE the police have been given a substantial increase in pay just for the asking—as far as we can see—the electricians are being forced again into a series of strikes in order to gain a wage increase.

As they had announced, the Executive Committee of the Electrical Trades Union called out a number of its members on Monday in a repetition of the guerilla tactics of last September. What has happened to aggravate the situation however is that the employers organisation (National Federated Electrical Association) has announced that it will retaliate against the strikers by locking them out after the strike for a period equal to the duration of the strike. For every day on strike, the men will be locked out a day.

This action is a very foolish one by the employers—who have in fact acted in a foolish way throughout most of the dispute. They had appealed to the Minister of Labour to intervene by sending the dispute to arbitration, but they have immediately afterwards embarrassed the Minister's position by announcing the lock-out.

It has also, of course, stiffened the attitude of the workers, who see the em-

ployers' threat not as an attempt to lessen the effect of the strikes, but to extend them.

Since October the situation has altered somewhat in that the employers have now in fact made an offer to the union—but one which they consider to be quite unacceptable.

The union have made it known that they will settle for 3d. an hour more. (Their original claim was for a "substantial" increase). On a 44-hour week this makes 11s. The employers' offer is of 14d. an hour (5s. 6d. a week), everywhere except on the South Coast, *but* a reduction in overtime rates from time-and-a-half to time-and-a-third.

Continued on p. 4

ANOTHER WANDERER

A 16-year-old Indian orphan who stowed away on October 25 has now travelled 20,000 miles on the Polish liner *Batory*. He cannot land anywhere—he has no papers to prove nationality. His ship docked at Sunderland yesterday.

A court action has been started in Bombay to make clear the position of the orphan, Ahmed Ali Mansoor.

—News Chronicle, 8/1/54.

Yugoslavia

Heading for a Party Purge?

A rift has appeared in Yugoslavia's Communist leadership. The party's executive committee in a special announcement last week attacked Milovan Djilas, the Yugoslav Vice-President and the country's leading Marxist theoretician, for a series of articles he has been publishing on communism and democracy. The announcement said of Mr. Djilas's articles, which have been appearing in the leading Communist newspaper *Borba*: "They were basically opposed to the opinion of all other members of the executive committee, to the spirit of the decisions of the sixth party congress, and to the decisions of the second plenary session of the central committee of the Communist League of Yugoslavia."

The following are some of Mr. Djilas's statements in the article:

In our country only the steady progress of democracy is capable of settling class conflicts and diminishing differences between classes.

The struggle for power in a revolutionary manner is senseless not only because it is unrealistic but because it is counter-revolutionary.

The law courts and the police must no longer allow the interference of the Communist party in the administration of justice such as has happened in the past.

Local party organisations "bureaucratically and unnecessarily" mobilised citizens forcibly last summer to hear Marshal Tito's speeches.

Many party members did not know what to do under present circumstances and were cut off from the masses. The Yugoslav Communist party must be flexible and move with the times, remembering that old theories—while good in their day—could become outmoded under new circumstances.

This week he made an attack on the "caste system" which, he said, had grown up among the leading party and Government functionaries and their wives—especially the wives. He told of a young actress who married a senior Yugoslav leader and was snubbed and vilified by

his comrades' wives because she was "not one of us".

The executive committee said the articles "created confusion in the ranks of our party". Djilas had failed first to discuss his ideas with other members of the executive committee. Furthermore, he had continued to publish his articles in spite of the fact that after the first one some of his comrades had called his attention "to the evident damage the articles would cause to the development of the League of Communists and of the building of socialist democracy in our land."

The next session of the party's central committee would discuss Djilas's case, the communiqué added. Djilas had meanwhile said he would suspend the publication of the rest of his series.

Mr. Djilas, who is 42, has been a Communist all his life. During the war he was a member of Tito's supreme partisan headquarters.—*Reuter*.

★

One wonders whether the Party objects only to Mr. Djilas' "westernised" ideas, or whether what has particularly created confusion is his exposure of the corruption within the party and the revelation that once one scratches the surface one finds that Communist Parties—that is authoritarian parties—are all the same whether they are Moscow stooges or "independents".

We can imagine that those British "socialists" who have been wined and dined by Tito (as well as some who have gone there under their own steam) and who came back to tell us how different things were in Yugoslavia, are going to have a difficult time explaining away "comrade" Djilas' revelations. The simplest way out for everybody would of course be a Beria-la-Tito, even if it leaves a rather bitter taste. But political memories are short when necessary!

THE HOMOSEXUALS

In brief I tell thee, that all these were clerks.

Men of great learning and no less renown.

By one same sin polluted in the world.

(Dante, "Inferno", XV).

MALE homosexuality in these last months has received greater attention in the press than hitherto, and a few sensible things have been said about it openly and bravely. More still need be said, however, if thought and reflection have to be knocked into public opinion, and sympathy and intelligence take the place of slimy complexes and panic-like reactions. For public opinion is neither public nor opinion, but in this as in many other cases the behaviour of a mind alienated to the collective and not stopping at anything in order not to lose the collective's approval. Leaving to psychoanalysts to account for the mechanism underlying such alienation, I wish to put forward a few general observations based as much as generalities permit on reason and experience.

First of all then let it be stated that there is nothing monstrous, devilish or degenerate about a homosexual. He may be abnormal or, rather para-normal, but normality is not particularly natural, angelical or true-bred. It shrinks and stretches in space and time like the social conventions from which it can hardly be separated. Normality is not morality, and homosexuality is no more against nature than onanism or contraception. Symptomatic of the confusion or lack of ideas in those who hate homosexuality is to call it beastly and against nature in one and the same breath, as though to

act like a beast were not more according to nature than to act like a man. But he he man or beast, the homosexual lives in the only universe and by the only nature we know, the same as anybody or anything else, and there can be nothing in nature against nature itself. Nor does he necessarily run counter the one obvious purpose of the species, for he may have wife and children, while other men have wife and no children, and others have neither wife nor children without being homosexuals. The evangelical precept of doing unto others as you would like to be done unto you, or the Kantian maxim bidding always to act in such a way that your action can be taken as universal norm cannot be proffered to homosexuals by religious and moral authorities who fail to proffer them to soldiers when they are given a gun and sent to war.

A second point is that there are as many types of homosexual relationship as there are ways of loving a woman. They range from an intermittent series of quickly aroused and quickly satisfied desires to the most elaborate and spiritual adoration. More truly, each type of relationship that avoids the dangers of both standardization and stagnation goes through several phases. It is a venture and an adventure, with lyrical moods and dramatic moments, expansion in dream and contraction in disappointment. It has shame and joy, glory and humiliation, mystery and triviality, tragedy, humour, comedy and romance, everything in short that may make the love and the story of a boy meeting a girl. The only difference is that the boy and girl may and do get married, and that marriage, even in our irreligious society,

has still the power of a sacrament. The carnal-pleasure basis of the heterosexual relationship is safeguarded, wrapped up in innocence and virtue, and no profanation of it in word or thought is permitted to any outsiders.

With no social consecration, the carnal-pleasure basis of the homosexual relationship is instead exposed to any kind of profanation. If in talking of a married couple you are expected to expand on any aspect of their relationship except the one for which the matrimonial bed was invented, when you talk of homosexuality you must always have in mind or obviously keep off your mind its physiological aspect. No wonder, then, that this socially ostracized, homosexuality becomes among certain of its adepts a kind of secret religion with its own sacraments and abhorrences in antisocial retaliation.

If loathing and hatred are clear enough reactions towards an act to which it is comforting to think homosexuality can be reduced, the scorn and ridicule meted out to its anodyne manifestations show a morbid interest, and uneasiness of judgment and alibi of conscience revealing deeper issues than one is prepared to face. Are there what we may call the secondary characters of homosexuality to be expected as a matter of more or less uniform course, once the paranormality of a certain act is there, or is this act a kind of precipitation, not necessary or indispensable at that, of something in that civilizational solution in which the salt and sweetness of all our values are suspended? It so happens in fact that it is precisely in those professions and vocations which are most esteemed and considered the glory and

hope of our civilization that homosexuals are often found, people of many talents, superior intelligence, exquisite sensitiveness and impeccable manners. No wonder that many, women especially, should be frightened into not thinking about homosexuality. They would like the problem to be abolished, so difficult it appears to solve and difficult it is to understand. Homosexuals are a danger or, at least, a warning sign of danger, the seemingly natural fruit or undreamt-of blossom of a social tree one knows to be one's own, and too old to be transplanted. It is the subconscious conception of society as a tree and not as a forest, together with the shallowness and provincialism of modernity in habits of thought that are responsible for a real fear of the homosexual as an image of what man can be, and who knows, probably will, perhaps even should be. Was not homosexuality rife in all civilizations of the past, and in direct proportion to their splendour? There are then cyclical theories about civilizations, and although the point has not authoritatively been made, there seems to be a close connection between homosexuality and civilizational decay. Sodom and Gomorrah perished in fire, and every civilization that followed their example called for the mortician or for the surgical intervention of the barbarians.

Sodomy, if anything, is a sign of virility, vigour and health. It was practiced by Spartans, Arabs, and many a glorious army. But homosexuality is not the same thing as sodomy, it can go with or without sodomy, and at any rate the homosexuality to be associated with ripeness and over-civilization has no military qualities but springs from softness, delicacy, meekness, from all the feminine virtues and graces. It is not men who hate women who become pederasts, but men who jealous or secretly, supremely worshipful

of them, try to be like them and do so not only by imitating their ways, their charm and their tricks of seduction, but also, concomitantly or alternatively, by upholding and cultivating the most precious feminine values. It will generally be found that homosexuals are for luxury and ornament against poverty and bareness, for art over utility, the creative against the destructive, gentleness against violence, love against hate, peace against war. Male homosexuality in its modern prevalent form is no more a form of decadence than is the cultivation of any feminine value. Incidentally I may mention that great misapprehension of reality and much needless suffering have been caused by following Nietzsche in his emphasis on masters' and slaves' moralities when the contrast was primarily one between masculine and feminine values. Male homosexuality is the expression of a feminine protest. In a world bent on repressing tenderness and making a cult of toughness, male homosexuality is an extreme but natural rebellion or protection of a human nature not born for a climate of violence, of a mind steeped in the cultural inheritance of the past and knowing of better things than the aridity and plastic flora of the present age; it is part or incident of a wider rebellion, that of heart and brain against brawn. When women dress like men and adopt masculine habits and attitudes of mind, when some of them do everything to forget their sex or merely use it as an instrument of power, for sadistic satisfactions to be reaped from the sexual weakness and foolishness of men, male homosexuality looks almost like a kind of civilizational compensation and redress.

With this I do not intend to present homosexuals as superior beings and the salt of the earth as they like to think of

Continued on p. 3

WE pointed out at the beginning of these notes that Malatesta could not be described as a "professional revolutionary" though throughout his life the social revolution was always in the forefront of his thought and activity. At an early age he had rid himself of his wealth, distributing some among poor people and using the rest for propaganda, and when at the age of eighteen, he abandoned his studies at the university, in order to "go to the people", he decided to learn a trade which could provide him with his daily bread. He joined his internationalist friend Agenore Natta in the latter's workshop in Florence

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

OPEN 10 a.m. to 6.30; 5.0 SATURDAYS

New Books . . .

The Golden Bough

Sir James Frazer (abridged) 25/-

The Bolshevik Revolution (Vol. 3)

E. H. Carr 36/-

Sex in History

Gordon Re Tray Taylor 21/-

Workers' Councils

Anton Pannekoek 6/-

Reprints . . .

Straight and Crooked Thinking

R. H. Thouless 2/-

Good English

C. H. Vallins 2/-

Better English

C. H. Vallins 2/-

The Wayward "Bus"

John Steinbeck 2/-

Pastures of Heaven

John Steinbeck 2/-

Cup of Gold

John Steinbeck 2/-

Thieves in the Night

Arthur Koestler 4/-

Second-Hand . . .

Bread and Roses

Ethel Mannin 3/6

Women and the Revolution

Ethel Mannin 6/-

Comrade, O Comrade

Ethel Mannin 3/-

English Captain

Tom Wintringham 3/-

Holy Deadlock

A. P. Herbert 2/6

The Idiot Teacher

Gerard Holmes 3/6

Deserts on the March

Paul B. Sears 3/-

Memories and Portraits

Ivan Bunin 3/-

Kings, Lords and Gentlemen

K. H. Abshagen 3/-

The Case of Comrade Tulyayev

Victor Serge 3/6

Adversary in the House

Irving Stone 3/6

Authority and the Individual

Bertrand Russell 2/6

Periodicals . . .

Resistance (December) 3d.

The Glass (No. 9) 2/-

Poetry & Poverty 2/-

Obtainable from

27, RED LION STREET,

LONDON, W.C.1

Notes for the Malatesta Centenary—5 MEANS AND ENDS

where he acquired his skill as a mechanic, and it was in the capacity of electrician, fitter and general mechanic that Malatesta earned his living for more than half a century. Wherever he stayed for any length of time his tool-bag went with him. In Paris, Florence, in Buenos Aires and London he earned his living thus, and when in 1922 the fascists succeeded in preventing the continued publication of the daily anarchist paper *Umanità Nuova*, Malatesta, who was its principal editor, found himself a small workshop in Rome and, though in his seventieth year, resumed his trade as a mechanic. Only when in 1926 a gang of fascists raided and smashed up his workshop did he accept the economic solidarity of his comrades, which had never been lacking had he been prepared to accept it, and which besides providing him with his physical needs was for Malatesta, a source of warmth during those remaining six years virtually of house arrest, during which Mussolini's régime sought to isolate him from all outside contact while boasting that the "dangerous anarchist Malatesta" was not in prison.

It would be a mistake to interpret Malatesta's "independence" as masochistic or by any other of the fashionable terms which might be used nowadays to describe his life as a manual worker. He had very definite ideas—and very sound ones—on the question which he expressed in a letter to Bertoni from London in 1913:¹

"With regard to your observations on the question of 'living on propaganda' I will tell you right away that for me it the question of 'living on propaganda' I will tell you right away that for me it is rather, if I have any remorse it is rather because I am wasting my time on jobs, often unpleasant and useless, for well-to-do people, and which would, in any case, be done willingly by many who are without work, when I could be devoting much more of my activity to our cause, which is after all everybody's cause.

"It is the practical aspect of the matter which worries me; it is the effect that it can have on our propaganda. You know how many rogues push themselves into the syndicalist, socialist and anarchist movements to live on them; and you know that at the bottom of almost all the scissions which have torn asunder our camp, and that of the others, are questions of money and a rivalry of shopkeepers.

"Like yourself, I must be in a position to intervene wherever necessary, against this pestilence of paid and permanent secretaries, of professional organisers, etc. And to be able to do so no one must be in a position to assert, or suggest, that I do like the others. You appreciate that I could not reply, even if it were true: 'I am older than you and more important [to the cause].'"

On the other hand where his full-time activity was demanded by the comrades, not only in Italy but anywhere in the world, and Malatesta felt that he could be of use, he would temporarily close his workshop and accept financial help. Even then he preferred to "turn to personal friends who would do for me what they would otherwise not do at all, and in this way it will not be at the expense of our propaganda".

PERHAPS Malatesta might have been the exception that proves the rule that the apparent advantages to be derived from full-time political organisers and agitators, are always offset by the creation of a bureaucracy, an Executive remote from the aspirations of the rank-and-file, and, in revolutionary movements, the growth of political opportunism. There is more than a tendency for professional politicians and revolutionaries to consider their followers—as well as the people as a whole, as a means to an end, only paying lip-service to their ultimate well-being and happiness. And the ruthlessness, and lack of concern for questions of humanity, are as apparent in the actions of revolutionary and political leaders, as in the military campaigns of generals bent of winning battles at any cost.

For Malatesta it was impossible to divorce the struggle from the human values on which his whole concept of anarchy was based. As his biographer puts it: ". . . [for Malatesta] it is not humanity that must subserve a principle established a priori, but it is instead the principle that must serve for the salvation of humanity. For him the principle was valid so long as it benefited mankind. If its application would have been harmful to it, this would have meant that the principle was mistaken, and one should therefore abandon it."²

When he wrote: "I would give all the principles [in the world] to save a man!" or on another occasion, "If to win it were necessary to set up the gallows in the public square, I would prefer to lose!" Malatesta was again demonstrating that his means and ends were not abstractions, political theories, systems, but human beings.

It would be as wrong to portray Malatesta an incurable sentimental and optimistic dreamer as to go to the other extreme indulged in by capitalist journalists and the writers of police fiction who described him in the most lurid terms as a revolutionary conspirator and terrorist.

Malatesta always maintained that the power of the possessing classes could only be destroyed by violence, but he never advocated violence as an end, nor did he seek to inflame passions to isolated acts of violence. Thus, though hopeful in 1920 that the situation in Italy was ripe for the armed insurrection of the working people, and all his activity in that period was therefore directed to this end, he deplored the armed skirmishes between fascist gangs and anti-fascist workers which took place at a later period, and sought to discourage such activity, because he felt that nothing but misery and hatred would result. *Hatred and revenge* were alien to his ideas of revolutionary struggle. For him the anarchist programme must be based on "solidarity and love", and extend "beyond justice".

This concept—contained in his well-known essay on Kropotkin—was questioned by Luigi Fabbri in a letter in which he suggested instead that "anarchist-communism does not go beyond, but towards a justice ever more just and noble (*superiore*)". Malatesta replied in words which are both profound and moving:³

"Obviously in such a matter any disagreement between us cannot be other than a question of words. Nevertheless allow me to explain to you how I understand the word justice.

"Strictly speaking, justice means giving to others the equivalent of what they give you; it means the *l'échange égal* of Proudhon; it means reciprocity, exchange, proportion, and consequently it implies

calculation, measure. Its symbol is the pair of scales. 'A justice ever more just' gives me somehow the impression of a straight line ever straighter, or of a circle ever rounder.

"Love instead gives all it can, and would always wish to give more, without counting, without calculating.

"In economics to give to each according to his work would correspond to justice; to give to each according to his needs would be more, and better, than justice.

"In a society ideally just it would be necessary to have the exact measure of each person's worth; it would be necessary to calculate how useful each person is to the rest in order to measure the total benefits which it is his right to receive in return.

"Tolstoy says somewhere: 'If you cannot do to others that which you would wish that they should do to you, at least do not do to others that which you would not wish them to do to you.' Which could be interpreted: if you cannot be good at least be just. *Not to do to others that which you would not wish them to do to you* is justice; *doing to others that which you would wish they should do to you* (that is, the maximum of good) is what the Christians call charity and what we call solidarity: in short, it is love.

"I was once on the point of writing an essay with the title: 'The idea of justice as the cause of social evils'. The title might perhaps have appeared paradoxical, but I believe that it would have been somewhat justified by facts.

"It seems to me that there are in the human mind two opposing feelings: the feeling of sympathy, of love towards one's fellow beings which is always a factor towards good, and the feeling of justice which is the continuous cause of struggle, because each person considers just that which best suits him.

"Whoever has taken possession of the land considers it just that whoever wants to make use of the land should pay him rent. The conqueror, since he has had the strength and the ability to win, considers it just to rule over the conquered. The individualist (the super-man) thinks it just that others should submit to him because he is worth more than they. The authoritarian communist and the fascist will say that since the individual is a social product, it is just that he should be subjected to Society and thus to the State which claims to represent it. The inventor . . . But why continue? Even the cannibal must have felt in his troubled conscience, that it was just to kill and eat the vanquished, since the same fate would have been his had the rôles been reversed . . ."

V.R.

(To be continued)

¹Published after Malatesta's death in *Il Risveglio* (Zurich) No. 859, Oct 22, 1932.

²Luigi Fabbri, *Malatesta, l'Uomo e il Pensiero* (Naples 1951) p. 25.

³Published in *Volontà* (Naples) Vol. VII, No. 9-10, Dec. 15, 1953.

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 15, No. 3 January 16, 1954

FREEDOM DESTROYED FROM WITHIN

ELSEWHERE in this issue the equivocations employed by President Eisenhower in speaking of the anticipated American slump are discussed. But the president of the United States employed even more flagrant double-talk and double-think when he spoke of internal security.

"We should recognize by law," he said, "a fact that is plain to all thoughtful citizens—that we are dealing here with actions akin to treason—that when a citizen knowingly participates in the communist conspiracy he no longer holds allegiance to the United States."

But having spoken specifically of Communism, he then went on to demand much more general powers of repression. "He therefore asked Congress to enact legislation to provide that an American citizen convicted of conspiring to advocate the overthrow of this government by force be treated as having renounced his allegiance to the United States and forfeited his citizenship." A government can interpret many an action or speech, from simple strikes to any expression of revolutionary opinion as "conspiring to advocate the overthrow of the government by force". It can also cover all sorts of doubtful police activity as the following comment (from the *Observer* 10/1/54) shows:

"The most surprising part of Mr. Eisenhower's State of the Union message was his proposal in future to deprive convicted American Communists of United States citizenship. This creation of a class of Stateless persons is an unusual practice, and it is somewhat doubtful whether it can be reconciled with the spirit of international law. In the same context Mr. Eisenhower called for additional legal weapons against subversion and new measures to deal with the question of claimed immunity; this seems to mean the legislation of evidence obtained by wire-tapping, and the restriction of the right to refuse evidence in self-incrimination."

The President was plainly in earnest, and so were Congress when they received this suggestion (and it was the only part of the speech to receive it) with prolonged and unanimous applause. For the very same day Senator Margaret Chase Smith introduced a Bill to give effect to the proposal that Americans convicted of subversion be deprived of citizenship. Loss of citizenship means deportation for a naturalized American. For an American-born it means that he may not vote, hold public office, serve on juries, or acquire a passport.

Such proposals clearly induce a state of fear-ridden anxiety in every refugee from totalitarianism who has secured American nationality. They constitute the thin end of a wedge whose broad end is found in such countries as the Soviet Union or Fascist Spain.

But they also carry that implication that there can be no higher allegiance than devotion to the government. Eisenhower described his proposals as the *defence of freedom*, but such freedom is clearly freedom to agree with the government, a freedom possessed by every Soviet citizen. It is a statement that every individual belongs to the State. When the American Constitution was framed the idea was that the government of a democracy was there to express the will of the people, and it therefore expressly provided that the people had the right to overthrow the government, if necessary by resort to arms.

To deny that right is completely authoritarian and means that a people languishing under, for example, the Soviet or the Nazi dictatorship

have no right to revolt and overthrow the tyranny from within. Eisenhower is tacitly accepting the totalitarian thesis that everything belongs to the State.

It has been suggested that the President is seeking to steal Senator McCarthy's thunder (is devotion to the Vatican, by the way, to be a ground for loss of citizenship?). We quote once again the *Observer's* comment:

"Apparently the President's intention is to take the wind out of Senator McCarthy's sails. Unfortunately, opponents of Mr. McCarthy who fight him by trying to outdo him must, in the process, themselves weaken the fabric of their State's civil liberties. Nor is it much comfort that thought-control and persecution are directed only against Communists, for such measures can easily spread; once they have become part of the accepted public life of a country, nobody is as safe as he previously was. In another part of his message Mr. Eisenhower spoke of the threat presented to American freedom by the Communist conspiracy. It is tragic that he does not see that the more immediate threat to American freedom now comes from practices introduced in the name of anti-Communism."

It would be a too simple explanation, however, to say that President Eisenhower and the U.S. Congressmen are simply enemies of freedom, advocates of totalitarianism. They are supporters of government and of the economic system which requires a government for its operation. The world of nation states and of international rivalry breeds just these sorts of "practical measures" and encourages the idea that all those who are not with us are against us.

Many people as well as anarchists find this trend and these ideas distasteful and dangerous. The fact is that there are higher allegiances than to one's "own" government, and that it is not particularly ethical or advanced to accept the nation-state as an eternal verity. Allegiance is more properly given to the people of the world in general and to the idea that they can and should live together in co-operation, amity and peace. In pursuit of such allegiance, men may find themselves supporting the oppressed and the deprived against oppressors and the powerful-through-wealth. Such views are the only decent views to hold in the world as it is to-day: but they are the kind of views—even though they intrinsically exclude that vicarious patriotism known as Communism—which in America expose those who hold them to the risk of losing their citizenship.

During the Nazi days, many of the best Germans chose to shake themselves free from a nationalism so revolting. If America proceeds much further down the McCarthy-Eisenhower path, the government may be shocked to find that an increasing number of the best individuals renounce their citizenship without waiting to be deprived of it. But if this happens, where in our world, are they to find haven?

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. cloth 5s.

The Political Philosophy of Bakunin: Scientific Anarchism, compiled and edited by G. P. Maximoff. (Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois).

AT last, in the volume under review, we have a large and representative selection of Bakunin's writings in an English translation. Up to the present we have had to be content with *God and the State*, which is not Bakunin's most important work by any means, and a few odd snippets of translation that have ap-

peared in various periodicals or biographical works on Bakunin. To translate and publish a collected edition of Bakunin's entire works in this language would have been a great task which, in these days of costly printing, would probably have been beyond the resources of any anarchist group or any independent publisher; the French edition contained six volumes, and even that was not complete. The next best thing is an adequate selection, and this is an arrangement more advantageous in the case of Bakunin than it might be with many other theoreticians, for Bakunin was an

extremely prolix writer and much of his work because of the very circumstances of intense activity under which it was written, had a rather ephemeral character. Even to the scholar, a study of the whole of Bakunin is a much more arduous task than the study of, say, the whole of Kropotkin, who was much more of a natural writer. We should therefore be grateful to the late G. P. Maximoff for the task, to which he devoted so many years in his later life, of preparing this volume which, within its four hundred pages, does contain the essential Bakunin. Only the specialist will need to go beyond.

AN IMPORTANT BAKUNIN VOLUME

Having said thus much in welcoming the volume, it may be appropriate to make a few comments on its presentation, and on some aspects of Bakunin that are revealed therein. Firstly, let me begin with the cover; one notes with a certain discomfort that the publishers have chosen to announce it as "a comprehensive selection from the writings of Marx's great historical enemy". In the present political situation I feel that this over-emphasis on the negative side of Bakunin's philosophy is unfortunate; Bakunin was indeed one of Marx's enemies (or perhaps opponents would be a better word), but he was also, as becomes evident when we get inside the dust cover, a social thinker with a very positive philosophy of his own, and the basic struggle of his life was against social oppression of every kind; the fight against Marxian absolutism was only incidental to this main struggle.

At the same time, while the publishers announce Bakunin as Marx's "great enemy", a leaf is taken out of Marx's own book when Bakunin is also announced as the advocate of "scientific anarchism". What meaning does this phrase in fact have, if we ignore the uneasy connotation which is produced by the echo of Marx's boast of "scientific socialism"? I imagine that Maximoff intends to suggest that Bakunin, in shaping his theories, took into account the scientific developments of his day. But have not all the other important anarchist thinkers been conscious of the scientific climate of their own time? Some of Godwin's acutest insights, for instance, were into the possibilities of mechanical development which were offered by science in his own time, while one has only to read Proudhon's *The Creation of Order* to see what a remarkable understanding of contemporary scientific developments this self-educated printer had attained. To-day the science of Godwin and Proudhon is outdated; so also is that of Bakunin, and a student of modern biology would have no difficulty in shooting some pretty big holes in the crude evolutionary assumptions which often appear in these pages. It therefore seems inexact to give his particular view of anarchism a title which suggests that it was more "scientific" than that of other thinkers. A further unfortunate aspect of this title of "scientific anarchism" is that it tends to link Bakunin with the science cultists of his time, who imagined with rosy optimism a salvation of the world by the scientist which would parallel Plato's dream of the golden age of the philosopher kings. Nothing, indeed, could be farther from Bakunin's point of view, and indeed, one of the

aspects of his writing that reveals his particular clear-sightedness is the intense distrust with which he regarded the pretensions of the scientists. We must consider their revelations, he contended, but we must also resist their attempts to dominate us. And how acutely prophetic of the irresponsibility of scientists in our own day were these remarks:

"Though we can be almost certain that no scientist would dare to treat a man to-day as he treats rabbits, nevertheless there remains the fear that scientists as a body, if permitted to do so, might submit living men to scientific experiments, doubtless less cruel but none the less disastrous to their human victims. If scientists cannot perform experiments upon the bodies of individuals, they are eager to perform such experiments upon the collective body, and it is in this that they must be unconditionally stopped."

As a last illustration of Bakunin's sound and healthy view of science, it may be worth remarking also that he himself regarded art as performing a more important function:

"Science," he said, "cannot go outside of the realm of abstractions. In this respect it is vastly inferior to art which, properly speaking, has to do with general types and general situations, but which, by the use of its own peculiar methods, embodies them in forms which, though not living forms in the sense of real life, none the less arouse in our imagination the feeling and recollection of life. In a certain sense it individualises types and situations which it has conceived, and by means of those individualities without flesh and bone—and consequently permanent and immortal—which it has the power to create, it recalls to our minds living, real individuals who appear and disappear before our eyes. Art therefore is, as it were, the bringing back of abstraction to life. Science, on the contrary, is the perpetual immolation of fugitive and passing, but real life on the altar of eternal abstractions."

On the basis of this text, one might with some reason contend that Bakunin was not a *scientific*, but an *artistic* anarchist. In fact, of course, either label would be inexact, since what is really significant about Bakunin is the *wholeness* of his attitude towards life.

This volume is brought into the world with a great scholarly apparatus; there is a preface by Bert F. Hoselitz of the University of Chicago, there is an introduction by Rudolf Rocker, and a Biographical Sketch of Bakunin by Max Nettlau. The last is indubitably the best, and enhances the volume by giving, in twenty pages, a clear and condensed account of Bakunin's life and his place

Continued on p. 4

The Homosexuals

Continued from p. 2

themselves among themselves in moments of unchallenged and undisturbed euphoria. If all is not dung in them, it is neither all gold. There are features sticking to the homosexuals which, whether they be classified as masculine or feminine, are not attractive in the least, not creative, not releasing, not needing a traditionally or institutionally inspired morality to be repressed. To a more poignant and characteristic degree than other specimens of the human fauna they are often divided and at war with themselves for by internalizing and endorsing the social condemnation and then failing to live up to it, they inoculate their passions and anything they do with the poison, perhaps the seasoning of a bad conscience, they cheat and lie to themselves. In other cases they develop a conceit of themselves beyond all reasonable proportions, and are capable of great contempt for the human kind. Often also, as do heterosexual lovers, they treat a human being as a mere instrument to their sexual satisfactions, and their love, far from shining with the light and colours Plato lent it in one of his dialogues, is mean

and grasping, covetous and close-fisted. Worst of all, especially in particularly adverse economic and social circumstances, their character may be so tried and weakened that there takes place a real disfiguration of their human form as everything they talk about or do in the presence of others is only a screen, a mask or a decoy to hide their only preoccupation, and nothing and nobody is to them of genuine interest that is not in some way connected with their homosexuality.

The blame for this last trait, however, is to be laid at the door of those people who make or accept a society callous and stupid in its hostility to homosexuals. Homosexuals are human beings, and society and nobody in the name of society has any right to make them suffer unnecessarily. To understand the plight of a homosexual you need not be a homosexual yourself. It is sufficient to have experienced political or racial persecution, and it is ominously the same traits that are manifested both in the anti-homosexual and the anti-semitic.

GIOVANNI BALDELLI

Fabianism and the Managerial Revolution

(The Fabian Society has recently celebrated its 70th anniversary. Although at the outset it included anarchist as well as state socialist elements, it soon replaced any revolutionary objectives it may have avowed by the doctrine of 'the inevitability of gradualness'. In the article below an attempt is made to assess the significance of Fabianism in the light of the emergence of what James Burnham has called 'the managerial society' and to interpret the tasks of the future in the light of this assessment).

WHEN the future historian comes to write the history of the managerial social revolution in this country, he will undoubtedly assign a prime rôle to the Fabians. To them belongs the credit for preparing the way for the peaceful emergence of the new ruling class by the elaboration of a 'socialist' ideology which could, at one and the same time, enlist the sympathy of the proletariat without antagonising those elements of the old capitalist class which were to be enrolled in the new ruling class of managers.

To-day, as always, the membership of the Fabian Society is limited to a few thousand middle class intellectuals but the Society has never estimated its success in terms of membership figures. Its criterion of success has ever been the extent to which its ideas have permeated political parties and the Labour Move-

ment, and, judged on this standard, no one can deny its victory. British Socialism, except for the Communist and other minor elements, is essentially Fabian Socialism.

No Class Struggle

Fabianism has sometimes been regarded as essentially a tactical method—the method of permeating other bodies with the object of furthering Fabian ends—but the superficiality of this view is obvious. Tactics presuppose doctrines and in the light of the emergence of the new social order the leading ideas of Fabianism may be characterised as follows:

First and most obvious is the rejection of the theory of the class struggle which assigns to the proletariat the chief rôle in the achievement of the free, classless, socialist society. The popularity of the early Fabians, as E. R. Pease, the historian of the Society has suggested, was in no small part due to their freeing British Socialism from revolutionary ideas and diverting it into constitutional paths, thereby making it respectable for even the middle class 'do-gooders' to profess a belief in socialism. The Fabian Society began and has continued as essentially a middle class movement, with middle class men and with middle class ideas and prejudices. No one will deny that the Fabians have often displayed a

genuine sympathy for the poor and the oppressed, but however much they were for the working class they were never of it. To the Fabian working class has always appeared at best as a rather stupid helpless child who requires an intelligent guardian to protect him.

The second and equally important Fabian doctrine is the acceptance of the bourgeois democratic state as a suitable instrument for the achievement and application of socialism. No essential change, the Fabians argued, was necessary, as the Marxists thought, in the apparatus of government. Much less was it necessary, as the anarchists believe, to destroy the whole conception of the modern centralised State. To break the State machine, said Shaw with a characteristic glibness, is tantamount to Luddism: "I regard machine breaking as an exploded mistake. A machine will serve Jack as well as his master if Jack can get it out of his master's hands. The 'State Machine' has its defects; but it serves the enemy well enough; and with a little adaptation, it will serve us quite as well as anything we are likely to put in its place." (*To-day*, Sept. 1887).

All that was required was for the people to gain control of the machine through the use of their votes and to perfect it for their own ends. With the acceptance of the democratic State went the tendency to identify it with the community. Such an identification made it possible to regard State control and State ownership as control and ownership by the community in the interests of 'the community as a whole'.

Nationalisation Welcomed

The Fabian rejection of the class struggle and their attitude to the State inevitably had important repercussions on their theory of socialisation. The revolutionary socialists and anarchists, grounding their theory on the prime importance of the ownership of the means of production as the source of power of the ruling class, were led to draw a distinction between capitalist public ownership and genuine socialisation. The capitalists as a class, however much certain interested sections of them might be hostile to particular acts of nationalisation, were not averse to, and indeed supported, a limited extension of it in those services which were natural monopolies and which were of great importance to the functioning of private industry—notably communications, transit and power.

Such nationalisation could be welcomed as increasing the general efficiency of private industry, as providing a secure

and profitable field for investment, and as producing surpluses which could be used to relieve national and local taxation on property. The extension of public ownership by a capitalist controlled State could, therefore, only mean the strengthening of capitalist domination.*

The Fabians, in contrast, showed themselves far less discriminating. Every extension of public ownership and control they welcomed as a victory for the community over the capitalists, and socialism became practically equivalent to the extension of State power and ownership. The original 'Basis' of the Society is a revealing document. Its stated object was not, as the revolutionary socialists would have put it, 'the emancipation of labour through the socialisation of the means of production', but instead 'the emancipation of land and capital from individual ownership'. This more limited object betrays the fact that the Fabians from the outset were far more markedly anti-capitalist than pro-labour.

Consumer Control

The fourth essential Fabian doctrine was the theory of the limited rôle of workers' organisations in a socialist society. The acceptance of the bourgeois State machine with its location of sovereign legal power in Parliament entailed the corollary that any institutions the workers built up should be subordinate to it. The early Fabians neglected to study the main working class organisations—the Trade Unions and the Co-operatives. Sidney and Beatrice Webb, however, soon made up for this deficiency and in so doing laid down the broad principles which should govern their functioning in a socialist society. Socialism, they decided, meant essentially paramount control by the consumer. Producers' co-operatives, for long the ideal of 19th century socialists, were ruled out as liable to be anti-social as well as being impracticable.

Consumers' co-operation naturally had a part to play in the field of distribution, but elsewhere it suffered from inherent limitations which only the State could overcome. The function of the Trade Unions was to represent the interests of the producers vis-à-vis the consumers. The extent of Trade Union control was, however, to be strictly limited to a partial control over the conditions of work. In no circumstances was it to extend to interference in the productive side of business management.

Managerialism

The fifth and perhaps most significant Fabian idea is the notion of the peculiar importance of experts—the administrators and the managerial elements. As one historian of socialism has so naively put it, Fabian Socialism "saw in the middle class a group that could be utilised in developing the technique of administration on behalf of the new order" (Laidler: *Socio-Economic Movements*). The early Fabians included a high proportion of upper Civil Servants and not unnaturally stressed the importance of efficient bureaucratic administration. Early Fabian literature contains no hint of the elective control of officials—a plank in the programme of the Social Democratic Federation which the latter got from Joseph Lane's Labour Emancipation League. On the contrary, officials were to be appointed from above by the State after examination, and controlled only indirectly by the community through Parliament. Pre-1914 Fabianism appears as essentially bureaucratic socialism and was attacked as such by the syndicalists and the guild socialists.

After 1918 the emphasis on political bureaucracy disappears to be replaced by

*This revolutionary distinction between capitalist nationalism and socialist nationalisation, however useful in the past, is now outmoded in most advanced industrial countries. Nationalisation no longer serves the interest of the capitalists and its further extension spells their extinction. The important distinction is between nationalisation, whether 'capitalist' or 'socialist', and a form of socialisation which ensures workers' control.

Exeter Readers Please Note

Will the comrade in the Exeter area (or who was in that area in early December) and who wrote to the "Libertarian Society, Manchester University", please write to the undersigned, c/o *Freedom Press*? The writer has been advised that the letter appeared in the mail rack at the University Union for a couple of days before being removed by a person or persons unknown. All attempts to trace it have proved unsuccessful. The only clue is an Exeter postmark. Counter-sabotage?
Manchester, Jan. 2. V. MAYES.

a growing emphasis on the importance of the managerial elements in a socialist society—a change which coincided with the abandonment of the concept of nationalisation through a Government Department on the model of the Post Office in favour of nationalisation through semi-independent public corporations which are much less amenable to public control. But from the beginning the Fabians had not neglected to woo the managers. Accepting explicitly the development of modern large-scale industry, they underlined, as early as the *Fabian Essays* of 1889, the growing distinction between the capitalist owners and the salaried managers, the latter performing the indispensable function of organising production while the former, through their property rights, simply laid claim to profits, rent and interest. The progressive development of industry from individual ownership and management to joint stock companies and trusts indicated, they argued, that the next step, as each industry became 'ripe' for control, was the elimination of the capitalist owners, the State taking the place of the shareholders "with no more dislocation . . . than is caused by the daily purchase of shares on the Stock Exchange" (Sidney Webb). The managers were further reassured by the categorical statement that there would be no nonsense about equality of wages. The Fabian Society, declared one of its tracts (No. 70, 1896), "resolutely opposes all pretensions to hamper the socialisation of industry with equal wages, equal hours of labour, equal official status, or equal authority for everyone." Management, it was later pointed out, is, or is fast becoming, a specialist technique, and its profession must be organised as such and paid its appropriate reward. (Webb: *The Works Manager To-day*, 1916).

With this high regard for bureaucratic and managerial administration went a characteristic managerial ideal—that of social efficiency, an ideal, which, if it has always found expression in socialist literature, has previously been subordinate to the more human values of freedom, mutual aid and social co-operation. The Fabians above all emphasised the economic advantages to be gained from a collectivist economy—the replacement of the 'anarchy' of competition by planned production and the elimination of wasteful unemployment and poverty through the establishment of a national minimum standard of life. The total effect of Fabian doctrines was thus to transform socialism from a moral ideal of the emancipation of the proletariat to a complicated problem of social engineering, making it a task, once political power had been achieved, not for the ordinary stupid mortal but for the super-intelligent administrator armed with facts and figures which had been provided by diligent research. G.N.O.

(To be concluded)

Letter

Ethics & 'Sending a Man to Coventry'

I HAVE considerable respect for the practical outlook, and contributions to Anarchism, of Philip Sansom, and in his article on *The Ethics of the Boycott* he has faced the 'Coventry' issue pretty squarely; but I must express the strongest disagreement with his conclusions.

It is partly true that sending a man to Coventry does not deprive him of life and liberty (it does deprive him of the liberty of living a full life), but it shares with the worse excesses of the State the property of being punished, the deliberate infliction of something unpleasant to stop a man or others from repeating a certain act because of fear of punishment (in fact Sansom seems to urge on a retributive view in saying the workers 'expressed their contempt' in sending the man to Coventry). In this case too the man is being punished for the negative 'crime' of putting his own interests first, and refusing to take certain risks (of poverty, etc.), rather than for a positive 'crime' like stealing or coshing.

Sending to Coventry is also an instance of the majority compelling the individual, and indeed compelling conformity of thought (though Sansom doesn't make it clear whether he thinks those whose opposition is conscientious should not be boycotted). The fact that this sort of compulsion exists at present is no answer, though it is valid enough to a *tu quoque* against orthodox leader-writers. The view that people are 'bound' to get hurt (and so it doesn't much matter) until

Electricians

Continued from p. 1

This would have the effect of lessening the increase. For example, on the 44-hour basic week the increase would be 5s. 6d., but on a 48-hour week, it would be only 3s. 6d. and on a 50-hour week, only 2s. 6d.!

Most electricians at work put in a 48-hour week, and on the jobs which we are told are of national importance—the atom sites, oil refineries, steel works, etc., where the guerillas are being called out—there is always plenty of overtime.

The employers offer, then, is, as Frank Foulkes, president of the E.T.U. rightly said, a humiliating one, and the union are quite right to reject it.

The union's plans for their guerilla strikes were kept secret until the very day they began, and although the N.F.E.A. boasted they knew where they were going to take place, there was nothing they could do about it anyway.

Foulkes went up to Scunthorpe, where on a steel-works construction job the electricians have said they weren't going to strike. The Press tried to find some comfort from that by talking of a "split" but in fact what the Scunthorpe men wanted was a complete national stoppage—not the small guerilla ones!

The Press are not making such a fuss about the Communist allegiances of the E.T.U. executive this time. The provocative actions by the employers have shown where the blame for the dispute really lies.

Utopia arrives seems very dangerous; hasn't Russia been saying the same thing for 30 years? Anyway the boycotting can hardly be described as spontaneous when a similar fate threatened anyone who defined it.

Surely all these things fly right in the teeth of Anarchism, which, as the political movement which gives most respect to individuals, must utterly reject '100-percentism'. This last point seems to me of the greatest importance, and even if the Allcocks and Hewitts retard the workers' interests, isn't it much better that they should be retarded, rather than corrupted on the lines so familiar in the last half-century?

I hope FREEDOM will give considerable space to this question, which seems to touch the basis of the whole Anarchist outlook and system of values.

Birmingham, Jan. 5. A. R. LACEY.

Bakunin's Writings Continued from p. 3

activity came to an end. How devastatingly prophetic, for instance, is this passage on the reality behind the Marxian theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

"According to the theory of M. Marx, the people not only should not destroy the State but should strengthen and reinforce it, and transfer it in this form into the hands of its benefactors, guardians and teachers, the chiefs of the Communist Party—in a word, to M. Marx and his friends, who will begin to emancipate it in their own fashion.

"They will concentrate all the powers of government in strong hands, because the very fact that the people are ignorant necessitates strong, solicitous care by the government. They will create a single State bank, concentrating in its hands all the commercial, industrial, agricultural and even scientific production; and they will divide the mass of people into two armies—industrial and agricultural armies under the direct command of the State engineers who will constitute the new privileged scientific-political class."

At the same time, Bakunin was not without his curious blind spots. Most of his positive ideas came from Proudhon—his anarchism and his federalism alike spring from that source—and he seemed also to have imbibed—though in a much lesser degree—some of the negative ideas which marred Proudhon's thought. True, he negates Proudhon's anti-feminism, but at the same time he retains an attitude towards the education of children which modern anarchists will find it hard to comprehend, and which is totally inconsistent with his general libertarian doctrines. He talks, to begin with, about "obligatory" education, and then proceeds to a specious and astonishing justification of the use of authority in the school:

"The principle of authority in the education of children constitutes the natural starting point; it is legitimate and necessary when applied to those of tender age,

at a time when their intelligence is still not in any way developed. But inasmuch as the development of everything, and consequently of education, implies the gradual negation of the point of departure, this principle must gradually diminish in the same measure in which instruction and education advance, giving place to increasing liberty.

"All rational education is at bottom nothing but the progressive immolation of authority for the benefit of freedom, the final aim of education necessarily being the development of free men imbued with a feeling of respect and love for the liberty of others. Thus the first day of school life, if the school takes pupils at an age when they have just begun to prattle must be that of the greatest authority and almost total absence of liberty, but its last day must be that of the greatest liberty and the absolute abolition of every vestige of the animal or divine principle of authority."

Life does not move according to such neat Hegelian rules, and there is no age at which the imposition of authority is not liable to have a detrimental effect on the development of children; indeed, the younger they are, the less able are they to cope with it. It is strange indeed that Bakunin, who saw that human societies could not reach liberty through authority, should have imagined that human beings could do so.

But it is the whole of a man's career and teaching that we have to consider when we make our final estimate of him, and in that process, while we cannot ignore Bakunin's unlibertarian attitude towards education, any more than we can ignore Proudhon's anti-feminism or Kropotkin's bellicosity in 1914, it is evident that his total importance as a fighter and an important thinker in the struggle for freedom much more than counterbalances his inconsistencies. To the present selection we are indebted for having given us the material to judge Bakunin's achievement from every side.

GEORGE WOODCOCK.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting

HYDE PARK

Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

NORTH-EAST LONDON

DISCUSSION MEETINGS

IN EAST HAM

Alternate Wednesdays

at 7.30 p.m.

GLASGOW

INDOOR MEETINGS

every Friday

at 7.30 p.m.

at 200 Buchanan Street.

Speakers: Mark Kramisch, Hugh McCutcheon and others.

JAN. 22—Giovanni
GROWING A BEARD.
JAN. 29—Thomas Mullin
EDUCATION OR DEVASTATION.

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