

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

'Gen. China' & Political Realism

THE outcry in certain quarters since the announcement that "General China" had joined forces with the British Government in its struggle against Mau Mau can be understood, but it is, as has been so ably pointed out by responsible politicians and newspaper editors, an unrealistic approach to the main problem. Something it is true, seems to have gone wrong with the timing for it appears that Gen. China himself had first suggested that his services should be used "to hasten the unconditional surrender" of his former followers before his trial (at which he was found guilty and sentenced to be hanged). It would obviously have aroused much less opposition from the trigger-happy settlers if the offer had been accepted right away and the charges against China left on the files to be brought out only if he tried any "double-crossing". In this respect therefore the moralistic criticisms of the settlers have justification. But beyond that, as we have said, their attitude is "unrealistic". After all, think of the murderers who in the recent past escaped trial as war-criminals because they changed flags at the right moment. Remember Darlan and Badoglio? We can remember the whoops of delight when the allies found it expedient to whitewash these former enemies, and set them up as their puppets. So why not General China?

★

IT would not seem that "China's" attitude was altogether motivated by over-anxiety to save his skin. According to reports he was "frank" about the reasons that prompted him to offer his services. They were that terrorism had served its purpose and the time had come to transfer the struggle to the political plane. If this report is to be believed a new light is shed on the Mau Mau organisation its tactics and its objectives, but without first-hand knowledge of its workings such an assessment seems virtually impossible.

Equally, at present, it is difficult to understand the Government's real motives in accepting General China's services. The argument put forward, on the one hand, that his offer to help negotiate unconditional surrender—as well as the response

already shown by other Mau Mau leaders, would indicate that the Government had them on the run and that it is in their interests to surrender before they are all wiped out; therefore why bother to use China at this stage. On the other hand as the Parliamentary delegation was at pains to point out, the influence of Mau Mau is greater to-day than ever. As recently as last Saturday the Kenya Government announced a communal fine of £1 a head on ten thousand adult inhabitants of the Kangema division, "who are known, or are suspected, to have consistently harboured Mau Mau gangs, or have failed to report their presence to the authorities."—(Reuter).

Mr. Lyttelton's attitude since his arrival in Kenya would seem to be to want his cake and eat it. He accepts General China as a co-belligerent (as they called Darlan and Badoglio) but does not appear to heed the implications of "China's" statement that if the campaign of terrorism has not served its purpose of making world opinion aware of the conditions of the Kenyan Africans, and shaking the Government into action, then they will resort to more terrorism. (This at least is how we understand the statement). Lyttelton's attitude at the constitutional talks now going on in Nairobi with the local political leaders is described by the *Observer's* correspondent on the spot as "tough". His proposals are summed up as follows:

Mr. Lyttelton walked into the conference with the Asian representatives with the remark: "I'm going to be blunt with you." He told them, it is understood, that the most the Asians could hope to get was one Cabinet post, that of Minister of State for Works under the Minister of Finance, Mr. E. A. Vasey.

The Africans are to get even less—the Under-Secretaryship of African Development. This is expected to go to Mr. B. A. Ohanga, a member of the Luo tribe. This would mean that the ablest of the African leaders, Mr. Eliud Mathu, who is at present a member of the Executive Committee, would be dropped. He is said to be unacceptable because he is a Kikuyu. That, at any rate, is the interpretation that

would be placed on his relegation. And the Kikuyu, the most politically conscious of the Kenya tribes, would be unrepresented in the Cabinet.

Mr. Lyttelton is deliberately "acting tough". The surprised Asian representatives said to him: "Sir, you're a politician yourself: how are we to sell this proposal you make to our constituents?" He answered: "Tell them it's the best you could get from such an illiberal Colonial Secretary."

So far the results are that both the Asians and the Africans are strongly dissatisfied with what is proposed. So are the settlers.

Their demand for a War Cabinet has been turned down. They have been offered two portfolios in the Cabinet. It is significant that Mr. Lyttelton's proposals fall far short of what even the settlers' leader, Mr. Michael Blundell, was prepared to accept as a basis for negotiation.

The *Observer* is disappointed with Mr. Lyttelton's attitude, since it believes that what is needed is a "new constitutional machinery that will make it possible for an intensive political struggle to take place by legitimate non-violent means". But how can such machinery be devised, when 96 per cent. of the population are Africans and only 4 per cent. are Europeans and others, without completely overturning the present balance of power in which the majority is kept in subjection by an insignificant minority of reactionary white settlers? After all, one must be "realistic" in politics, and at that game Britain's politicians have few equals!

V.R.

Another Purge in French C.P.

THE greedy power-seekers in the French Communist Party are once again in trouble. This time it is M. Lecoeur one of the three secretaries who direct the party under the absent leadership of Maurice Thorez, the secretary-general who has been a sick man for a number of years (in spite of having been "cured" by Soviet doctors). According to the *Manchester Guardian's* Paris correspondent:

"At the first session of the Communist Central party now being held at Arcueil, M. Jacques Duclos, the senior of the three secretaries and the regent of the party during M. Thorez's long absence in Russia, sharply attacked M. Lecoeur in terms that left no doubt that he is to be stripped of his principal offices.

M. Lecoeur, like M. Thorez, is a former miner. He is one of the deputies of the Pas-de-Clais department—where there seems to have been a good deal of trouble inside the Communist party recently. While M. Duclos was evidently responsible for the general management of the party during the absence of M. Thorez, M. Lecoeur seems to have been the director of its conscience.

It was he who had successive meetings of the Central Committee, analysed in broad lines the party's difficulties and errors, and drew lessons as to the attitude of party members and party officers. It is for his manner of doing this that he is now being attacked. He was widely thought of as heir-apparent to M. Thorez, and it was believed that he had not been promoted to be in charge of the party, only because in comparison with M. Duclos he was still relatively inexperienced. His fall thus makes all the bigger impression. The third party secretary, M. Fajon, who succeeded the expelled M. Marty in 1952, has at present only acting rank, so that the strength of M. Duclos as number two in the party at the present juncture is very evident.

M. Lecoeur was accused by M. Duclos of having covered up his own responsibility for party deviation in the last two years by constantly speaking and writing in the first person plural instead of the first person singular. He thus attributed to all the leaders of the party responsibilities which were his own. He had

made the so-called isolation of the Communist party a pretext for recommending a policy contrary to the recommendations of the 12th Party Congress and which would have made the party a mere adjunct to certain political organisations of the bourgeoisie. He had neglected the factory cells for the street cells and had accepted a standard of membership which made the payment of the party subscriptions sufficient without any other activity. M. Lecoeur had thus reserved for himself a monopoly of the party's reduced activity at the head of a group of party members—the political instructors appointed by himself—without any contact with the masses.

M. Duclos said that M. Lecoeur had neglected the principle laid down by M. Thorez that when the party was flourishing it was because all the members were pulling their weight but that when things were going wrong it was because the party secretary was falling down on his job."

Sorry - Wrong Faith

THE colourful Swiss Guards have been reinforced at the main Vatican gate to repel French faith healers who threaten to storm into the Vatican.

Yesterday there was a pitched battle between eight Guards and four French faith healers who wanted to enter the Papal apartments.

They said they were from Avignon and that their leader was a former postal clerk, George Roux, founder of the sect known as the "Church of Christ Incarnate".

They handed in a petition, then police took them away.

But the four said 400 of their followers would try to get in.

Last week three other faith healers from Avignon were expelled from Italy after trying to enter the Vatican.

(*News Chronicle*, 5/3/54).

The Railway Crockery Controversy

A Smashing Job He Doesn't Want

FEW individuals destroy articles which are still of some use, even if not to themselves. Most people would far rather give away unwanted objects than destroy them, in the hope that they will be of further use to somebody else.

One of the characteristics of institutions, corporations, or large impersonal organisations, however, is that they cannot seem to apply to their problems the common sense of responsibility that individuals can. Add to that the rigidity legalistic property ownership enforces and quite naturally irresponsibility ensues.

Hence we get the fantastic incident which has recently come to light, of an employee of British Railways settling down for a day's work smashing railway crockery under one of the arches of Waterloo Station. This crockery, everybody admits, is perfectly sound and useable, but it happens to be old Southern Railway stock from pre-nationalisation days, and bears the sinister initials "S.R." instead of the only acceptable ones today, "B.R." (for British Railways).

How many diners on trains, in refreshment rooms or railway hotels would be upset by the wrong initials it is hard to say. Our guess would be that the vast majority would prefer the food, the cooking and the service to be improved, and would not worry overmuch about S.R. instead of B.R.

But somewhere, buried in the warrens of the Railway Executive, a bureaucrat has decided that, as from a certain date, all crockery has to bear the new initials, and all old stock must be disposed of.

The job of disposal was given to Albert Trehearn, a 48-year-old storeman at Waterloo, and it was only the fact that he was disgusted at the destructive and wasteful nature of the "work" he was ordered to do, and that he reported the matter to his union, that this stupidity has received publicity.

Following questions in Parliament, the Minister of Transport asked for a report, which has been duly supplied by Lieut.-General Sir Humphrey Gale and, in the nature of these things, our military man white-washes the administration and finds "that the measures being taken by the Hotel and Catering Services to rationalise and standardise their equipment and stores procedure are commercially sound."

Much of the crockery was not even old. It was not a case of chipped, cracked, unhygienic crocks being disposed of. Many cups, plates and jugs were lifted straight out of the packing-cases in which they had been despatched from the potteries, carefully packed with straw, and hurled against the wall. Such practice, we are assured, is "commercially sound".

To which Albert Trehearn quite rightly retorted: "Nonsense". But Mr. Trehearn is only a worker, and in his report the General says that criticism of managerial policy by Mr. Trehearn "is due to lack of appreciation or knowledge underlying that policy."

"His limited experience in a small store at Waterloo provides no evidence that managerial policy as a whole is in any way at fault."

"Mr. Trehearn is a low-paid employee working as a storeman, but not in charge of the Waterloo stores. An instance previously occurred of his making complaint about his conditions of service direct by letter to the chairman of the late Hotels Executive."

"His complaints were rectified. While his attitude at the interview was co-operative, it was highly critical of his superiors."

And, we might say, no wonder. The General went on to say that it is a general custom throughout the catering trade to destroy surplus badged crockery where

articles having similar badging remain in service.

"This is essential if purchasers are not to be subsequently embarrassed by being thought to be in unlawful possession of property."

But the case for destroying S.R.-badged crockery is that the S.R. badge is no longer in use! And surely anybody with a use for the stuff could judge for themselves how much "embarrassment" might follow!

The day the report was published, Trehearn was expecting an order to carry out more smashing.

"There is a lot of double-spouted teapots waiting treatment," he said. "I shall do what I'm told, of course, but I intend to carry on my fight through our union to end this stupidity."

There, of course, is the pity. He is doing what he is told. Trehearn is clearly a man with a better sense of responsibility, and of economy, than the district managers and the office-holders in the Railway Executive, who order and justify this destruction. He has pointed out where some of the goods could be used, and it is perfectly obvious that hundreds of owners of workers' cafés in London alone would be quite willing to call at Waterloo and take some of the crockery away.

This, however, would be too sensible. The pity is that Trehearn is carrying on with his senseless job. If he were to dig his heels in, refuse to do it, even run the risk of getting the sack, he would find a tremendous amount of support from both the public and his fellow railway workers. The latter, after all, are being underpaid because the railways are not making a profit. And the public do not look kindly on the continual raising of fares when they hear of this wholesale destruction of "their own property".

P.S.

SHOTTS MINERS REINSTATED

THE dismissal notices against 350 miners at Northfield Colliery, Shotts, Lanarks., referred to in FREEDOM last week, have been withdrawn.

This may solve the immediate problem of what would have happened to these men and their dependants—and indeed the whole of Shotts—if the pit had closed, but it is a very unsatisfactory situation which continues.

The men's restrictive practices which the N.C.B. gave as their reason for the dismissals were not, as I suggested last week, merely a reluctance on the part of the miners to work themselves out of a job since the coal was running out. The men were pursuing a deliberate go-slow policy as a means of trying to get a third man added to their two-men underground teams. They say it is too much for two men to hew the coal and then push it up steep inclines in 15 cwt. "hutches".

The notices have been withdrawn, and the men reinstated on condition that the go-slow is called off. Which means that the men are defeated—they go back to conditions which get progressively harder—and with the threat of eventual closure hanging over them anyway.

Small wonder incidentally, that the pit is unproductive—or, more accurately, unprofitable. Not only do the N.C.B. consider it not worth putting in any equipment—they even keep it short-handed.

★

In Italy, when factories have been closed down, the workers have occupied them and begun to work them themselves. The best answer the Shotts miners could have to the N.C.B. is to do the same. They could set up a producers' co-operative and operate workers' control on a sharing basis.

The N.C.B. has lost £60,000 in the last year at Northfield. The chances are, however, that if the workers there eliminated the bureaucrats and took over the pit themselves, marketing the coal direct to the consumers, that they could show, if not a profit, at least a continued living in the community they prefer.

The miners claim they know the pit, how to work it and where to find more coal. They should have the chance to run it rather than that it be closed down.

But it is indeed unlikely that the N.C.B. would agree to that. It might show it up too much!

P.S.

Conservative Anarchism

CONSERVATIVE anarchism may be taken to mean attachment to the anarchist ideology as formulated by the great masters or asserted in the congresses and official pronouncements of an anarchist organization. Most necessary to prevent its exact opposite from being taken for anarchism, it may on the other hand impede the vital process of constant reformulation and adaptation demanded by historical changes and new or newly discovered intellectual and emotional needs.

This article, however, is about another kind of conservative anarchism, namely about what things anarchists should not fight against, but, rather, preserve, in the society in which they try to live as anarchists, with a view to stopping it from becoming more harmful and hostile to themselves and to anarchist values.

Naturally this type of conservatism is more likely to manifest itself among the more advanced in age and experience, as the fruit of reflection rather than enthusiasm, of a sober and unadventurous outlook. It is not an attitude of defeatism and despair; on the contrary, it is based on hope, and is so convinced of the victory the cause deserves that it loathes jeopardising even the tiniest token of it for the sake of a "beau geste" or a moment's exaltation.

When not simply a rationalization of fear and fatigue, this type of anarchism could suggest and carry out policies in a combination of logic and courage that would prove too much of a strain (and of a shock) for the young and revolutionary. It could, for example, recommend and help in the defence of a government—albeit in a revolutionary situation and against the threat of a stronger government. This paradox of anarchists endeavouring to preserve government needs a little explanation.

A revolution would not be a revolution if the government it first puts up were as strong as the one it has just overthrown. The Kerensky type of government is one that hardly governs, but insofar as it still governs anarchists could be tempted to join forces with other groups to make it fall. Yet, unless anarchists are a big and determined majority, it would be a rash and foolish thing on their part to destroy the first revolutionary government because they would thereby deprive themselves of human and indispensable allies while favouring the formation of a new government that will grow stronger and stronger through successive waves of repressive measures some anarchists may hail as revolutionary. Each one of them, however, will weaken the anarchist position until one will come specifically aimed at getting the anarchists out of the way. The evidence is overwhelming about the fate anarchists have to expect if in a revolutionary situation they allow themselves to be manoeuvred by the Leninist tactics of a party that sees in the inevitably weak first revolutionary government the golden chance to establishing its dictatorship. In a revolu-

tionary situation the lot of the anarchists is with the moderates for again there is ample evidence that extremists whether of the Right or the Left are simply extreme authoritarians.

If anarchists have helped in bringing about a revolution and are playing an active part in it, they obviously cannot ignore or withdraw from the play of interests and strength between the various parties and groups that have come to the fore. The sudden withdrawal or disappearance of customary forms of authority leaves a kind of vacuum which anarchists consider as the first condition of freedom, but which political parties are eager to fill with an earnest and to an extent that are in direct proportion to the distance separating them from the anarchists. That means that once anarchists have committed themselves to a revolutionary situation they have not only to fight for their ideals but also for their life and that of all whom they hold dear. The larger the issues and the anarchist movement, the greater the need for strategy and tactics, of which alliance with the moderates and preservation of a weak government seem to me the fundamental principles.

All that may seem very academic, the more so as revolutions cannot be manufactured, and perhaps not even wilfully precipitated. Judging by past experiences, besides, it is at least doubtful that the anarchist cause gained from them more than it lost. So reliance on a future revolution to do all the work that anarchists would like to see done is not a wise or helpful policy, and may indeed be very harmful. Militant anarchism to be effective needs continuity of action, and rather in the way of a steady pressure and expansion than of a series of violent explosions. Such action if carried out in the political arena or as organized class struggle would also require a strategy and impose tactical decisions as the Swedish or Spanish movements, for example, had the oppor-

tunity to learn, but the British or the Italian had not.

In all countries, however, and especially where anarchists are few in number, underground or unorganized, conservative anarchism is of the greatest importance. Unless anarchism be a synonym of nihilism, there must be much in any existing society which is worth preserving—if nothing else, specific conditions and cultural elements which have made possible the emergence of anarchists and the circulation of anarchist ideas. Clear feelings and notions about what values are to be strengthened and preserved will be the best guide to distinguish between enemies and allies. Bakunin's view on the unconditional value of destruction was for all its Hegelian basis the view of a barbarian. Another barbarian view is the unconditional glorification of the proletariat, and the predatory wish of taking over from the present society all its material and scientific wealth without any regard for the less tangible values that made possible that wealth.

There is a danger for conservative anarchism of the type I am recommending to gradually evolve in one direction until it is all conservatism with no trace of anarchism. On the other hand, anarchism can so find faults with everything and everybody that it loses all social meaning, and becomes rationalized selfishness only lacking opportunity or courage to become manifest tyranny. Thus the movement and the ideology are continually pulled in opposite directions often with lamentable breaks and disruptions, against which a middle-course policy and a centripetal force put up a brave fight to preserve one little harmony and establish a greater one in a world that can well do without anarchism, but not, I feel, without anarchist inspiration.

GIOVANNI BALDELLI

PERSONAL VIEWPOINTS

Is Human Life Sacred?

I AM not an enthusiastic reader of the bourgeois press. I find it impossible to pick up a newspaper without being either depressed or disgusted. However on picking up a paper recently I read that a man of 63 has been sentenced to seven years' imprisonment for shooting at and wounding his girl friend, who however bears him no malice apparently. Although he is not likely to survive his sentence and is in some measure condemned to death, or to be buried alive till death, he is not likely to get much sympathy from the British public. "Serve him right", they will say, and dismiss the matter from their minds. If he had been condemned to death he might have stood a better chance of sympathy, not that it would have done him much good. A death sentence rouses pity and terror, not to mention morbid interest. A heavy prison sentence, which may well be in fact the worse penalty, rouses none at all. There are even humanitarians who are frightfully keen to abolish the death penalty and substitute life imprisonment, really for life that is, not as now fifteen years or so.

The whole problem of our attitude to human life seems to me to be raised by this miserable case of legal brutality. One frequently hears a person as saying, "I consider human life as sacred and a person who takes it ought to be hanged." They do not seem to see the contradiction, and perhaps there is none. One must avoid judging most people on the grounds of pure reason. I do not regard human life as "sacred" at all. But if one does, perhaps there is no reason why under certain circumstances it may not be taken. All over the world it has been the custom for a person to take on the rôle of a god throughout the year, only to be sacrificed at the end of it, and it is claimed that this was the origin of kings. At any rate the person in question was in a sense "sacred", and dedicated to the god that he or she represented. "Sacredness" was no safeguard in this case, the reverse in fact!

It may well be that the killing of murderers has a ritual origin. It certainly seems that the spirit of the murdered person is still believed to hover around, angrily awaiting the appropriate vengeance. I do not know how many judges would admit to this belief, nor how many ordinary folk, but if it is not widespread it is difficult to understand the enthusiasm that most people seem to have for the scaffold, provided of course that they do not have to ascend it themselves!

The vague and horrid threats of "rape, seduction, loot, and murder" that sup-

porters of the death penalty always hurl at the head of their opponents remind one of the vague terrors that beset the savage when his taboos are threatened. If for instance the taboo on incest is broken we are told that the crops will fail, that there will be earthquakes and volcanic eruptions, and so on. Although the upholders of execution know perfectly well that in every country where it has been abolished murder has decreased they still hang on to it. They hint vaguely that since England has many ports, and is therefore full of foreigners and seamen, we must therefore be wickeder than the people of other countries. This childish argument I have heard put forward in all seriousness more than once on a par with the attitude of the savage. He does not know what will really happen if the taboo is broken, nor why, but he has a sense of dread that is very real to him, and he therefore invents all sorts of possible disasters to explain it.

But the fear of the spirit of the dead person is not enough by itself to explain why people of ordinary intelligence go

'HUMAN ANGLE' STORY

Miss Jemima Sutherland, a district nurse on the island of Unst in the Shetlands, made two visits to the Russian trawler driven aground by a recent gale. She knew no Russian and the Russians, except for a boy, knew no English, but her gift of a bone for their Alsatian dog melted their reserve and soon they were giving the islanders barrels of herrings in exchange for buckets of fresh water.

Miss Sutherland found the crew "very courteous" but noted that they "seemed somewhat distrustful". Later three teachers armed with Russian grammars went on board to try to make conversation, and local people presented bread and other supplies. The crew replied with gifts of cigarettes and tins of preserved meat. One visitor was given a bottle of perfume on which was written in English, "In memory of good comrades."

The trawler, one of a fleet of eleven, is said to be in sand to above the propeller, and all efforts by the others to pull it free failed yesterday. It is believed that it will have to be dug out. There is no immediate danger and the crew have refused to leave. An official of the Lerwick lifeboat said that he thought a salvage vessel would be needed to refloat the trawler.

A Russian Embassy spokesman said yesterday that they know no more about the matter than they had read in the newspapers.

THE SIMPLICITY OF ANARCHISM

THE most frightening aspect of anarchism, to the regimented mind, is the simplicity of the truths it contains. Whilst society is quite prepared to accept the feasibility of planetary flight, alchemy and other things within, and beyond, the realms of logic, the simple possibility of man being self-governing and capable of standing on his own feet—without the aid of political and legal crutches—is regarded as something akin to lunacy; or dangerously fanatic to say the least.

The potential horrors of atomic warfare and the possible obliteration of the human race, although here and there invoking a sundry voice of protestation, is presumably nowhere near as terrifying as the prospect of society being freed from political bondage, and given independence to organise its own economy by mutual-aid and co-operation.

Government provides its own indictment when it so brazenly presumes the helpless imbecility of its subjects, which it regards as a mass of potential lunatics restrained only by the leash of politics and law. It would seem that without the saving grace of politicians Bedlam itself would be let loose, and that arson, rape, murder and loot would be the order of the day!

One might be impertinent enough to ask why, then, if men are so incapable of self-restraint they should be deemed sufficiently sane to elect others to control them? Why, for instance, do politicians shout, manoeuvre and contrive to get elected by large majorities, if those majorities are such potential lunatics?

The anarchist believes that freedom is what its name implies, and he can't conceive how it is possible to be free and at the same time be governed by others; nor can he see how it is possible to help others to be free by sticking bayonets in their bodies or dropping atom-bombs on their homes. He considers himself capable of goodness without religion, and of dignity without the aid of Law; and whilst he is prepared to give freely and of his best in co-operation with

others for the commonweal, he takes exception to administering to the selfishness of drones.

He has no faith in the infallibility of politicians, nor in the wisdom of kings. Whilst he repudiates the necessity of law, he concedes the necessity for order: not the kind of order decreed by politicians and enforced by threats, but natural order resulting from the harmonious development of mutual-respect within society, when once freed from political bondage.

There is something radically wrong, he declares, in a system of society that functions, and maintains its existence, by the impetus of violence and force. He sees nothing praiseworthy in political society which has recourse to periodic wars, or the need of jails, gallows and bludgeons; and it is because he is aware that these brutal weapons are the instruments of every government and State, that he works for their destruction.

To him, freedom is something more than mere political clap-trap; it is the quintessence of being and living. It gives focus to the ego's expanding universe, and eclipses the power of ignorance and fear. Given the freedom to assert its inherent qualities, he believes humanity capable of solving its own social problems by the simple application of equity and mutual aid.

Unlike the politician, he does not regard dishonesty, brutality and avariciousness as natural characteristics of human nature, but as the inevitable consequences of coercion and frustration engendered by artificial law, and he believes that these social evils are best eradicated not by greater penalties and further legislation, but by the free development of the latent forces of solidarity and sympathetic understanding which government and law so ruthlessly suppress.

Freedom will be possible when people understand and desire it; for man can only rule where others subserviently obey. Where none obey, none has power to rule. GEORGE NICHOLSON.

turbing symptoms of our age. The murder-mystery and the sadistic thriller are the most popular form of reading matter, even among Left-wingers and humanitarians, who not only read them but write them too. The legalists are powerless. They may ban a few in which the sexual element is too open, but they cannot hope to check them effectively because everyone reads them. Bertrand Russell has even told us that they are a useful outlet, and has even, I believe, suggested that they help to prevent war. When perverted impulses are strong sense flies out of the window. Some effort is made to preserve children from American comics, but mainly because of the sexual elements, for in our society sex is worse than murder.

It would be easy to put all this down to frustrated sexual desires, and of course that is the fundamental cause. But there is more to it than that. Civilised man is always under authority. It may be that of a person or of an irrational taboo. The two may be mixed together. For instance at one time disobedience of one's father was taboo. It was an unbelievably heinous thing to do. But not only was it an almost unbelievable wrong, it could also be punished. Society in many parts of the world gave a man power of life and death over his children and his wife, and would help him to carry out the penalty if need arose.

Everywhere we look in the civilised world we are aware of the power of some authority or another, which hinders us from doing what we want. As soon as the child comes into the world he becomes aware of this. In primitive societies there is usually much more freedom to gratify natural desires, and although there is much in them that the anarchist would not approve of, his instinctive preference for them as opposed to our present society or to the aseptic Utopias of the authoritarian socialists, is sound.

Ultimately the only way that a child can conceive of escaping from the trammels of adult authority is for the adults to disappear, to get out of this world. To him this is what killing means. He has no proper conception of death. When a person dies he or she goes away for good, and that's the end of it. Their authority is removed.

It can be seen at once that the pattern is set for the future. As time goes on and frustrations mount, this desire to obliterate, to "suppress" as the old revolutionaries used to put it, or to "liquidate" as is said now, the source of authority grows and grows. It may be one's wife, one's boss, the tax-collector, or more abstract enemies, who are none the less real, the State or the Capitalists.

Continued on p. 3

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

OPEN 10 a.m. to 6.30; 5.0 SATURDAYS

New Books . . .

Any Wife or Any Husband

Medica 7/6

(A book for couples who have met with Sexual Difficulties)

Reprints . . .

South Riding Winifred Holtby 4/-

Fame is the Spur Howard Spring 4/-

Germinal Emile Zola 5/-

Walden H. D. Thoreau 5/-

The Social Contract

J. J. Rousseau 5/-

Fathers and Sons Ivan Turgenev 5/-

Smoke Ivan Turgenev 5/-

Emile J. J. Rousseau 5/-

Chinese Philosophy in Classical Times E. R. Hughes 5/-

International Modern Plays Strindberg, Capek, etc. 5/-

Second-Hand . . .

Main Street Sinclair Lewis 2/6

Quintessence of Ibranism Bernard Shaw 4/-

Political Thought from 1848-1914 Ernest Barker 2/-

Scum of the Earth Arthur Koestler 3/-

Essays on Language and Literature Proust, Valery, Sartre, etc. 2/6

Roads to Ruin E.S. Turner 5/-

Publications . . .

Encounter, No. 6

(William Sansom, Albert Camus, etc.) 2/6

Grub Street, No. 3 1/6

Clare Market Review 1/6

Obtainable from

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

EISENSTEIN versus HISTORY

THE exhortations of propaganda can make arid reading, and the lessons of revolutionary history have an appeal for comparatively few. Yet few anarchists would deny that a clear grasp of revolutionary concepts was an essential for a revolutionary movement, or that knowledge of revolutionary achievements, mistakes, and failures constitute an essential ingredient in such concepts.

There is obviously a difficulty here, and it is one that propagandists of revolutionary ideas are well acquainted with. One way of bringing these ideas to a wider public is to weave them into the substance of a work of art—for example, a novel. How many people have had their eyes opened to the world of revolutionary thought and action by reading Zola or Upton Sinclair or Ignazio Silone or Camus? Novels can convey the emotional impact of ideas with far greater force, though perhaps with less precision, than can pamphlets and newspaper articles.

For this very reason such presentations need to be true. For many people, English history is the history of Shakespeare's historical plays; but as historical fact the picture he drew was a very partial one, and students of the Wars of the Roses are to-day not content to rely on Holinshed's Chronicle. Similar dangers lie in wait for those who rely on novels to present truth in revolutionary history. Most of the novels about the Spanish Civil War are just untrue, in fact and were written either deliberately to advance the Communists version of Spanish history, or by ignorant novelists who had no conception of the political and social structure of events during those years.

Novels however are comparatively ephemeral. The problem of how far a revolutionary art work tells the truth is illustrated with greater force by consideration of a classic in another medium—Eisenstein's great film *Battleship Potemkin*, which has recently (though 30 years old) had an extended showing at a London cinema. This film has such an immensely powerful impact, even after all these years, that it is mentioned in every history of the cinema. The immensely long and gripping sequence showing Tsarist soldiers firing on the crowd on the steps at Odessa is a piece of cinema which exploits resources of technique which have hardly been improved upon since. Yet this sequence has ensured continued life to a film whose revolutionary message might well have passed into oblivion long ago without it.

It is when one looks at the film from a revolutionary standpoint that misgivings arise however. Constatine Feldman whose book on the mutiny appears to have been a main source for Eisenstein, wrote that "the mutiny on the *Potemkin* was not simply a mutiny on account of putrid threat, as our 'patriotic' newspapers have zealously tried to prove—the underlying causes were deeper and more serious. They must be looked for in the fearful disorder of our life, and in the revolutionary movement which is gaining a hold on all Russia". (translated by Constance Garnett, 1908). Yet the film gives very little of the causes beyond the worm-infested meat. The officers were represented as pathological sadists and the net result is that one gains the impression that no mutiny would ever have occurred if the sailors had not been treated with exceptional high handedness. Such a presentation misses out the whole structure of revolutionary aims of which it gives not even a hint.

MUCH ink has been spilt on the subject of McCarthy, the man and the -ism. It used to be said in the thirties that if Fascism conquered the United States it would do so in the name, not of Fascism but of a one hundred per cent. Americanism. To many liberals and radicals McCarthyism appears as the verification of this prophecy. McCarthyism has not yet won out but many share the gloomy prognostication of Bertrand Russell that Senator Joe McCarthy will be the next President of the U.S.A.

McCarthyism, however, is by no means the simple phenomenon that its equation with neo-Fascism might suggest. Totalitarian as it is in its implications and methods of operation, it is in some respects a peculiarly American phenomenon—an evil weed rooted deep in the soil of American history and blossoming at the present time because of the acute divisions within the American ruling class. Analysis suggests that it may be not so much a disease in itself as a symptom of these divisions.

The concept of the frontier is now a well-used tool for the interpretation of American history. In the 18th and 19th centuries America had no frontier in the sense of a fixed boundary line. The prodigious growth of population, both a cause and a consequence of the Industrial Revolution, which set so many European states panting for new Imperialist pastures left America unaffected. Although the population of the U.S.A. has increased fifty-fold since 1800, compared with the six-fold increase in Britain, it presented no problem to a country with an expanding frontier—apart from the admittedly difficult prob-

The outbreak is thus seen as founded upon hatred and revenge and the Odessa steps sequence fans this feeling. Any normal anarchist can only feel discomfort and a sense of horror at the "revolutionary" speeches at the port by the bier of the dead sailor, Vakulintchuk. Here the emotions chiefly exploited are hatred and intolerance with physical violence and suppression of anyone who disagreed.

This revolutionary sadism, relying on destructive rather than constructive concepts, is actually exaggerated by Eisenstein. Dr. Smirnoff the ship's surgeon who had pronounced the maggoty meat to be edible was, according to Feldmann, "found wounded by a bullet; he was almost breathing his last, and begged the sailors to let him die in peace... his corpse was thrown into the sea." His *corpse*: in the film Eisenstein shows him dragged upside down and clutching ignominiously and ineffectually at ropes and railings to be thrown in to drown. The sequence is immensely telling but unquestionably sadistic.

Eisenstein sought to show the solidarity of the people of Odessa with the mutineers but these scenes are the least convincing in the film. Yet they are the only constructive revolutionary action shown in the present edition of the film, there is no hint that the mutineers surrendered in the end. The whole work is immensely powerful: but it is not revolutionary. But even in 1924 this was the Bolshevik party's view of revolution: to stir up class hatred—so that new party rulers can step into the ruling positions made vacant by the overthrow from below.

The tragic irony of Eisenstein is that having placed his vast talent rather slavishly at the disposal of the Party's view of history, he was quickly relegated and his talents left largely unused.

One may say therefore that this famous film, extolled as a triumph of revolutionary art, in reality obfuscates revolutionary ideals and presents a view of popular action which served immediate political ends. For one must remember that only 3 years before, Trotsky, acting on Lenin's express instructions had brutally suppressed the revolt of the Kronstadt sailors. His order of the day had been to "shoot them like partridges", and under this order 18,000 workers were killed. The arms of the Kronstadt sailors were more revolutionary in the constructive sense than the crew of the *Potemkin* dreamed of being. It is no wonder that three years later Lenin's government called upon the genius of Eisenstein to re-write revolutionary history.

The Anatomy of McCarthyism

lem of assimilation of different nationalities. To the teeming millions the advice was given and taken: Go West, young man! The potential explosion due to sheer increase in numbers was stifled and the energy thereby released utilised in the building up of an economy whose productive powers have no parallel on earth. In such a society, it was the business of money-making and (incidentally) wealth-making which absorbed the energies of the vigorous go-getters. Politics was a less rewarding occupation than business, unless one was prepared to regard it, as the unscrupulous did and do, as an impure and simple racket. As a result the ruling class was essentially a business class. Political management was left largely to the racketeers and the natural 'aristocrats' of New England. For the foreign policy of such a State, the Monroe Doctrine—the Hands-Off-the-Americas doctrine—sufficed: there was no need for a positive policy, much less a need to embark on serious Imperialist ventures for the sake of obtaining new markets and sources of raw materials.

Round about 1914 the American frontier closed up: there was no more virgin territory to plough or to debauch: The economy, subject to its own dynamic laws, however, continued to expand and at the same time to undergo violent alternations. The Great Depression of the thirties finally revealed the new situation and Roosevelt's New Deal was simply the reaction of the more farsighted of the American ruling class to it. Contemporaneously, the old economic order in Europe was folding up—the Bolshevik Revolution being the most obvious portent of its forthcoming demise. Britain, the workshop and bank of the 19th century world, lost its position as the world's political leader and supervisor. Two world wars speeded up the process. In the aftermath of World War II emerged the new familiar pattern of two opposing power blocs—America and Russia, each surrounded by a family of satellite States, with a few Asian countries, notably India, attempting to find a safe ringside seat.

These two power blocs emerged in different ways. From the East, it was a self-conscious deliberate thrusting forward by Russia, hell bent on the quest for world domination in the name of the universal Communist Revolution. From the West, however, it was a half-reluctant acceptance by America of a rôle forced on her by the facts of the situation. The vacuum created by the collapse of power in Europe had to be filled by America herself if she wanted to prevent Russia filling it. Bourgeois historians are fond of relating how Britain collected an empire in a fit of absence of mind. Future historians, with more truth, will relate how America had

greatness, i.e. leadership of the 'free world', thrust upon her.

The half-truth in this latter judgment is part of the anatomy of McCarthyism. McCarthyism is a symptom of the stresses and strains that exist within the American ruling class consequent upon its adaptation to the new internal and external relations which America is forced to adopt as one of the two world powers. Considered objectively, the new rôle of America requires a positive approach to both internal and external politics. Internally, the closing of the frontier and all that implies demands a fairly rigorous management and supervision of the economy by the Government: a repetition of 1929 would be disastrous for the ruling class as well as for the workers; it would, moreover, because of the inevitable repercussions abroad, react seriously on America's position as a world leader. Externally, world leadership has demanded the liquidation of isolationism and demands a continuous intervention in the affairs of America's 'satellites'. Marshall Aid was only the most striking instance of such intervention. Economic aid to Europe and to the under-developed countries is not, as naive Marxists have it, a function of American Imperialism: economically America is for all intents and purposes a self-contained system. Economic aid is, however, essential to the maintenance and extension of America's political hegemony.

New times demand new men and new policies. Conversely, they involve the displacement of old men and old policies. A ruling class is never a homogeneous entity: it is continually recruiting new types to deal with changing circumstances. Since the thirties the American ruling class has been recruiting the types who can cope with the problems of a managerial world economy: administrators, planners, bureaucrats and military men with a flair for administration and a mass appeal. The old ruling class of business tycoons, largely inexperienced politically and by long tradition ignorant of the handling of external political problems of the present magnitude, has had to take a back seat. Such adjustments in the composition of a ruling class never take place quietly. Individual saints—a Buddha or a Tolstoy, for example—may renounce their power and position but never a ruling class!

Individual adaptation to new situations is often accompanied by irrational manifestations—for example, by fantasy dreams of a golden past or of an impossible rosy future. The same applies to social groups. On this analogy McCarthyism is the irrational manifestation of that section of the American ruling class which feels its position within the

ruling hierarchy threatened by the new elements. It is no accident that Joe McCarthy should come from the traditionally isolationist Middle West or that he should be a Republican. Nor is it surprising that he should continue his witch-hunting crusade even in opposition to Eisenhower—the compromise candidate of the opposing factions.

The essentially irrational aspect of McCarthyism is patent when one examines the symbolism of the movement. Communism is a highly selective symbol—even if McCarthy is not choosy about the persons whom he dubs as Communist. Externally, it represents the enemy: Soviet Russia. Internally, it represents those who stand, not for a Communist America but for the 'managed' (still may be largely 'private enterprise') economy that is necessary in an age of the closed frontier. The business interests, of course, realise objectively that there is no return to the golden age of the 19th century: the 'managed' economy has come to stay; but, in the logic of unreason, that provides only a greater motive for detesting it. The existence of the irreversible fact serves only to exacerbate the emotional reaction to it and to intensify the irrational behaviour that flows from such an emotional reaction.

In social symbolism of this kind, a curious ambivalence is always to be observed. The Jew-baiter not only hates the Jew for what he stands for—successful business—but also subconsciously admires him for his very success. Similarly, the McCarthyite not only hates Communism because it is the enemy; he also secretly admires it for its success in the sphere of power politics. Measured beside a Stalin or a Molotov, a Truman or an Eisenhower is a mere babe at the great game of *Realpolitik*. This ambivalence explains why a movement such as McCarthyism displays such contradictions: it is in fact because of those very contradictions that it attracts support.

If our analysis is broadly correct, it is clear that McCarthyism is a symptom rather than a disease—a symptom that has taken place within the American ruling class. McCarthy may, of course, win in his personal struggle against the Eisenhower group. It remains on the cards that he will become the next President. But if he does so, it can safely be said that McCarthyism will either be transformed or it will be a sad day for the American ruling class: it will be a public admission of America's failure to make the grade. McCarthyism up to now has shown itself to be essentially a negative movement: it has no policy save that of rooting out 'Communists'. But a ruling class cannot survive on a policy of negation. In the long run symbols have to give way to reality.

G.N.O.

Is Human Life Sacred? Continued from p. 2

Rebellion against these numerous foes is too risky and difficult, so the only thing to do is to retreat into the world of fantasy. It is to this that the murder-thriller story appeals. But it reveals a state of mind among the citizenry that is truly alarming. We have seen that the more general is the desire to commit an anti-social act the heavier are the penalties. There can be no doubt of the gloating joy with which people read about murder. There can be no doubt at all that the murderer is doing just what they unconsciously wish to do themselves. But they feel that such a thing is terribly wrong, since on top of the "mutual aid instinct" there is added the anti-rebellious training that they have received, and so the murderer has to be punished in the very way that he has acted, by being murdered himself.

Murder is in fact a form of rebellion, it is a way of getting rid of oppressive individuals. It can also be applied to the gods themselves as Bakunin's oft-quoted saying, "If God existed it would be necessary to abolish him," shows. "Abolish" is the same and "liquidate", or kill, it comes to the same thing.

Rex Stout, a writer of detective stories, has said, "Those who do not like murder-mysteries are anarchists." This is profoundly true. To the anarchist the murderer is a misguided rebel. The anarchist does not feel a sense of guilt about his rebellion, nor is he still in the stage of wishing to wipe out his opponents, he knows that there are better ways of going to work, so he does not feel a sense of guilt over murders, nor does he participate in them in his imagination. He does not feel that the guilty person must die, he does not need a scapegoat to bear the punishment for his own forbidden desires.

To the ordinary man human life is "sacred" precisely because he wishes in his heart to destroy it. If he does not feel it is "sacred" he fears that his impulses will break the barrier. This sanctity which is given to the human person no more protects it than it did the person of the ancient sacrificial will disappear when the necessary adjustment. It is a sanctity that a ritual, a declaration of war, or the verdict of a

jury, may set aside. The very awe with which a person's life was viewed, before the performing of the ritual, helps to make the taking of it all the more attractive, even if, as is now the case, it is mainly done by proxy. "Stolen fruit is ever the sweetest".

The anarchist has no mystic concept of a human being's life. But he will not take it, in defiance of the governments who order him to do so. He considers that it is the person's own, theirs to destroy even, if they see fit.

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

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.
- GEORGE WOODCOCK :**
Anarchy or Chaos 2s. 6d.
New Life to the Land 6d.
Railways and Society 3d.
Homes orhovels? 6d.
What is Anarchism? 1d.
The Basis of Communal Living 1s.

- 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.
- RUDOLF ROCKER :**
The Education of Free Men 1s.
Nationalism and Culture cloth 21s.
- ALEX COMFORT :**
Delinquency 6d.
Barbarism & Sexual Freedom boards 3s. 6d.
- PETER KROPOTKIN :**
The State: Its Historic Rôle 1s.
The Wage System 3d.
Revolutionary Government Organised Vengeance Called Justice 2d.
- ALEXANDER BERKMAN :**
ABC of Anarchism 1s.
- JOHN HEWETSON :**
Sexual Freedom for the Young 6d.
Ill-Health, Poverty and the State cloth 2s. 6d., paper 1s.
- F. A. RIDLEY :**
The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age 2d.

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

In Birmingham there is Prejudice . . .

THE ballot which was being organised by the Transport and General Workers' Union on behalf of the Birmingham Corporation Transport Committee to gauge the willingness or otherwise of 5,000 Birmingham transport employees to work with coloured men, is off.

One would have hoped that the good sense of the Birmingham transport workers had prevailed, but reports from there indicate that it is really a move on the part of the leadership of the T. & G.W.U. to put the onus on to the transport committee, thus to a large extent avoiding the responsibility of what amounts to a ban on coloured workers.

After a two hour delegate meeting called to discuss the ballot, it is reported that the union have asked their members to give existing transport coloured workers a "fair deal", but the delegates would not go any further and "pledge their members to work with coloured men".

Where the Money Goes

Reconversion of the royal tour ship *Gothic* for normal use will cost £435,000, according to Navy estimates published yesterday.

In the estimates for the current year, ending next month, £415,000 is allowed for the *Gothic*.

—*News Chronicle*, 24/2/54.
TOTAL: a mere £850,000.

The present flare up started when it was rumoured that the transport committee, in need of 900 employees, were considering coloured men for the work of driving and clipping tickets (drivers must go through a period of bus conducting). As a result some of the 1,400 clippies had threatened to walk off the job. Unprejudiced bus travellers familiar with these delicate females must be puzzled at the threat to their purity by the employment of coloured men! We may well ask who is going to protect the men?

It seems that the transport committee faced with the threat of a walk-out could not take the risk of a serious disruption to transport, so the matter has been temporarily dropped but the unsavoury atmosphere of colour prejudice remains.

Some of the solid citizens of Birmingham have been adding their foul breaths to the already stinking air. Letters have been pouring into the chair-

man of the transport committee. One writes:—"No smelly nigger is going to help me off a bus". Another curiosity writes:—"It is a wicked disgrace not to employ British subjects, whatever their colour, when more than half the clippies are Southern Irish Nationals and foreigners. If the Irish don't like it let them go home. If the niggers don't like it let them go home".

We can expect a reaction like this from the odd lunatic, but what has one to think of that great amalgamation of "brothers", Deakin's mob? Harry Green, the district secretary has been called the Malan of Birmingham, and no doubt he would like to be. But whether or not this is true he is certainly playing safe at the moment by feeding the prejudices of some of the members and the biased elements from the general public.

When the local Liberal Party protested against the degrading aspects of a ballot, Green referred to it as a 'pitiful statement.' What a pitiful little man he is. Having made the grade as a provincial secretary he is determined to hang on to his job.

We cannot believe that all the transport workers of Birmingham are supporting this colour bar. And although we recognise the difficulties of holding out against other members who are supported by a strong prejudiced leadership and a hysterical section of the public, a few intelligent white and coloured workers co-operating together could strike at the roots of the economic and pathological fear that gives rise to these situations.

Ironically enough the biggest privately owned bus company in the County—the Birmingham and Midland Motor Omnibus Co. Ltd., better known as the Midland Red—has invited coloured workers to apply for jobs. They need 500 conductors and plenty of drivers and will consider "applications from anyone willing to come forward, irrespective of colour. We have no discrimination, and there are already a number of coloured workers in our garage working quite amicably with our other employees."

R.M.

Another Social Experiment

WE have on occasions given our support to certain social experiments which we have considered to have some value for human beings here and now. Notable among these was the Peckham Health Centre.

For this reason we have often been labelled reformist by "pure" socialists, who would have the historical process take care of everything and refuse to agitate for improvements in living standards in present-day society. (Although we never hear of any of these socialists refusing a wage increase for themselves!) They do, however, retain their purity—along with their paralysis.

An example of the whining dead beat of the 1904 Stagnation Blues was given in a typical criticism of an article from the late lamented *Syndicalist*, which advocated a flood protection scheme to save the inhabitants of Canvey Island and East Anglia from the disasters which overtook them last winter. This was dubbed as being reformist. In other words, we want socialism, comrades, not sea walls. (Fortunately the individuals—sorry, the Party—propagating this puerility are totally ineffectual).

We shall have to risk the charge of "reformism" again, in drawing attention to another social experiment, not quite as ambitious as Peckham was, now being launched at Bristol.

A grant of £25,000 from the Carnegie United Kingdom Trust towards a "broadly based social experiment to be conducted in a selected area of Bristol" was announced after a meeting of the trust at Dunfermline.

The main purpose of the project is to encourage local initiative and stress the importance of the inhabitants taking part in their community life. The decision is the result of a survey conducted by Mr. John Mack of Glasgow University on juvenile delinquency. His conclusions were that it would be more valuable to help and consider the problem of the family as a whole rather than by treatment of individuals within the family.

In order to consider social conditions intensively a single area has been selected, and although it is too early to say what specific form the experiment will take, a serious attempt is being made to tackle, by practical means, the "stresses

and strains arising in a developing community in the form of delinquencies and other disturbances". The consideration of the family unit suggests that the experiment may well develop along the lines of Peckham.

Of course the sum of £25,000 is scarcely enough to develop such a scheme, and it was for lack of financial support that the Peckham Health Centre had finally to close down.

A grant of £30,000 from the same trust has also been given to the Brentwood recuperative centre near Manchester, which caters for women "who are in need of a period of rest and rehabilitation to enable them to face with fresh confidence the family problems which have proved too much for them".

Those of us who have seen the results of too many children, poverty and unsatisfactory family life on women will not condemn this grant because it is reformist. Some women in this society are going to benefit from such schemes, although it is quite obvious that as long as the social set-up remains in its present form the pressing needs of far too many people will remain unsatisfied. The establishment of anarchism is the only final solution, but such experiments as the Peckham Health Centre and the new project in Bristol demonstrate in a practical way, in this society, that the encouragement of mental and physical health leads to a happier and more satisfied people, and therefore, more amenable to reason.

M.

Pity the Poor Foreman

THREE weeks ago we reported briefly an incident where some electricians went on strike to protest against the sacking of a popular foreman.

Now, just to show that foremen have not moved in general from their traditionally unpopular position, comes a strike of mines to get rid of a foreman whom they regard as "tyrannical and bullying".

1,800 miners at Whitburn Colliery, South Shields, are now out, following representations to the management which were abortive. A statement issued by the secretary of Marsden Miners' Lodge, Councillor Jack Edmondson, said:

"For some five years past workmen have had trouble with this man in reference to his tyrannical and bullying manner. On four or more occasions he has been before the board and on each occasion has been admonished. Each time he has promised the lodge that he would change his attitude towards the men, but he has only kept the promise for about a month.

"On this occasion he is accused of making derogatory remarks over the telephone to a wagon weighman. He also argued with another wagon weighman, and threatened him, until it was nearly a case of fisticuffs in the pit."

Last Monday week, Jack Edmondson asked the management to hold an inquiry into the matter. This was held on Thursday but the officials' association refused to attend it. The management had refused to suspend the man, and the National Coal Board had declined to have him transferred. Mr. Edmondson's statement concluded:

"It shows how bad things are when 1,800 men are willing to give up their wages all over one man . . . We will stay on strike until either something is done about this or until the men are forced

back to work through necessity."

When told of the allegations, the foreman, James Pearson, said that he was "quite satisfied with the way things are."

Through their action the men will fail to qualify for bonus payments totalling £1,500.

★

Now this is really rather naughty of the miners to use the coercive weapon of the strike against a fellow human being. It is clearly not the way to get him to understand the true nature of co-operation between workers. These 1,800 miners should each have taken him aside and by sweet reason and the patient explanation of the principles of mutual aid and Christian charity have made a new man out of him.

After all, the trouble had only been going on for five years—and what's five years in a working man's life? In a dangerous occupation like mining mutual respect and co-operation are essential on very practical grounds as well as ideological, but if one man is unco-operative and a source of conflict, still the majority must tolerate the annoyance and even danger that must ensue.

There must be some deep-rooted psychological cause for Pearson's unreasonable and persistent anti-sociality. Perhaps his wife doesn't understand him—in which case the miners should be striking to get rid of the foreman's wife and not the foreman. Or perhaps he was shut in a coal cellar when young and is in fact allergic to coal and dark places.

Whatever it is, as libertarians we should approach the miners and try to teach them how to understand their foreman. "Who understands all, forgives all"—surely as a revolutionary slogan that would catch on at Whitburn just now? P.S.

. . . In Chicago there is Violence

A FEW months ago we published a report of an attempt in Chicago to cope with the problems arising from the entry of coloured families into formerly all-white neighbourhoods.

The size of the problem—and the fact that it still exists on a massive scale—is shown by this report from *Time*, 1.3.54:

NO light came from the windows of an apartment at 10630 South Bensley [Trumbull Park, Chicago]; none has for months. But there were people there. Behind the plywood barrier set up to protect them from bricks and stones were Donald Howard, his wife and their two small children, going about their nightly routine, dinner, the television, bedtime for the kids. So they have been living for many weeks. The Howards are Negroes, the first of their race to become tenants in Trumbull Park. They got the apartment last summer partly because a state law forbids discrimination in public housing, partly because their name had moved to the head of the list of applicants—and mostly because Mrs. Howard, who signed the lease, is so light-skinned that the clerk did not recognize her as a Negro.

The Howards' first few days in Trumbull Park were without incident. Then, one Wednesday night as 25-year-old Don Howard sat with his son and daughter in the living room, a paving block crashed through the front window. That was the beginning. In the following weeks,

more windows were smashed; sulphur stink bombs were hurled into the apartment; effigies of Negroes blazed on street corners; two neighborhood stores which sold to Negro customers were set afire; scores of fires have been set on the property of whites who refused to join the campaign to force the Negroes out; ten ugly crowds of up to 1,000 people were dispersed by police. As many as 1,000 cops have been on round-the-clock duty in the Trumbull Park area ever since.

The *Churchgoers*. Five other Negro families have since moved into the development, but the Howards bear the brunt of mob hatred. Whenever Don Howard leaves the apartment house, he gets into a paddy wagon and, with a police escort, is taken to a safe area to board his bus. The route is changed every day. But violence continues. Last month as Betty Howard, 22, left the 11:30 Mass at St. Kevin's Church, some 40 people congregated outside, most of them also coming from the services. The group shouted insults and threats, and six shrieking women followed Mrs. Howard all the way home, throwing small stones at her.

Early last week, about 500 men, women and children, some of them armed with bricks and clubs, gathered near the Howard apartment. In the ensuing riot, four policemen and a six-year-old boy were injured. The police staunchly continue to protect the Negroes, although the huge details assigned to Trumbull Park mean that other areas of the city are going without adequate police protection. No real effort is made to punish rioters. Police make few arrests because, they say, magistrates (only two persons were charged with disorderly conduct in last week's riot) afraid of political reprisals will not take a firm line against the white demonstrators.

The trouble is not confined to Trumbull Park; it extends throughout the grimy steel district which surrounds the project. Last week a petition signed by 17,000 South Side residents was presented to city officials. It asked that police protection to persons moving into new homes be limited to the first 24 hours regardless of "the race, the color or the creed." Even on last week's quiet night, teen-agers skulked in the lot across from the Howard apartment. Growled a cop to a young tough: "Why aren't you home watching Arthur Godfrey?" The youth spat on the sidewalk. Said he: "It's a free country, isn't it?"

Special Appeal

February 24th to March 4th.

Birkenhead: J.H.W. £1; New York: V.B.W. £3/10/0; London: E.W.P. 10/-; Denver: R.B.* 14/-; London: J.W.H. 8/-; London: A.B.F. £2; Kettering: E.A.N. 1/6; Birmingham: R.M. 3/-; Reading: J.P.H. 6/-; Dublin: Anon. 13/-; Hesse: G.T. 1/6; Stevenage: J.W.P. 1/6; Edge: S.L.R. 2/6; Cambridge: Anon.* 5/-; Dawley: E. & E.P. 1/6; Glasgow: A.McD.* 5/-; London: D.R.* 5/-; Aldershot: D.M.B. 6/6; London: R.J.B.A. 1/6; Shepton Mallett: E.H.S. 5/-; Kidderminster: J.W.H. 1/6.

Total	11	1	0
Previously acknowledged	56	5	1
1954 TOTAL TO DATE	£67	6	1

GIFTS OF BOOKS:
Northwood: E.H.; Exeter P.H.

* Readers who have undertaken to send regular monthly contributions.

Removing 'Natives' from Jo'burg

HENDRIK VERWOERD, Minister of Native Affairs in the Malan Government, introduced a bill this month that would empower his ministry to settle elsewhere the largest body of city dwelling industrialized Negroes in Africa.

The legislation, already approved by a majority caucus, will therefore become a law. It provides for the "removal of natives from any area in the magisterial district of Johannesburg or any adjoining magisterial district and their settlement elsewhere.

The legal reference to magisterial districts means Witwatersrand, the wealthiest industrial, financial and commercial centre in Africa and the world's principal source of gold.

A large proportion of the Negro population live in Johannesburg and Witwatersrand Negro slums and in so-called "slums in the sky", boxlike constructions on the roofs of buildings in white sections of the city.

The power to remove and resettle Negroes of the Witwatersrand is being asked at the same time a process is being completed empowering the Ministry of Native Affairs to drive Negro squatters and tenants of various sorts off white-owned farms without the obligation to provide other homes for them.

The principal purpose of the new law is to enforce apartheid, or separation of

racess, on the industrial Witwatersrand, with its constantly swelling Negro labour force. However, it also is intended, the Minister of Native Affairs has stated, to enable his ministry to break up the great Negro slums and to provide air, light and an opportunity for decent living for the Negro masses.

The slum problem had reached a hopeless dead end. The wealthy municipality of Johannesburg has been building a very limited number of houses annually to rent to Negroes in locations. At the same time Johannesburg scheduled millions of dollars to be spent on new civic centres in white districts and expended great sums every year in improving the splendid white suburbs that stretch for miles.

Slum clearance plans have been drawn up, but recently the municipality even refused a request of the Ministry of Native Affairs to provide water standpipes and cesspools on municipal land for natives living in shack towns with no source of clean water and no sanitation whatever.

Millions of pounds provided by the government to build accommodations for Negroes have been turned back, apparently because the labour needed in white sections of the city was not available to work on housing for Negroes.

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.

MARCH 24.—Jack Robinson
"WILL MEN TAKE THE PLACE
OF MACHINES?"
APRIL 7.—S. E. Parker
"PROBLEMS OF ANTI-
MILITARISM"

GLASGOW

INDOOR MEETINGS
every Friday

MARCH 14.—William Kramrich
WORLD DANGER No. 1 TO-DAY
MARCH 19.—Frank McWilliams
POLICE & AUTHORITY
MARCH 26.—Archie Cox
FREEDOM & RELIGION
Will be held at 7 p.m. at the
Workers Open Forum
50 Renfrew Street, Glasgow.

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