

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 15, No. 4

January, 23rd, 1954

Threepence

## PURGE IN YUGOSLAVIA

FREEDOM'S comments last week on the rebukes offered to Milovan Djilas, the President of the Yugoslav Parliament, and leading theoretician of Tito's party, have been fully borne out.

Djilas exposed corruption in the Party's hierarchy, held the sacred Marxism-Leninism up to criticism, attacked the Party for intervening in the judiciary—all very much in line with the "democratic decentralizing" line of the Party since Tito turned to the West. The speed with which the Party have closed in on him perhaps indicates that Djilas' line was receiving an altogether too friendly reception from the Yugoslav people. A *Reuter* report dated Jan. 13 declares that back numbers of the newspaper *Borba* (the official paper) and the current issue of the periodical *Nova Misao* in which the offending articles appeared, are to-day unobtainable in Belgrade.

The Central Committee expelled Djilas on Sunday, 17/1/54 after a 15-hour session.

"The session was opened yesterday afternoon by Marshal Tito, was resumed early this morning, and concluded only at 8 o'clock this evening. Subsequently, publication of part of the stenographic report showed that the Marshal and Mr. Kardelj, who has been largely concerned with the constitutional and organizational changes carried out in Yugoslavia in the past year, were the principal spokesmen in the repudiation of the views presented by Mr. Djilas in the *Borba* articles which are at the root of the present rift in the leadership.

"Referring to one of Mr. Djilas's oft-

### Human Angle Story

AN agency report from Innsbruck tells of action taken to obtain a rare drug which alone could save the life of a boy slowly dying from haemophilia:

"A drug which was taken 4,500 miles from Detroit, Michigan, by special plane and car in an attempt to save an eight-year-old boy from slowly bleeding to death, turned out to be the wrong serum on arrival here to-day. The correct serum was found later at Westover Field, Massachusetts, where it had been mislaid. It is now being flown to Innsbruck while doctors fight to save the life of the boy, Gottfried Eder, who has been suffering from haemophilia since he had a tooth out on January 2.

Austrian doctors urgently appealed for some anti-haemophilia globulin—a rare drug and the only one which can help in such cases. The United States Embassy in Vienna contacted the Michigan State Laboratory, Lansing, near Detroit, and a United States Navy-plane left Massachusetts with a drug for the boy yesterday. It flew through bad weather to Frankfurt, Germany, where another United States plane carried it to Munich and an American Consulate car took it to Innsbruck over snow-covered mountain roads. It was the wrong drug.

Meanwhile doctors are keeping Gottfried Eder alive by giving him transfusions from fresh plasma."

For those of us who remain optimists as to the eventual future of mankind, in spite of all the misery and cruelty and indifference that surrounds us to-day, such news items tend to confirm our optimism. And the fact that they find a place in the news columns of the Press, surely points to the fact that even in that hardened world of journalism in which gloom and disaster are their stock-in-trade, it is felt that such drastic action (which if all things were measured in terms of money, as they generally are, would be impossible), will meet with universal approval, and no one will question the expense involved and say that it was money wasted.

While in Kenya 5/- is paid for every African shot dead, no effort is spared to save the life of an unknown little Austrian boy. How paradoxical is man's behaviour! And how impossible to be dogmatic about "human nature" being bad—or good. We obviously have the power to be either!

expressed themes, Marshal Tito claimed that he had been the first to speak of the 'withering away' of the party, but he had never said that 'this should be in six months' or a year's time.' It was destined to be a long process, and before the last 'class enemy' was defeated and a 'Socialist consciousness' had gained a hold on the broadest mass of citizens there could be no 'withering away,' no slackening of the party's responsibilities.

"He saw in Mr. Djilas's articles questions of 'democracy at any price' and formulations of a revisionist character which met with 'special approval' in certain quarters in the west. This, in fact, was revisionism of the worst type, said Marshal Tito—it was 'putting back the clock' of revolutionary history instead of turning it forward, and Mr. Djilas had moved away from his comrades in order 'not to speed up Yugoslav development but to hurry it back into the past.'

"Mr. Djilas's error, said Marshal Tito, had been to preach an 'abstract democracy' sufficient unto itself, a democracy which really represented anarchy, whereas for Communists democracy was a means

for the achievement of the main aim, Socialism; for there was no genuine democracy without Socialism, and *vice versa*. To preach democracy for the sake of democracy, and moreover of the western formalistic type, was a reversion to the past and old social forms.

"Marshal Tito said that opponents of Yugoslav Socialism in the west, as well as the 'unhealthy elements and reactionaries' who in recent days had 'started to raise their heads,' had rejoiced over the theories advanced by Mr. Djilas, who had appeared to some people as the 'flag bearer of democracy' in Yugoslavia. It was true, the Marshal added, that Yugoslavia was drawing closer to western democracy, but not on questions of her internal system but in matters of co-operation on the foreign political plane." (*Times*, 18/1/54).

It is fortunate for Djilas that Tito is orientated towards the West: he will not be executed. Less prominent deviationists who do not have an international limelight on them, may expect less leniency however.

## UKRAINIAN NATIONALISM v. RUSSIFICATION

### More Implications of Beria's Fall

THE three hundredth anniversary of the "union" between Russia and the Ukraine is being celebrated with great ceremony in the Soviet Union. The celebrations serve both to reduce tension between Moscow and the Ukraine and to conceal its existence. They have been discussed at considerable length by the biographer of Stalin and Trotsky, Isaac Deutscher, and reveal some at least of the underlying meaning of the fall of Beria.

Ukrainians have always had vague nationalist aspirations, usually—as is so often the case with nationalism—as a reaction to foreign rule. Thus the "Union" three hundred years ago came about when the Dnieper Cossacks in revolt against the Polish nobles, and at the point of defeat, decided to beg for the protection of the Tsar. Of course this manoeuvre was no more than a change of masters, not of serfdom, and their leader, the Hetman Khmelnytsky, lamented it before his death.

Since that time nationalism has never been far below the surface in the Ukraine, and is a powerful force in present day Russia. Deutscher points out however that the situation is very different to-day from even the fairly recent past. The Ukraine is not now a land of scattered and more or less helpless peasants. It has a vast population and enormous industrial resources. These are outlined by Deutscher in the medium of quotations from an important speech by Beria at the Nineteenth Party Congress in October, 1952.

"Read in the light of later events that speech seems much more significant than it might have appeared at the time. Beria's main theme was the economic and cultural development and growth of the non-Russian Republics of the U.S.S.R.. He drew, *inter alia*, a striking balance of the industrialization of the Ukraine, and he compared its results with the economic condition of two old, and great, western European nations, France and Italy, which between them have a population more than twice as large as that of the Ukraine."

"He pointed out that the Ukraine, although devastated by two invasions within the lifetime of a single generation, was already producing more pig iron than France and Italy taken together; more steel, both crude and rolled, than was produced in France, and over three times as much as was produced in Italy. Her coal output was about 50 per cent. higher than the combined French and Italian output; and her engineering plants turned out tractors the total capacity of which

was three times as large as that produced jointly by the French and Italian plants. In addition, the Ukraine produced much more grain, potatoes, sugar beet, and sugar than was grown on the fields of both France and Italy.

"This was not just one of the usual statistical boasts of Soviet propaganda. Beria indicated the important place the Ukraine had come to occupy on the economic map of Europe. Present-day Ukraine is not just the old, proverbial 'granary', coveted by Germany, or merely the supplier of raw materials to Russian industry. The Ukraine is also one of Europe's greatest manufacturing industrial centres, comparable to western Germany rather than to France.

"This is all the more remarkable because the Ukraine's recovery was painful and slow in the first post-war quinquennium, as the following index of Ukrainian industrial activity shows: 1940—100; 1948—70; 1949—87; 1950—108; 1951—135. The change in the outlook of Ukrainian agriculture is best seen from the fact that the Ukraine has now only about 16,000 large-scale, highly mechanized collective farms of an average size of 6,000-7,000 acres each. The educational progress is characterized by the fact that over 40,000 students graduate from Ukrainian academic institu-

### THE 'ELECTRICIANS' STRIKE & LOCK-OUT

AT the time of going to press, the position in the electricians' dispute is that the week of guerilla strikes has been successfully carried through, with strikers varying from 1,000 to 2,000 every day.

The one-day stoppage on last Monday has also taken place, the union claiming nearly 100 per cent. success, with 35,000 men out all over the country. The employers have repeated their threat to lock out all those taking part in this one-day strike and the union has retaliated by threatening another one-day national strike if the lock-out is carried through.

The E.T.U. gave instructions to its members to ignore the employers' lock-out, and to go into work as normally. This is possible on many sites, owing to the scattered and decentralised nature of the contracting side of the electrical industry, and where foremen and charge hands are themselves union members.

At the time of writing, however, no reliable information is available as to the success of this tactic—nor can we guess what will happen on pay day!

The struggle is still a ding-dong one, with no very clear view possible of the outcome.

## The French and Italian 'Crises'

### THREE BOOS FOR DEMOCRACY

THE series of French government crises since the beginning of the Fourth Republic, which has made good democrats everywhere wring their hands in despair, has provided an entertaining spectacle for anarchists. The rise and fall of successive French governments has acquired something of the inevitability of the tides, and although predictions about this political phenomenon have not yet acquired the precision of an exact science the prognosticators are steadily gaining in accuracy. There is already speculation about the probable duration of Mr. Laniel's government, and it is a safe bet that it will not survive much longer.

In Italy there has until recently been an appearance of greater stability, and Mr. de Gasperi's governments, although resting on a narrow majority of votes, seemed more secure. Mr. Pella seems to be less fortunate. Not only has he been hard pressed to keep his ramshackle coalition going; he has had to contend with such twists of malignant Fortune as the crossed lines that led to the accidental broadcasting of a secret meeting of the back-room boys in his shadow cabinet,

"To argue with a man who has renounced his reason is like giving medicine to the dead."

—THOMAS PAINE.

which cast a sudden shaft of light on some of the democratic jiggery-pokery that goes on out of sight and sound of the public. But there was even worse to come. After a careful recount and double check it was found that the wrong party had been awarded the majority at the last election. True, this decision has been arrived at as a result of reassessing the spoilt ballot papers (and disqualification because of a lipstick smear here and there seems rather like quibbling), but even so it must have been rather a shock to those simple Simons who regard the democratic racket as an infallible means of carrying out the will of the people.

Both France and Italy have proportional-representational systems of voting, which are supposed to result in the election of candidates in more or less the proportions that the population as a whole divides into politically. This is regarded as more equitable than a straight knock-out contest, but it leads to a greater number of political parties. This in turn means very often that no one party gets a clear majority with the result that a coalition of parties is needed to form a government. It seems that this is an even greater drawback than the more unfair system of a straight fight with its "wasted" votes; and the Italian politicians altered their system so that the party that secures most seats is automatically given a bonus of additional seats in the hope that this will give it a big enough majority to form a government. As the wrong gang received the bonus at the last share-out we can understand the heartburning among so many Italian deputies.

A true system of proportional representation, of course, would not leave the anarchists out in the cold but would ensure that the proportion of non-voters would be represented by a corresponding reduction in the number of seats. The politicians could well afford to do this, as no matter how few of them were elected we can be sure that they would continue to make as big a botch of things as ever.

The whole theory of representative government is so full of absurdities and inconsistencies, however, that no amount of refinements will ever make it just. Even an incorruptible politician, if there were such, could not possibly represent the widely varying personalities of his constituents: still less could he reconcile the conflicting interests that divide and bedevil our present society. In practice he represents some of the interests (including his own) of some of his constituents; and the purpose of an election is to give the public a limited opportunity to favour some interests at the expense of others. The limits are determined by the politicians themselves, and the elector finds himself compelled to choose between alternatives that have already been decided upon by the various political parties. And unless he is very shrewd he is likely to mistake the promises and pledges of election time for the intentions of the respective candidates.

The constructors of the United States political system recognized the conflict of interests and tried to resolve the problem by creating a balance of power with checks at different levels. For this reason presidential elections take place between congressional elections, and the result is often that the president is of one party and congress of another. It was hoped that when this happened neither side would be able to be too extreme.

In Russia, than which no country could be more democratic (or so we are told), the conflicts between different interests take place behind the scenes, and any balance of power has to be inferred from the events that take place. The Russians are to have an election on March 14. The outcome is awaited with considerable interest, some commentators holding that the Communist Party will win, others that the Communist Party will be elected. We can be sure of one thing, however: whoever wins, the common people will, as always, lose.

### Response in the Provinces

Beria, one may guess, supported nationalism and opposed centralization not because he was a democrat, but because his own power was derived from the development of backward areas. He no doubt sought to use the chafing of the people against Moscow rule to strengthen his position against the Party man Malenkov, whose power lay in the centralizing apparatus.

Continued on p. 4

EDWIN PEEKE.

# PEACE AND WAR

## Readers' Viewpoint

### Towards Anarchism

THE anarchist movement has long been the object of derision and distortion; particularly by those who see in its existence a constant threat to their selfish ambition for political power, for despotism can never be paramount where the voice of dissension remains to be heard. Political office-seekers might well afford to deride the smallness of the anarchist movement, but size is no more the measure of effectiveness, than truth is the prerogative of majorities.

True enough we have no blue-print toward Utopia, neither do we set ourselves up as legislators of a paradise to come; but we can claim that such measures of freedom that remain with us yet are due in no small part to the vigilance of the anarchist movement, and the spirit of libertarianism it has struggled to keep alive. Had matters been left entirely in the hands of politicians and their legislative bodies, the entire enslavement of mankind would have long since been an accomplished fact.

But beneath what appears to be the submissiveness of man to the dictates of his political masters, there lingers the element of doubt in their political integrity. The primitive instinct of man—his love of self-assertion and independence of action—cannot be completely eclipsed by blind subservience to another's will. Whilst the natural instinct for survival makes co-operation between men desirable, the coercive measures of political power must inevitably incite militant reaction, and the more tyrannical those measures of coercion the more violent is that reaction likely to become.

The omnipotence of the State will continue to be accepted only insofar as its mouthpiece, the politicians, can successfully keep its subjects deluded by a sense of helplessness. To this end the people are intimidated and cajoled, re-

strained from the trouble of thinking for themselves, and sapped of individual initiative.

Yet, somehow, some people continue to think for themselves. Here, perhaps, is the weakest link in the armour of the State, for even though it deprives us of our liberty it cannot deprive us of our thoughts—but try it will by every possible means to mould our process of thinking.

All science originates in thought. The 'whys' and 'ifs' and 'buts' are the progenitors of universal knowledge. The acquisition of knowledge is likewise a process of disillusionment; it opens the eyes and loosens the tongue. It challenges the authority of dogma, and exposes the stupidity of blind belief.

If for no other purpose than that of stimulating thought, the anarchist movement plays an indispensable rôle in society. It is in this field, more than any other, that the anarchist movement can exercise its greatest influence. That it has already done so, and with marked effect, is confirmed by the growing cynicism toward political and theological dogmas. The political instability of society is indicative of the enquiring mind, expressing the dubiety of the electorate in political expediency being the panacea of every human need. Gone are the days when brass bands and bunting lent colour to elections fought with gusto and bribes. To-day the candidate seeking election has to plead, to beg, to offer the moon in exchange for the boon we could confer upon him by returning him as our "jolly good fellow".

Much the same is happening in the industrial field where the workers are gradually learning that direct-action is far more effective in procuring their demands than the long-drawn-out arbitration conferences which reluctantly concede mere pittance of pacification. The

AS a war ends the world sighs with relief. People in the defeated countries are satisfied that the worst has passed, and that the living are living. In the victorious ones flags, music, fireworks and dancing silence all qualms. The dead, it seems, have died for something, for this great day of flags and dancing.

Even during the war, though friends and relations were lost, homes destroyed and freedom and life taken away, it was great, it was grand while it lasted to fight or dig—to know at least that somebody dug and fought, fought for warships and cradles, and dug for corn and for graves. One almost became a moral being during the war: sacrifice was imposed, (most hard to avoid), and seemed greatly meritorious; one even became generous, having to depend so much on the generosity of others. Finally the

union bosses are being forced to adopt a pretence of militancy, since the workers have grown tired of being told to "be good boys and everything will be alright".

To get people thinking for themselves is in itself a praiseworthy accomplishment. But thought without action must yield a barren harvest. We must shatter the illusions of fools, and expose the trickery of knaves. Where there is blind faith we must introduce doubt; where there is subservience we must encourage revolt!

It is in the awakening conscience of mankind that the revolutionary transition takes place. What we build in men's minds will reflect itself in their institutions. The appeal of anarchism, therefore, is essentially to that of reason.

The liberation of man begins within himself.

Bristol. GEORGE NICHOLSON.

men at the helm, the men in charge, proved worthy of their mandate, and saved the future of civilization and mankind, saved freedom, and millions of lives simply by applying and multiplying improved-upon or newly-devised methods of destroying freedom and lives.

All great and good things, however, soon come to an end. One wakes up one morning to realize with horror that peace has come. A new era has been entered with a different tone and a different tempo which one feels will end all the more imminently the longer it lasts, and all the more devastatingly the more smoothly the end is approached.

A peace cannot be wholesome and durable that is born out of a war. Laws similar to those of genetics seem to link the two together rather than a relationship of cause and effect or mere succession in time. The wrongness of peace comes from its developing within the world of war, and deriving its nourishment therefrom. It is a plant whose seeds are fear and revenge, and the fruit it eventually bears contains seeds of the same kind. The practice of ruthlessness against the enemy in war, and the lesson learnt through this practice, that might and not right can win a war, are applied in the framing of peace against allies defeated or weakened by the enemy as well as against the enemy himself. Governments and nations for whose honour and independence the war is said to have been started are sold out dishonourably into slavery. The security sought after winning a war is security only for the more powerful winners, and moves and agreements by which they try to achieve it are already strategical if not military in character. Security is sought against a menace; means of security relied upon and developed according to the nature and magnitude of a menace that has just been shattered and brought to nought can only raise the spectre and then the reality of another menace of the same nature but of greater magnitude still. This is recent and present history, and its dialectic is so keenly and widely realized that the solution openly or secretly envisaged nearly by all is that of another war ending with the triumph of a single political and military power. There is a proverb saying "as thick as thieves", and not one saying "as thick as murderers". Murderers are likely to fall out. Thieves have not much interest in stealing from each other, but a murderer may have in suppressing his partner, and a similar interest sooner or later imposes itself to states confronting each other at the end of a war.

★

THERE is a strong support in faith and imagination, though none in fact and very little in an honest interpretation of facts, for the view that war is fought for the cause of freedom and justice, or as a large-scale police operation to clear mankind of its worst and most dangerous criminals. It would be

sheer blindness or stupidity to deny that many if not most of the men that do the actual fighting have ideals, and expect from war, from their sacrifice in war what others expect from a revolution. But, even apart from the above considerations, a war fails to fulfil this expectation for the same reasons that a bloody revolution fails: that good and evil never coincide with this or that nation or class, that there is no aggression without injustice and no victory without aggression, that in the struggle innocents are killed and killers must be rewarded and praised, that no past order is liquidated in violence without asking for the new to be liquidated in turn.

The practical man may shrug his shoulders, and the ironist may laugh wryly, but the man who fought in a war with an ideal and just managed to still his conscience by making himself believe that peace would come with victory can neither laugh nor shrug his shoulders. The guilt of his participation in what he saw was organized crime, not the less so for its being allegedly organized against crime, comes up in waves of gory and sordid memories. Then anger seizes him against prime ministers, generals, bishops, pressmen, and all those who deceived him into crime, and he feels pity and disgust for the millions that have been deceived with him and will be deceived once again. Though he may never have read existentialist literature he feels like vomiting when he thinks of mankind, and finds rottenness and absurdity at the bottom of all things. He also finds them at the bottom of himself when he fails to revolt or despairs of rebellion. Eventually he makes the best of a rotten and absurd world, and adds this his little bit to its rottenness and absurdity.

It is indeed not too easy to choose rebellion. Effective, conscience-clearing rebellion means opting for a permanent revolution, not necessarily in the way Trotsky understood it, but a permanent revolution just the same, because as Hobbes warned long ago "WAR consisteth not in battle only, or the act of fighting; but in a tract of time, wherein the will to contend by battle is sufficiently known". Now this tract of time shows no limits and no breaks, and if the will to rebel against war does suffer limits or breaks, then it is defeated *a priori*, and will be defeated in fact in each instance.

It is much easier to trust one's leaders, and hope for the best. After all, does not one hear them and any person reputed competent and in authority proclaim the necessity, the desirability and possibility of genuine, lasting peace? Each month that passes may see the piling up of more and more deadly weapons, and international relations harden and be more densely woven with mistrust, hypocrisy and bad faith, but the average man cannot afford to despair or even doubt his leaders when they have all the power, and presumably all the competence in the world. Nobody but

Continued on p. 3

## REVIEWS

### 'Red-Baiting' in the U.S.A.

THE SURE THING, by Merle Miller. (Penguin, 2/-).

This is a novel about "red-baiting" in the U.S.A.

More precisely it is a study of the downfall of a senior Civil Servant in the State Department when it is discovered that he was once for twelve months a member of the Communist Party. It does not draw any obvious moral, but sets out the disruptive effect of suspicion, distrust and fear on personal relationships. It represents the frightened conscience of American 19th century liberalism, afraid of the 20th century phenomena of thought-control and enforced orthodoxy, without knowing precisely how to tackle them. It is a successor to the play "The Troubled Air"—a little more realistic, but having no more literary value, and it shares no more than

its subject matter with "Darkness at Noon" and "The Trial", though the three together cover most aspects—psychological, political and social—of the process of disruption of an individual's life by a suddenly hostile society, in which he has hitherto held a relatively important place.

The central character, Bradley Douglas, is a civil servant, and a civil servant, as we all know, is a person who is honest enough not to want to make a fortune by commercial swindling, idealistic enough to want to do some service to his fellow-men and intelligent enough to be able to organise a public amenity, weak enough to value security above independence, and dumb enough not to realise that he is being used by politicians and business men to do the work they cannot do or can't make money out of, and that he himself is slowly being separated from his fellow men and his sensitivity and idealism killed by the exercise of power. This is as evident in the counter clerk as in the Permanent Secretary. Mr. Miller is not an anarchist, and hence Bradley Douglas quite unconvincingly remains as fundamentally human a man after years in the State Department, as when he entered. This strikes a very false note, for the author is a good

enough novelist to have given us real characters, and the other Civil Servants (except those who are also in the process of being fired) have developed the hard skin over the conscience and the eye to the main chance, which anyone who has seen the inside of a Government Department—in the U.S.A. or elsewhere—will recognise at once.

The feeling the book leaves you with is the complete helplessness of the American liberal, who can and indeed does argue the general issues of freedom of speech and conscience and association perfectly successfully, but who is unable to resist in the particular cases where all the emotive power of political mass hatred is, for party purposes, concentrated on one vulnerable individual, picked almost haphazardly for tactical considerations. The author draws no moral, though his sympathies are apparent, and one is left to wonder whether he could recommend the politico-legal remedy of more constitutional "safeguards" to present new obstacles to the ingenuity of lawyers and courts, or whether he appreciates that justice cannot be produced by machinery, legal or otherwise, and the only way to avoid suffering this penalty of unorthodoxy is not to be dependent on politicians either for your job or for your opinions.

L. & P.A.

### FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

OPEN 10 a.m. to 6.30; 5.0 SATURDAYS

#### New Books . . .

Men Against the Jungle Ritchie Calder 15/-  
The Happy Island Bengt Danielsson 15/-  
New Handbook on Hanging (Brought up-to-date) Charles Duff 10/6

#### Reprints . . .

Thieves in the Night Arthur Koestler 4/-  
The Meaning of Art (Pelican) Herbert Read 3/6  
First Principles Herbert Spencer 3/6

#### Second-Hand . . .

War Commentary, Volume 3 (Bound) 10/-  
Cleanliness and Godliness Reginald Reynolds 5/-  
Fields, Factories & Workshops Peter Kropotkin 5/-  
In Russian and French Prisons Peter Kropotkin 12/6  
Mussolini's Italy Herman Finer 3/-  
Three Tales Fedor Dostoyevsky 2/6  
Dostoyevsky Andre Gide 5/-  
Upopular Essays Bertrand Russell 4/-  
The Estate of Man Michael Roberts 5/-  
Blessed is the Match Marie Syrkin 3/-  
The Katyn Wood Murders Joseph Mackiewicz 3/6

#### Periodicals . . .

Perspectives No. 6. 2/6

Obtainable from

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

### Interpreters of Wilhelm Reich's Work

"ORGONOMIC FUNCTIONALISM": edited by Paul and Jean Ritter, Alston, Alexandra Park, Nottingham. Single copies 2/6d. Annual subscription (6 issues a year) 15s.

PROGRESSIVE movements in this country have shown a steady though perhaps not widespread interest in the work of Wilhelm Reich. The Orgone Institute has since 1943 published a number of works in English translation and the student has thus been able to assess the ideas of sex-economy and orgonomy and the work on which they are based. Reich himself seems always to have eschewed any attempt at popular exposition of his ideas and has authorized nothing that could be regarded as propaganda for them.

It seems to the writer that in this attitude he is justified for conceptions so widely at variance with accepted ideas are most likely to gain acceptance if their exposition is full and thorough. But many people attracted to Reich's work and enthusiastic about it undoubtedly regard this attitude as altogether too cautious. One may suppose that the

promoters of the new mimeographed magazine "Orgonomic Functionalism", Paul and Jean Ritter, are of this school. They take full responsibility for the publication and a rather cryptic editorial note suggests that it receives no blessing from the Wilhelm Reich Foundation.

The editors are not wholly successful in making clear the meaning of the expression 'orgonomic functionalism'. Nor is their historical summary of Reich's work altogether happy. A section on misinterpretations of orgonomy does more to introduce the sense of persecution (unhappily, though understandably, frequent in the official publications of the Wilhelm Reich Foundation) than to aid exposition.

The most satisfactory section is the last: a report on temperature experiments with volunteers in the orgone energy accumulator. In general, however, (to the reviewer, at least) this publication is altogether too defensive. One leaves it with the feeling that Reich is right to discourage "interpreters" of his work. Though mimeographed, it is very well produced.

## Exhibition

### DUFY AT THE TATE

BEFORE I saw the exhibition of Raoul Dufy's work at the Tate Gallery, my knowledge of him was derived purely from reproductions of some of his paintings. I had respected him as a technical master and an imaginative originator in painting, but never actually liked his work. Now I do like it; I have become a Dufy fan.

Dufy's paintings, I had gathered from reproduction books, were rather sombre compositions of smallish shapes, outlined in heavy black and filled in with drab colour. There are quite a number of such paintings in the exhibition, but they are classified as 'early works'. The later, more typical Dufy painting is far gayer. The colours are much less mixed, with the result that they are brighter; the black lines are still there, but thinner and sharper; the freedom of the actual brush strokes, for such well worked out compositions and colour schemes, is wonderful.

"Sainte-adresse, the black cargo boat" is a highly coloured painting with one abstract black shape, on which is a very simple outline drawing of a cargo boat in pale green; an ingenious way of expressing blackness without making the painting any less bright and joyful. I also noted especially "Champ de Blé" (which is owned by the Tate Gallery) and "Studio with figure and blue portfolio", but the feeling of gaiety and freedom and ingenuity is common to all the later oil paintings and to the watercolours, of which I especially liked "Carnival at Nice".

The best part of the exhibition is the small collection of illustrated books. It

is one of my pet arguments that artists do their best work when trying to solve some problem not strictly pictorial, such as designing a household instrument or illustrating a text; and I am gratified to find that, beautiful as Dufy's gallery pictures are, his book illustrations are even more so.

There are five books, including one not yet published. They vary considerably both in style and in expense of production, but they are all masterpieces. I do not know whether the actual books were designed by Dufy himself (the variation in style perhaps indicates a different designer for each book) but he shows perfect feeling for the medium in all of them.

In "La Belle Enfant", the only monochrome book among them, the illustrations seem to be drawn around type which has already been printed onto a litho plate, and the type is really incorporated into the drawing without being made in any way less readable. The type in "Mon Docteur le Vin" a full coloured book, is printed in black and grey ink; on the displayed spread, Dufy uses only black and grey inks for half the illustration, which emphasizes the gaudy colour of the rest of the illustration without forcing it out from the page.

This is one of the best exhibitions I have ever seen. It will be at the Tate (admission 1s.; students 6d.; persons declaring themselves students usually accepted as such) until Feb. 7, after which I hope and believe it will go on tour. D.R.

## ANARCHISM AND PLANNING

ANARCHISTS have always felt a little uncomfortable at being regarded as being at the left of the left wing, or as "the most extreme of the revolutionary extremists". Anarchism is not just a logical further extension of Socialism: it is different in kind.

But when it comes to defining this difference, it becomes more difficult. In discussion one uses words which have an accepted general meaning, but these words have often a very different meaning to people whose philosophy of life is widely different. Most of the phrases of Socialism are seen within the framework of government and their meaning is much the same to all who believe in the necessity or desirability of government, even though they be in opposite electoral camps. The same phrases mean something wholly different to those who aspire to a world without government, where organization flows from mutual agreement among such groups of men and is not arbitrarily imposed from above.

All this was beautifully illustrated in last week's FREEDOM in the quotations from Malatesta, the least pretentious, the clearest and most comprehensible of anarchist thinkers. The anarchist outlook is revealed with sudden clarity in his remarks (in a letter to Luigi Fabbri) on *Justice*:

"Strictly speaking, justice means giving to others the equivalent of what they give you; it means the *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."

And he goes on:

"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."

The crucial thing here which demarcates Malatesta's anarchism from Socialism, and especially Marxism, is the rejection of the idea of equal exchange with all its ensuing scale of values and calculations of amount. Exactly the same idea was expressed in economics by Peter Kropotkin. The essence of economics in a free society as Kropotkin envisaged it was just that goods should be produced and exchanged without reference to any scale of values. Capitalist and Socialist ideas on the exchange of goods always contain the conception of an *equivalent* exchange: a man only gives to the other fellow as much as is of equivalent value to what he gives. It matters little whether the exchange is calculated in terms of goods (barter) or money or logged up in a ledger of accounts: such transactions demand a defined *value* and imply the possibility of credit and debt. Immediately, one is beset by argument and theories about value. So goods have some *intrinsic* value based on, say, the labour content expressed in them? Or do they have merely a value based on supply and demand? All such speculation is peculiarly arid, fertile only in the strife and occasions for

## Fabianism and the Managerial Revolution—2

TO-DAY with our retrospective wisdom, it requires no great insight to see how these five essential Fabian doctrines have contributed to the development, not of the free, classless, socialist society but of the managerial society. The rejection of the class struggle and the insistence that there could be, even in a predominantly capitalist society, a genuine community of interests, has had the effect of turning the proletariat away from its revolutionary objective and towards the goal of mere amelioration through social reforms.

The acceptance of the existing State meant the acceptance of an institution which, whilst it suited the bourgeoisie and could be, in this country at least, fairly readily adapted to the new ruling class of managers, is incapable of being controlled by the workers. The State and especially its central organs, as all who study its functioning know and as all practical politicians realise, is essentially a power over and above the people and not one readily amenable to their control. It acts in their name but in reality it acts in the interests of the dominant groups in society which control the instruments of production, however many concessions it may care to make in the way of social welfare schemes. The Fabian theory of State ownership in the interests of the community, coupled with the insistence on the subordinate rôle of the Trade Unions and Co-operatives and on the importance of the experts, the bureaucrat and the manager, is one that is of direct interest to the managerial class, just as it is opposed to the interests of both the workers and (in the long run) to the capitalist owners.

No amount of assertion, statutory or otherwise, that nationalised industries are to be run "in the public interest" can disguise the fact that they are being run in the interests of those in whom the real control is vested.

The concept of "the public interest", in itself an unanalysable mumbo-jumbo, is in fact a beautiful ideological smoke-screen to hide the interests of the managers while, at the same time, exposing the capitalists to public obloquy and confusing the workers. The limitations of the Trade Unions to a subordinate rôle in the nationalised industries means, moreover, that these working class organisations which could and should be operated as a base for building up, "within the womb of the old society", the power of the proletariat, have been castrated from the outset: the Trade Unions are to be used by the new masters, many of whom are ex-Trade Union leaders, only as more refined instruments for disciplining the workers. The emphatic rejection of the revolutionary idea of workers' control—the most direct threat that the managers had to face—is a signal victory for the new ruling class.

### The New Rulers

These five leading Fabian doctrines are thus all in keeping with the interests of the new ruling class that is emerging. The acceptance of them as the basis of the new social order constitutes the great illusion of our time. The application of them leads not to the free, classless, socialist society: it leads to the managerial society and the history of their

enmity and strife, indignation about ingratitude, meannesses of every kind.

Kropotkin wished to get away from all such speculation. It seemed plain to him that work was natural to man, that social instincts were naturally expressed by work directed towards the good of the community, and that it was against all human solidarity to calculate one's contribution, to no more than one's share.

But the very simplicity of these views of Malatesta and Kropotkin make them hard to grasp by people who have been brought up in a world of buying and selling, in which mutual competition makes solidarity a word which many people could not even explain the meaning of.

Nor are such ideas more at home in the present day world of planning—the age where calculation is done on a large scale, where even welfare organization is planned by actuaries. Malatesta did well to oppose the conception of love to that of justice: and the most chilling thing one can say of a man is that he is *calculating*.

application by the Labour Government serves only to underline that fact more clearly.

It may be that the managerial society is inevitable if present tendencies continue but this does not mean that the dominance of the managers must be meekly accepted. The proletarian social revolution may be further off than we once thought and the difficulties of bringing it to birth may be more substantial than we once optimistically imagined, but this provides no reason why we should not continue to work for it. To think otherwise is to accept—as Burnham himself accepts—the fallacy of historical determinism.

But we can only work for the proletarian social revolution if we have cleared our minds of the ideology of the managers. The time has now come for laying the foundations of a new workers' movement—a movement which will not be misled by doctrines that appear to hold out the prospect of workers' emancipation but in reality hands over the workers to new masters, a movement which will cut through the web that the Fabians have so cunningly spun, albeit half-unconsciously, in the interests of the managers.

In terms of the Fabian doctrines outlined above this new workers' movement must recognise:

(i) That the theory—and practice!—of the class struggle must be redefined in such a way as to make clear that the proletariat has two enemies, the old, fast-disappearing capitalist class and the new increasingly powerful managerial class—the men whose social power is based not on their property rights but on the key positions which they hold within the industrial process. The long and bitter struggle of the first workers' movement is drawing to a close. The drama is ending in a Pyrrhic victory for the workers and the stage must now be set for the next and second phase of the class struggle—the struggle against the managerial class.

(ii) That the State can never serve as an instrument to achieve workers' emancipation and that political action, in the narrow sense of parliamentary and party politics, is profoundly irrelevant to the real struggle—the struggle within the workshops.

(iii) That nationalisation as such is no concern of the working class. It may facilitate the technical and economic re-organisation of industry—its primary purpose—and incidentally provide the means by which extra concessions can be made to the workers but it does nothing to alter their status: they remain essentially wage-slaves. Only a form of socialisation which ensures control by the workers in place of control by the managers and bureaucrats is worth pursuing.

## Peace and War

Continued from p. 2

they can save the peace, and if they are not given credit how can they put all their heart in the job?

★

LEADERS of nations, however, know the value of the old Latin adage: *Si vis pacem para bellum* (if you want peace prepare for war). The more you prepare for war the more formidable you become and greater are the chances of your being respected and left in peace. It is golden advice, provided you have means at your disposal to prepare for war as quickly and efficiently as your neighbour. Given these means, however, he would be a genius of statesmanship who could think or persuade his government to follow a policy inspired by the complementary, not contrary maxim: "If you want war prepare for peace". I mean, of course, the peace to follow the war, and not the illusory peace asking to be smothered by war. A war undertaken and waged with no idea or with vague, utopian ideas of what the peace to follow is going to be is a war politically lost from the beginning, whatever the military issue. Of this we need no other factual proof than the feeling soon seizing the people of the victorious nations that they have won their war in vain. They may not dare think that their leaders lacked courage, competence and foresight, but they must find it very strange that harmless and peace-loving as they know them to be yet managed to win a war while failing to make a decent and less precarious peace. It will be said that it is not strange at all for as they never wanted war they could not think or make good use of the maxim

(iv) That a serious attempt must be made to build up workers' organisations with their own culture, morals and ideology, free from middle class influence. The first workers' movement failed lamentably in this respect. By diverting the struggle into political channels the middle class were able to assume control and leadership of the workers' movement. An anti-political and industrial movement provides no opportunity for the careerist and frustrated intellectual. Of the two genuinely working class forms of organisation—the Trade Unions and the Co-operatives—the first has been content to remain a purely defensive instrument so far as industrial organisation is concerned; and when it did decide to take positive action it did so in the form of creating a political party which at once succumbed to Fabian permeation. The second—potentially the more revolutionary in that it attempts to lay hold on the means of production and distribution *directly* instead of through the State—has survived only by abandoning its ideals.

(v) Lastly, the new workers' movement, must face squarely the problem of controlling the expert and devise means to ensure that he remains on tap not on top. Complex modern industrial organisation cannot function without experts—men with the technical know-how which nowadays requires a long and expensive training. To talk as though the ordinary workers at the bench could to-morrow take over the functions of management, if only they had the will and the opportunity, is mere moonshine. Opposition to the managerial class does not mean opposition to management as such. Workers' control does not imply the abolition of management: it implies the control of managerial functions by the workers. Workers' control in this sense will be no easy matter to achieve but achieved it must be if the emergence of a new ruling class is to be prevented now

and in the future. Workers' control is and remains the touchstone of any successful workers' revolution.

### Essentially Syndicalist

The new workers' movement, in other words, must be essentially a syndicalist movement. The 19th century anarchist-communist movement showed great precision when, in opposition to Fabian and Marxist socialists alike, it predicted that State socialism would result in the exchange of one set of masters for another but it also had its weaknesses. It underestimated the immense difficulties of organising a successful social revolution and failed to emphasise the importance of building up workers' organisations for the two-fold purpose of waging the daily struggle against capitalism and of creating the administrative units of the new society. This defect in anarchist doctrine was recognised by the pre-1914 syndicalist movement—although the rapidity with which that movement disintegrated after the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 indicates that many syndicalists soon forgot the text which they had preached and acted upon: that no new system can supersede another until it has become fully matured within the womb of the old. Nevertheless, syndicalism of the period 1900-1920 now appears as the great heroic movement of the proletariat, the last desperate attempt before society took the plunge down the managerial abyss to emancipate the proletariat by its own exertions, to build up a distinction proletarian culture purged of any traces of bourgeois ideology, and to evolve a uniquely proletarian method of social action. To the Fabian who is constitutionally incapable of conceiving a society which is not constructed according to the canons of bourgeois architecture, syndicalism seems a crude and impractical social theory. But those who are to play their part in the new workers' movement in opposition to the managerial State will find in it the fount of their inspiration. G.N.O.

## The French Anarchist Federation

In your No. 52, speaking of "Malatesta and the anarchist organisation", you discussed quite accurately the point of view of the *Libertaire*, but identified rather inaccurately the present *French Libertarian Communist Federation* with the former *French-speaking Anarchist Federation*. As a matter of fact the new name (as well as new statutes, new principles and so on) were adopted in May, 1953, in a secret "congress" held by the authoritarian fraction of the late A.F.—in the absence and ignorance of their numerous opponents (the non-voters and the voting "minority"). The "great change" was, indeed, the combined result of a *scission* and of a *desertion*; and the old Anarchist Federation was never really transformed into a communist sect, but only temporarily conquered and partly

destroyed by the authoritarians "boring from within".

During the Xmas holidays a reconstruction congress of the A.F. took place in Paris, with the unanimous support of more than fifty groups, and they decided:

- (1) to preserve the name of the old federation
- (2) to reassert the libertarian methods of organisation as defined by Malatesta in his polemic against Makhno.

The L.C.F. does not seem to have more than ten groups in the whole country and, though they still impudently usurp the funds, the journal, the headquarters and the bookshop stocks of the old A.F., they did not insist on usurping its name, ideas, and principles. In fact, it is pretty evident to the public that they are neither the same persons as, nor persons directly connected with, the militants who supported the A.F. since 1946 (G. Fontenis being the only one of these who at present play an active part in the scissionist game, and a game that cannot last much longer).

Even more rapidly than the G.A.A.P.'s (the corresponding scissionist groups in Italy)—the "historical" (or hysterical) way of the F.L.C.F. leads rapidly to a merger with Marxist-Leninist elements and to a complete surrender of libertarian phraseology to the well-known bolshevik action and methods. On the other hand the F.A.F. is now reconstructed on a more flexible and reliable basis than in 1946, and the comrades here are ready to make it effective and practical. Paris, Jan. 13. André Prunier.

[In our opinion our correspondent somewhat oversimplifies the processes by which the French Libertarian-Communist Federation arrived at its present authoritarian position. The "secret congress" of May 1953 was the final step in a whole series of manoeuvres which have taken place over the past several years, with, in many cases, the active participation of some comrades who, once they had served the purpose of the Fontenis' and other anarcho-bolsheviks, found themselves in their turn manoeuvred out of the "direction" of the French Anarchist Federation.

Since its revival after the "liberation" the F.A.F. has always laid considerable importance on developing a strong disciplined organisation, which, though recognising free discussion in the local groups, and outlining "policy" at its congresses, virtually placed all initiative and

# SENDING THEM TO COVENTRY

TWO readers have written letters to FREEDOM (Jan. 2 and 16) criticising my support of workers who have instituted boycotts against individuals who went into work on Dec. 2—the day of the engineers' token strike.

Now I knew perfectly well when I wrote on this issue that I was sticking my neck out, and I think that if our two comrades read very carefully what I wrote, they will see that I did not come down heavily on one side at all. I was trying to explain the workers' actions rather than uncompromisingly support them—for of course there is a strong theoretical case against the boycott.

But so there may be against any mass action where there is anything less than complete unanimity. Anarchists always maintain that it is as wrong for the majority to rule the minority as the other way round, but that is certainly not the same thing as to say that we should placidly allow the minority to harm the majority.

One of the stock objections by question to anarchism is: How are you going to deal with dangerous lunatics? After having said that we desire the abolition of all forms of authority and coercion, the questioner thinks he has us on toast by posing a question the only sensible answer to which implies the use of coercion. As soon as we say that the

dangerous lunatic will have to be restrained, the questioner triumphantly declaims, "Aha! So you will have to use coercion after all!" and from that decides that the whole of the anarchist case falls to the ground—or that we are a bunch of tricksters.

Now one does not class the blackleg precisely as a dangerous lunatic, although he is dangerous to the very necessary solidarity among the workers, and to draw an analogy is perhaps too extreme. After all, the lunatic is not amenable to reasonable persuasion. Let us then push the analogy only as far as the informer and then see how we feel about it.

How are we to deal with an informer in our midst? Suppose we find that in our anarchist group we have someone who is passing on information to the police. It may be said that at the moment that does not really matter—most of our business is completely open and above board—but there will come a time (we hope!) when it would matter very much.

In a revolutionary situation, or under a dictatorship, information given to the police can lead to considerable suffering by our comrades. Now if a comrade of mine—either of our two correspondents, for example—was betrayed to the police who tortured and then shot him—should I be expected to be sweetly reasonable to the informer who gave him away, and by gentle argument try to encourage him to see the error of his ways?

That, of course, would be the nicest thing to do, and I personally could make out a very good theoretical case for such a course. It would be morally perfect; I should be living up to my principles of no coercion; it would simply be unfortunate that my comrade had been shot and that by not dissuading the informer from repeating his action, maybe some other comrades would be shot also. But the fact that he was acting in a despicable manner would be, of course, no

moral reason for me to bring any pressure to bear upon him at all.

Now the instance may seem far-fetched to us in this country at this time, although our comrades in totalitarian countries have to face up to it every day. But I must admit that were I in a situation such as I have described, my loyalty to my comrades would outweigh my concern for my soul—and my concern for the freedom of the informer. Now at what point between the action of the blackleg in Chesterfield and the informer in a dictatorship do we decide that respect for the freedom of the individual does not extend to giving him freedom to betray us?

There is no principled argument that can draw the line. The only criterion could be the amount of damage done by the offender—and that would be to base our attitude upon expediency and effect instead of upon basic principles.

To take the attitude of no retaliation would be to commit ourselves to take no action at all. For what is a strike except retaliation by the workers against conditions imposed on them by the boss. What is revolution but refusal to cooperate any longer with the ruling-class? A strike can be described as coercion—many pacifists do so describe it—and the result of the strike will be in direct proportion to the strength of each side. When circumstances favour the boss, the strike will be lost; when they favour the workers, it will be won.

The employer is always a minority. Should the workers then never use the coercive weapon of withdrawal of labour against him? Should they never play upon his fear of a strike, simply because he is taking the 'negative' step of putting his own interests before theirs?

If it is considered legitimate to do this against an employer, why not against a fellow worker who sides with the employer? Our Thornton Heath reader affirms that he supported the engineers'

strike, and our Birmingham reader doesn't say that he didn't. So if it's all right to coerce the boss by withdrawal of labour, why is it wrong to coerce a blackleg by withdrawal of social contact?

In fact, a case can be made out that it is worse to do the former since you are attacking a man's means of livelihood by refusing his right to exploit you. But, of course, here anarchists often draw the distinction between invasive coercion and defensive coercion. A ruling class, owning and controlling the means of life, invades our freedom and our lives, and to defend both we must answer back with all the power at our disposal.

Reader Lacey should not read me as meaning that it "doesn't much matter" if people get hurt in the class struggle, since they are bound to get hurt anyway. It does matter very much, but the only thing that will prevent it is—the end of the class division of society which, I maintain, can only come about through the abolition of the ruling class, as a result of consciously revolutionary working class action.

Now, how unanimous has that action to be? Lacey says we must reject "100 per centism", but maintains that it is better for working class interests to be retarded by the Alcock and Hewitts, rather than corrupted on the familiar lines. But in waiting for the Alcock and Hewitts isn't he sticking out for 100 per centism? Isn't he maintaining that we cannot move until everybody is with us? Which is asking a lot, isn't it!

Our Thornton Heath reader maintains that our methods of ensuring loyalty and unity must be libertarian—but doesn't go on to say how. I feel that the boycott is a libertarian measure, showing without the use of force that a member of a community cannot act in an anti-social way and expect his neighbours to behave as though nothing has happened. P.S.

## UKRAINE

Continued from p. 1

But these struggles do show also the uneasiness of centralized power in Russia. One may guess that Beria's use of discontent in the outlying nationalities implied a serious movement opposing Russification. The fate of Beria becomes therefore less of a move in the "new liberalizing" tendency, than a victory for the centralizers. Nevertheless it remains an indication of the tensions underlying the apparent grip of the party. As Deutscher says:

"The Russifiers appear to have come back. Yet they seem to have lost much of their old confidence. They do not preach about the Great Russian's burden as crudely and loudly as they used to. For one thing, they no longer have the backing for this and the prodding which Stalin gave them; for another, Beria's saying that 'there are no more backward nations among us' sums up a new mood in the Ukraine and elsewhere, a mood stronger than the transitory alignments in the Kremlin, a mood which will continue to defy the old Tsarist and the recent Stalinist traditions of government and will demand Socialist equality. 'This is not what I wished; this is not how this thing should have turned out,' the Ukraine still seems to repeat after her Hetman Khmel'nitsky. But it is a new and a very different Ukraine that repeats these words, and the words seem to lose their old helplessly plaintive tone and to acquire a new self-assured ring."

The Ukraine may yet be a decisive factor in Russian history. Let us hope that the Ukrainians will not seek help from German or English or American governments, but revert to the best and most successful period of their revolt against central authority, the period of Makhno's peasant armies supported by voluntary Soviets.

## French Anarchist Federation

Continued from p. 3

power with the National Committee, which had in its hands the finances and the direction of the propaganda, as well as including in its ranks the "permanents" (the paid officials of the organisation). This arrangement has undoubtedly permitted unscrupulous, and ambitious people to worm their way into the controlling positions. And in these positions they have been able gradually to "tighten up" the organisation to the extent that in the end their journal *Le Libertaire* spoke with one voice—theirs! Distortions of fact were presented without ever a dissenting opinion being allowed its expression.

We believe that the new animators of the F.A.F. would do well to carefully analyse the causes of the "crisis" from its roots, objectively and sincerely, not shirking to recognise their share of the responsibility. In this way they will from the beginning establish bases for their movement which will be able to resist the authoritarian infiltrators who will seek to capture the goodwill and success that will, we hope, attend the efforts of the reorganised French Anarchist Federation.—EDITORS.]

IN correspondent Lee Beech's "Why the indifference?" there appears a doubt that neuroses have been present in Man for the last 50,000 years, and therefore cannot be used to explain "the widespread indifference to world conditions". This seems to rest on a confused premise. Neuroses are on interaction-product of the organism and its environment, the necessary and sufficient conditions for its existence are two sets of factors, either of which can be in some internal relation we may call equilibrium. The first set are determinants of the environment itself. Given this second set as having a limited variability, there is a restriction on the variation of the first before the interaction between the two sets causes a breakdown in the optimum functioning of the organism as a biological unit, and the survival-value of its behaviour is diminished. For example it may refuse to eat or breed.

Neurotic behaviour has been induced in a range of mammals, and probably could be induced in the rest. Conditioned neurosis established in a sheep persisted for nine years, until death. Outside the laboratory, the aggressive behaviour of the old bull deposed from his harem of cows by a younger male seems to have much in common with neurosis induced experimentally in pigs and sheep. The point of all this is that with suitable manipulation of the environmental set of factors the animal breaks down when it reaches the limits imposed by its own neural organisation. This is observed at phylogenetic levels below Man, and it is highly probable that it could have arisen in the ancestors of modern man, some 2,000,000 years ago.

The confusion may have arisen because the environmental factors giving rise to neurosis are usually social or more specifically socio-economic for man, and therefore the incidence of neurosis increases with the amplification of the authoritarian features in society, but it does not follow that neuroses are an innovation, rather that man has inherited a predisposition to neuroses which blossom forth under the impact of social constraints. If we combine this with Comfort's concept of the power-centered minority extant in any group, it is not difficult to envisage a self-perpetuating status quo where the neurotics make it possible for the minority to remain in power, and thus maintain their own neuroses.

It seems that Lee Beech has implied this when noting that "The social instincts drive us to create authority", though I see no need to postulate instinctive mechanisms in addition to personality types and neurosis. *Entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem*, if we concede a specific psychological

process to explain every phenomena, we end up with a system which is merely an elaborate collection of neologisms. That the concept of instincts is of dubious value is shown by Beech's mention of "Stone Age instincts". As there has been little biological change since well before that time, how is it that instincts could be formed then and not before or since, and subsequently inherited with negligible modification?

Should this seem purely destructive criticism, may I add my answer to the

The discussion provoked by Arthur Uloth's article "Why so few Anarchists" is a most interesting one.

I think Giovanni Baldelli has put his finger on a very important point when he puts forward his "guess" that many came to anarchism before being reached by specifically anarchist literature. This was certainly true in my case, and I suspect that it is true of many others. It would be too much to say, perhaps, that I was born an anarchist; but at different times in my life I arrived quite independently at anarchist conclusions about money, personal relationships, and other matters. When I did learn about anarchism it was from the usual authoritarian sources, and my early impression of an anarchist was of a disgruntled, conspiratorial person who worked off his spleen by throwing bombs at people. When I was first shown a copy of FREEDOM I was at first surprised that anarchists still existed, for I had supposed that they were merely a passing phenomenon of the nineteenth century. My surprise was even greater when I began to read that copy of FREEDOM and found that it was telling me something I already knew. (This is said to be a characteristic of great literature). Until then I had felt myself to be a solitary figure, whose ideas (when I was rash enough to mention them) were regarded as absurd and impractical. The discovery that there was a body of people who had systematized similar ideas and were propagating them was a revelation; and it was not long before I realized that I was an anarchist whether I liked it or not. That being the case, it seemed to me that the most sensible course for me was to do something about it.

Lee Beech says that the usual replies to the question why there is indifference to the ideas put forward in FREEDOM include such words as "indifference, apathy, uniformity, etc." The first two words seem to be somewhat tautological. I would suggest that one reason is ignorance and the "authoritarian mentality" that Lee Beech seems to be so sceptical about. The psychologists have now got

question 'Is there any point in being an Anarchist?' It seems, empirically, that we adopt Anarchist beliefs because they have survival value, not necessarily for ourselves in the immediate future, and to which we attribute ethical qualities. This is a relativistic explanation in the sense that it does not raise our opinions to the status of absolutes. I do not think we can go further without making *a priori* judgments about the comparative merits of anarchist and non-anarchist theories. Derby, Jan. 10. ROBT. A. M. GREGSON.

around to studying the "authoritarian personality". That there are such personalities is surely verified by our common experience. We have all met those who seem to delight in a regimented existence, who feel insecure unless there is some authority to tell them what to do, and whose idea of heaven is a place where everything is laid on for them. Among them we find those who, to a greater or lesser degree, are bent on doing something. I am convinced that we have got to understand these people before we can hope to influence them.

In Thomas Mann's short story "Tonio Kröger" the protagonist, a writer who follows the solitary path of the artist with some reluctance, is summed up by a woman friend as a *bourgeois manqué*. My experience of people (not very great, I admit) leads me to suggest that many of them are anarchists *manqués*. Part of our task is to convince the anarchist *manqué* that he is an authoritarian *malgré lui* and persuade him of the folly of continuing to support a system of society that is destroying him spiritually and will eventually, if present indications are any guide, destroy him physically. The views of our experienced propagandists on this point would be interesting.

It may be true, as some contributors have suggested, that the forces governing our present society will prove too strong for us and that we are on the threshold of a new dark age. Even if we were convinced beyond all doubt that this will happen I do not think we should be well advised to abandon as useless what propaganda work we are able to do and settle down to making the most of our lives within the present bourgeois conventions. For one thing the new dark age may be followed by a renaissance, which may lead to a revival of interest in the ideas of the ancients, which we shall by then have become. In any case I think some of us would find it difficult to cease to be anarchists entirely: "He who consents against his will is of the same opinion still." London, Jan. 12. EDWIN PEEKE.

## LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

### WHY THE INDIFFERENCE?

## 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 SANSON :  
*Syndicalism—The Workers' Next Step* 1s.
- ERRICO MALATESTA :  
*Anarchy* 6d.
- Vote—What For?* 1d.
- M. BAKUNIN :  
*Marxism, Freedom and the State.*  
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.
- ALEX COMFORT :  
*Delinquency* 6d.
- Barbarism & Sexual Freedom*  
boards 3s. 6d.
- PETER KROPOTKIN :  
*The State: Its Historic Role* 1s.
- The Wage System* 3d.
- Revolutionary Government* 3d.
- Organised Vengeance Called Justice* 2d.
- ALEXANDER BERKMAN :  
*ABC of Anarchism* 1s.
- 27, Red Lion Street,  
London, W.C.1.

## Special Appeal

December 20th—31st

London: C.F. 3/-; Welling: E.M.B. 7/6.  
Total ... 10 6  
Previously acknowledged ... 553 0 9  
1953 TOTAL ... £553 11 3

1954

January 1st—8th

London: V.T. £2; Cambridge: Anon\* £5;  
Preston: W.A.L. 3/-; Glasgow: A.McD.\* 4/-;  
Glasgow: S.M. 5/-; London: Park Sympath-  
iser 1/1. Total ... £7 13 1

\* Readers who have undertaken to send regular monthly contributions.

## 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.

"FREEDOM IS NOT ENOUGH".

JAN. 27.—Edwin Peeke

FEB. 10.—"PERSONAL CHOICE"

Readings from *Revolutionary Literature*

### GLASGOW

INDOOR MEETINGS  
every Friday  
at 7.30 p.m.

at 200 Buchanan Street.

Speakers: Mark Kramisch, Hugh McCutcheon and others.

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