"That government is best which governs least."

—THOMAS JEFFERSON.

Vol. 15, No. 22

May 29th, 1954

Threepence

THE RAILWAY STRIKE

(From our Correspondent)

EXETER, MAY 22.

Unions - p. 4

FURTHER support for the hope that reformism and socialism have not completely succeeded in destroying working class militancy is given this week by the unofficial strike of railwaymen in protest against the re-introduction of the system of lodging turns.

Under this system, crews of long distance trains work for a whole day on a train going in one direction, spend the night at a hostel, or in lodgings at the terminus, and then return the following day on a train travelling on the return journey. The result is that drivers and firemen working under it have to spend about half their evenings and nights away from home. "Lodging turns" have not been in operation since before the war, and the proposal to re-introduce them has met with fierce opposition by the railwaymen concerned, who maintain that they would be deprived of a normal family life to which they are entitled.

The resentment showed itself in a practical manner on Monday, May 17th, when drivers and firemen at Newton Abbot, one of the principal depots of the Western Region, refused to work the new turns, and declared an unofficial strike. Almost immediately, they were joined by most of the crews based on Bristol, Old Oak Common and Paddington, and during the next few days meetings of railwaymen at Exeter, Cardiff and Plymouth decided not to work on trains normally handled by workers then on strike.

Rôle of Unions

While the railwaymen were thus engaged in a fight over something so fundamental to their conditions of work and living standards, it would be natural to expect vigorous activity also being carried out by the leaders of the appropriate unions, and by the elected representatives of the people, particularly those of the great socialist and Trade Union party. There certainly was vigorous activity, but in the wrong direction! The N.U.R. and A.S.L.E.F. had officially agreed to the introduction of lodging turns, and leaders of both unions appealed to the men to return to work immediately. Mr. Baty, secretary of the A.S.L.E.F. travelled to the South West for this very purpose. In the House of Commons, members from both sides of the floor also urged the workers to end their strike. One of the Labour speakers is reported to have spoken feelingly, drawing on his long-experience on the footplate. It appears that he has also had quite a lot of experience in keeping his job as a Labour M.P.

The appeals of these 'leaders' have so far been disregarded by the railwaymen, but they must have done a great amount of harm in deflecting sympathy and support away from the strike. A small delegation representing the strikers at Newton Abbott and Old Oak Common travelled to London, and were joined by Paddington men, not to negotiate with the British Transport Commission with a view to settling the dispute, but to try to persuade their unions to support them! The sole result of these meetings was a statement from the unions that they were not prepared to consider the

Anglo-Iranian's £16 Million Profits

AS representatives of Anglo-Iranian were leaving Teheran with Persia's counter-proposals for settlement of the nationalisation dispute with Britain, the Company in London was circularising its stockholders with the Statement by the Chairman which he will deliver at the next Annual General Meeting on June 10. Besides a report on the state of the negotiations, there are the all-important accounts, showing that in a financial empire such as Anglo-Iranian, there are always ways and means to make up for setbacks such as overtook them in Teheran. In 1953 the Company made a profit of £63,883,828 as against £61 million in 1952. After provision of £20 million for Depreciation on Fixed Assets and other charges, £19 million for taxation on profits, £24,382,850 was left over to distribute among shareholders or to place to reserve.

question until work had been resumed, an attitude almost identical with that expressed by Sir Brian Robertson on behalf of the B.T.C.

By the time Freedom appears in print the situation may have undergone radical changes, but even now the dispute has many interesting aspects. The justice of the case is obvious. Most of the railwaymen would prefer to spend their off-duty periods with their wives, families and friends, rather than in hostels or lodging houses away from home. Strangely enough, no protests have been heard from the Christian Churches, usually such ardent defenders of the sanctity of family life. If the family clashes with the interests of capitalism or the State, then it has to go by the board.

Justice of Workers' Case

This is further indication, for those who need it, of the rôle of religious organisations and propaganda in the social struggle. The principle involved however, is not basically the preservation of the family, which would in itself find little support among anarchists, but is the right of the workers to organize their lives as they wish, and not to have it done for them

done for them. Much play has been made in the bourgeois press of the fact that many other workers, such as fishermen, often have to spend long periods away from home, so why should not engine drivers as well? The important point is that in the case of fishermen this is almost unavoidable, but for railwaymen there is a simple alternative to the lodging turns system. The crews simply take a train half way to its destination, are relieved by a crew based on that destination, and then in turn take over another train for the latter half of the return journey. This system is conceivably less economical, in financial terms, but is certainly worth the extra cost, to avoid the disruption of men's lives. In any case the saving is minute compared to that which would be effected by ending interest payments,

and abolishing the ticket system. Possibly it would lend force to the men's claim if some unionists with knowledge of administrative work could outline a schedule which they would be prepared to operate.

Solidarity Among Strikers

At Newton Abbot, there is almost complete unanimity among the strikers. Only about a dozen drivers are reporting for work. Similar solidarity exists at other depots, and this has come about, not only without any assistance from the central bureaucracy of the unions, but in the face of direct opposition by it.

Although no doubt, most of the workers involved are loyal supporters of the Labour Party and T.U.C. they have shown that when a real problem arises they are prepared to go over the heads of these bodies, and take matters into their own hands, and to do this spontaneously without the aid of paid officials. If this is possible, then why have trade unions of the present type at all? An individual syndicalist should of course join his trade union, but in a situation such as the present one, where the futility of socialism and reformist trade unionism are so completely exposed, the best policy seems to be to urge that the entire branch involved should disaffiliate from the union, and if, as would probably happen, several branches should do this simultaneously they could then federate loosely for mutual solidarity, making it quite clear that they were prepared to back up the official union in any strike action it was involved in, and to support pension and welfare schemes, but NOT to assist in paying high salaries to officials who fought against them on every encounter, and arranged working schedules without consulting them, or to waste money in securing the election of M.P.s who did the same thing.

This would admittedly be a difficult step to take, but is one which will have to be taken if working class organisation is to become effective.

U.S. ANTI-SEGREGATION LAW

A FEW months ago we drew attention to a negro family who were the victims of continuous anti-black demonstrations after having moved into a hitherto 'white' district in Chicago. Since then, other negro families have joined them, but the young couple continued to receive the full brunt of what were particularly virulent attacks on their persons and their home (they have had their doors and windows barricaded since the beginning). Last week saw the end of their struggle; they decided to move out.

While some of the Chicago citizens were selecting their next victims for their campaign of envy and hate, a few hundred miles away nine Justices of the United States Supreme Court were announcing their unanimous decision that racial segregation in the public schools violates the constitution. Methods of effecting the decision have still be be decided by the Supreme Court, but the "separate but equal rights" doctrine which has been in the statute book since 1896 has been irrevocably replaced.

Seventeen Southern States have public school segregation by specific law. Out of these, as far as can be ascertained, only one (Georgia) has openly announced its intention to continue permanent segregation of the races.

It is obvious that legislation cannot alter an irrational state of mind, but it is equally obvious that this decision of the Supreme Court is ahead of a great many ordinary people in its recognition that education "is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms." One writer in the London Observer, commenting on the decision, even suggests that a problem has been resolved that "would not have been solved by the natural forces of American Society". The point is, that it is not "natural forces" which gave rise to racial hatred in the Southern States of America but economic ones.

Faced however, with a situation whereby Southern State authorities could get round the law embodied in the Fourteenth Amendment forbidding any State of the Union to "deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the law", we have to admit that in moral terms the decision taken by the nine judges is an acknowledgement that segregation is a degrading influence in our society.

Only time will prove whether the law remains on paper or will be adopted as part of the ordinary life of black and white alike. We know ourselves how easily people ar swayed by suggestion when it is given authoritative backing. How often are we met with the retort when we are denouncing some particular piece of fallacy—"It must be right, its the law"?—Can we hope then, that once the idea is placed in people's minds that segregation is stupid and without justice it will eventually be taken for granted?

The chances are of course that the new law may have the opposite effect. One State has hinted that rather than see black and white sharing the same schools they will close then down as public schools and run them as private schools. And here, there is another factor governing the South, the historical resentment against the power of the North.

It could be argued that the combination of racial superiority and old resentments may give rise to a complete boycott of the law or means of getting round it. The former seems unlikely. Quite apart from the fact that fanatical acts of race hatred have been dying out over the last few years, (last year it was reported for the first time on record no lynching incidents had taken place in the South) the majority of State Governors have accepted the situation, if regretfully. They have all said of course that it will take years to "work out the details". The un-named masses are another matter, and it is on their decisions that the final successful intermingling of races will depend.

One should add that the decision taken by the Supreme Court after so many years of acceptance of the principle of segregation should not be taken wholly as a change of morality, without also considering the possible political implications. Europe, it is said, is watching America with a careful eye, and behind the Iron Curtain incidents which underline the reactionary nature of American life are exploited to the full. Considered in this light one could read into the new law the familiar act of political expediency. The question remains for anarchists, should we give our support to a progressive legislation prompted by the wrong motives? R.M.

The McCarthy Hearings ** AS THE VIEWER SEES THEM

N the day that the name Earl Browder came up Senator McCarthy was in an awkward spot. Two and a half weeks had gone by with Mr. Stevens giving evidence and it was obvious that some sort of deal must soon be made to prevent the Senator from going on for another 2½. The committee rules allowed for the examination of each witness to continue round the table in 10 minute periods until no one had any more questions, but since the bubble-bursting appearance of Mr. Adams, Mr. Stevens' office lawyer, the previous Thursday, many questions were embarrassing to bring up. He had kept Friday going with an entertaining display of stagey attitudes, points of order, mock-pious speeches to the "American Nation", protests about this fantastic waste of time, this circus, this television show, at once balanced by very important questions, Mr. Secretary, that this nation has a right to know. This dish, as I say, was served up in 10 minute chunks, the Senator breaking off in the middle of a sentence, impatiently waiting for 2 Counsel, 6 Senators and the Chairman to say "I pass", and continuing, it seemed with the same breath, until 4.30 came along and he was safe for the week-end. People watching on television felt sure that on Monday . . . but Monday came and there he was, as rhetorical and imperturbable as ever. There was no reason why he should ever stop, and yet the patter was wearing thin. There was something comical and tragic about the pretended sincerity of this clumsy inquisition seeking to avoid the appearance of escaping a cross-examination by the Committee of which he was himself ordinarily Chairman, stalling off by every trick the moment when he is himself investigated, so the public will infer, for Un-American activities. So that when he asked Mr. Stevens to listen to a passage he was going to read from Earl Browder (the now deported ex-secretary

of the C.P. in the United States), the

sound of astonished mirth could be heard from all over the Senate room, and Mr. Welch, Mr. Stevens' Counsel for the present hearing, leaned back in his chair laughing, and Mr. Jenkins, the Committee's temporary legal adviser, mustered enough court dignity to pronounce solemnly that the testimony of one Earl Browder taken under oath or any other way was not such that this Committee could place credence upon it, and the same he felt sure was true for Senator McCarthy. Senator Mundt, the Chairman, ruled it out of order for said testimony to be quoted. A Senatorial Committee could not possibly believe anything a Communist, such as Mr. Browder, might say to be true, and there was just no point in the Senator from Wisconsin bringing it up, in fact, and the gavel was banged, he ruled that such testimony must not be mentioned.

Senator McCarthy with the glee masked by innocence of a show-off child who knows he's got his Dad beat reads out "In 1945 before a Senate Investigating Committee Earl Browder said . . . ".

"Does this mean I am a Communist?"
—we are astonished to hear this welltimed levity from Mr. Stevens, usually
a meek and unaggressive performer.

"That's very funny, Bob, that's terribly funny, isn't it," and in so many words (but occupying ten minutes) the Secretary of the Army of the U.S.A. is informed that it is doubtful whether the Communists would consider him intelligent enough to make an invitation to join the party worth while.

We go on: Earl Browder said—and as he breaks off you can hear the jesuitical machinery creak. He takes off his glasses and adopts the "honest discussion" posture. "Would you say, Bob, that . . . ". The gist of this transparent attack is (1) Communists are cunning (agreed). (2) G2 (Intelligence) is a good place for a Communist spy to hide (agreed). (3) So

we can assume that if let us say a certain number of Communists (Stevens shifts uneasily-is there a trap coming?) are in G2 at a certain time, as testified on oath and we have no proof that they have since been discharged (he blinks, there must be a catch coming) we must assume, is that right, Bob, (look out!) that they are still there? No, I don't agree Senator! Any number of things could have happened to them . . . Close shave, he saw that one in time. The Senator says Um-um and leans over to Roy Cohn for more ammunition, as the Consel for the Committee says that he understands that Senator McCarthy has just read purported testimony of one Earl Browder given in 1945 to the effect that as of that date there were 13,000 Communists in the United States Army, some, of them officers. He does not think this testimony (which of course is worthless) has any possible bearing on the issues at stake, but he forgets to mention that the reading of this particular statement was in any case futile as Earl Browder did not mention G2 in his account.

Futile? That depends on what you think is motivating this "enquiry" Certainly if you believe that it is an attempt to uncover the truth of charges and countercharges delivered by Mr. Stevens and Senator McCarthy against each other, you will say that the Senator at this point was wasting time. There are in general three opinions on the hearings. A small group of people (I speak of the institution in which I work) disclaims any interest; to them it is too bad that the hearings had to come up. One man said he was ashamed to be an American. While an anarchist could sympathize with this opinion, in reality those people who disclaim interest are wishing that the hearings were not conducted in front of the so revealing television cameras, but they would seem to be content to let McCarthy remain unexposed to light.

Continued on p. 4

The S. Korean Elections

IN spite of—or perhaps because of—what a Reuter report describes as "police intimidation, threats and actual violence" during the S. Korean election campaign, President Syngman Rhee's Liberal party has secured only a small majority over the Independents and other opposition parties, though he had urged voters to give his party two thirds of the seats. Observers say that the results indicate that there will now be an "extensive battle between Liberals and the Democratic Nationalist forces" for the support of the independent candidates who have been elected.

The New York Times correspondent in Seoul comments (May 21) that:

One of the most unsatisfactory results of this week's vote, from the point of view of President Rhee and his closest adherents, was the fact that several of the South Korean leader's most outspoken critics were victorious. These included P. H. Shinicky, Chairman [Speaker] of the Nationalist Assembly and head of the Democratic Nationalists, and Chough Pyong Ik, another Democratic Nationalist executive.

Both had charged during the campaign that the police were using pressure to influence the voters against them.

Reports from remote areas as well as first-hand observance of widely scattered polling places, left a clear impression that the vote itself was not marred by open intimidation or violence.

TEXT BOOK FOR STATESMEN

THE PRINCE, by Niccolò Macchiavelli. Various publishers, 15th century onwards.

WHEN Francis Bacon thought up a particularly shrewd bit of political trickery, James I used to say, by way of congratulation, "A Macchiavell, Bacon, A Macchiavell." Now that rulers prefer to think of themselves as freely chosen by their subjects, rather than divinely appointed, it is more usual for politicians to refer to their opponents' schemes as "Macchiavellian", by way of condemnation.

The application of unemotional thought to the problem of acquiring and maintaining power over people—states-manship without hypocrisy—is always associated with the name of Niccolò Macchiavelli; as it should be, for his book "The Prince" is probably unique among works on political science, in that it is in no way confused or obscured by any attempt to ascribe a moral purpose to government.

Yet Macchiavelli did not invent any "Macchiavellian" system of government, nor was he himself a prince or adviser to a prince. His general advice about princely behaviour is illustrated throughout by examples of successful and unsuccessful statesmanship, both from ancient history and from his own time. Moses, Alexander the Great, David and the more successful Caesars, all, he shows, applied Macchiavellian principles astutely. The cleverest moves of Pope Alexander VI, Orsini, Vitelli, Cesare Borgia, and the other brilliant politicians among Macchiavelli's contemporaries had mostly been made before "The Prince" was written, and many of them are cited in the book.

Macchiavelli was himself a successful politician, but a republican. "The Prince" deals exclusively with problems facing the autocrat. Both in "The Prince" and throughout his minor works he uses the concept "people governing themselves" synonymously with "people governed by elected rulers," and writes as if only autocrats need political science.

Macchiavelli, and following him Ricci, who translated his work into English in 1903, take the view (possibly with justification from subsequent letters of Macchiavelli) that "The Prince" was written for the guidance of liberals. "What he did," says Ricci, "was to show in the most deliberate and in the plainest manner the arts by which free peoples were made slaves; and had his words of advice been always heeded, no tyrant in Italy or elsewhere could have been successful in his policy. That he was not listened to, and his advice scorned and

spurned, was not Macchiavelli's fault."

If the book was written to advise liberals, is is a satire, for it pretends to advise despots. It is a satire, moreover, so subtly composed that the point is generally missed; for liberals mostly con-

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

OPEN 10 a.m. to 6.30; 5.0 SATURDAYS

New Books . . .

demn it and many autocrats have made good use of it.

The dedication of the book is to Lorenzo the Magnificent, one of the Medicis. It could be a satirical dedication, but even in Ricci's version (and the translator's point of view must influence the translation), it reads more like a genuine pleas for notice, with a hinted hope of patronage, from Lorenzo.

The last chapter, "Exhortation to liberate Italy from the barbarians" describes the weaknesses of various invaders and foreign rulers of parts of Italy, and favourably estimates the chances of success of an Italian Prince prepared to use Italian nationalism in acquiring such territories for his own rule. It is almost impossible to imagine this as satire.

One is justified in disagreeing with Macaulay and Ricci, and in believing that, whatever Macchiavelli may have said in later years, "The Prince" is what it seems. A man with such insight into politics must surely have realised, whatever his public declarations, that a republic is just another kind of state, the problems facing an elected politician much the same as those facing a prince, and requiring very similar solutions. When, through no fault of his own, he lost his powerful job as Secretary to the Florentine Republic, he may well have decided to try princely politics, and written and published "The Prince" as evidence of his political acumen, in the hope (which was not realised) that either Lorenzo or some other Prince would appoint him adviser.

The reason why it was written, however, makes little difference to the importance of "The Prince". Whatever its intention, it demonstrates the general principles of government. It can show both rulers and revolutionaries why governments prosper or fail, how a government should behave in order to maintain itself, and, less directly, how one might behave to bring about its downfall.

The following quotations from "The Prince" are both from the ends of chapters. They are typical of Macchiavelli's statements of the principles of government, but of course show nothing of his method of examining history in order to discover these principles. However, readers of Freedom will notice how they are still valid, and still applied by the most successful statesmen of our own time: and how failure to apply them makes the State insecure.

Of attaining power by villainy: ... In taking a State, the conqueror must arrange to commit all his cruelties at once, so as not to have to recur to them every day, and so as to be able, by not making fresh changes, to reassure people and win them over by benefiting them. Whoever acts otherwise, either through timidity or bad counsels, is always obliged to stand with knife in hand, and can never depend on his subjects, because they, through continually fresh injuries, are unable to depend upon him. For injuries should be done all together, so that being less tasted, they will give Jess offence. Benefits should be granted little by little, so that they may be better enjoyed. And above all, a prince must live with his subjects in such a way that no accident should make him change it, for good or evil; for necessity arising . . . you are not in time

with severity, and the good that you do

does not profit you, as it is judged to be forced."

Of princes keeping faith:

prince, cannot observe all those things that are considered good in men, being often obliged, in order to maintain the State, to act against faith, against charity, against humanity and against religion. And, therefore, he must have a mind disposed to adapt itself . . . as the variations of fortune dictate, and, as I said before, not deviate from what is good, if possible, but be able to do evil if necessitated . . . [But] to see and hear him, he should be all faith, all integrity, all humanity and all religion.

time, whom it is well not to name, never does anything but preach peace and good faith; but he is really a great enemy to both, and either of them, had he observed them, would have lost him both State and reputation on many occasions."

Silone's New Novel

A HANDFUL OF BLACK-BERRIES, by Ignazio Silone.

W/E have waited a good many years for Silone's new novel, and during this best part of a decade, while Silone has flirted with politics and, one imagines, caused himself a great deal of heartache in the fruitless attempt to inject a little ethics into Italian public life, our expectations have perhaps led us to anticipate something on a rather stupendous scale. A Handful of Blackberries, the book that has emerged from this long travail, is a fair enough novel by any ordinary standards, a piece of literary workmanship and compassionate observation which no writer need be ashamed to have produced. But it is still not a great masterpiece; it is not even on the same level of creative vitality as the three remarkable novels which Silone wrote before and during the war.

It deals again with the question which has been uppermost in Silone's mind

find it difficult to get employment else-

where, as he is a security risk. Brunton

is disgusted by this blackmailing, but he

ever since he left the Communist Party and wrote Bread and Wine-the problem of the intellectual who finds that a totalitarian party in the long run always presents the alternative of withdrawing or of being forced into the abandonment both of independent reasoning and of humanist ethical standards. In the case of Rocco, the hero, who has been a ruthless partisan leader during the war, the conflict is not merely an internal ethical question of ends and means; it is also projected on to his relationship with the world around him. He sees that the party is perpetually selling out on the workers; he also sees that certain individuals whom the party condemns, a set of natural-born rebels from among the local peasant population, are maintaining a rebellion against exploitation which is not only just, but is also in the interests of the people. His situation is complicated by the fact that his girl friend, whom he has converted to the party, chooses at first to stay in it after he has left, and is only driven out of it by the humiliating way in which the Communist bureaucrats try to force her to an open betrayal of him.

This story can be considered at certain levels. As an exposure of the devious course of Communist tactics in Italy it is interesting and, no doubt, revealing. It is also important in so far as it shows that Silone has an inner integrity which does not always appear to be shared by his fellow converts from Communism. Men like Koestler and Chambers seem to have cut themselves off almost entirely from their old radical ideals, while at the same time they show an intolerance which indicates that they have rather reversed their Communist ethics than abandoned them. But Silone, at least in so far as we can judge from his book, is still unshaken in his opposition to the traditional enemies of the poorthe landowners and the police—and he still retains a faith in the creative potentialities of the people that is rare indeed in this age of disillusioned radicalism.

But this faith, one feels, is becoming a desperate one, and the impression created by reading through A Handful of Blackberries is one of flatness and staleness. The cast is the same as before—the disillusioned intellectual, the good priest who tries to live out his Christianity, the peasant originals from whose natural wisdom the hero draws consolation and strength. But somehow the actors seem to have grown old and jaded in their years on the road, and they play out the new drama with considerably less zest than they showed in their magnificent performances of the past. Indeed, a sincere and compassionate humanity, a more or less accurate grasp of the present political situation, are not enough, if the fire of creative originality is lacking. And that, which Silone possessed in abundance in his days of exile, he seems to have lost in the years of petty and frustrating political strife that have followed. A Handful of Blackberries, for all its competence, for all the sympathy one feels for the attitude it expresses, seems too much like a desperate effort to get back to the old achievements by repeating the old formulae. Let us hope that Silone will soon write another novel in which his talent will have found a new direction in which it can express itself with rejuvenated creativity.

GEORGE WOODCOCK.

THE BOMBSHELL

"THE BOMBSHELL", by Val Gielgud, might have been a very good play, but it is sadly weakened by a deplorable third act. John Brunton is a physicist, a badly-paid junior lecturer at a provincial university; he has, however, a brilliant mind, and is offered an important position at a new atomic research station, as he has written a thesis on nuclear fission, which has, unintentionally on his part, been of value in developing a new type of bomb. He considers all the material and social advantages which accepting this employment will bring them, but he and his wife decide to resist these temptations, as they feel that this is an opportunity for practical pacifism. He is a scientist, but is not interested in inventing new and more horrible weapons of war; he believes that no scientist should do anything to contribute to the making of a new war, that the argument about a scientist pursuing knowledge regardless of the consequences is pure sophistry; applied science is made for man and not man for applied science, as the scientist should do everything he can to preserve and improve true civilization, to use his knowledge for the good of humanity. This is the best and sincerest part of the play. It is through the people's ignorance, which conceals from them the ambitious designs, the secret practices, the low artifices of rulers, thus preventing them from obviating tyranny, from stopping the progress of ruthless power, and ruining it entirely, and the hypocrisy and indifference of scientists, the conscious or unconscious instruments of militarists, armaments manufacturers, and a ruling oligarchy of capitalistic or governmental bosses, that the practical results of man's victory over nature are applied to means for destroying men, physically and spiritually, to increasing luxury, dissoluteness. So long as the State exists, every victory over nature will inevitably serve only to increase the power and oppression of rulers. John Brunton is convinced that the scientist should serve fundamental human needs and forward the causes of peace and personal liberty. The authorities attempt to intimidate him into doing what they want: a Home Office official informs him, in a very polite and smooth manner, that if he refuses to co-operate he will lose his job at the university, and will

still refuses to abandon his basic humanitarian principles. He is staying in London with his brother-in-law, James Rice, a near-Communist journalist; there is some good satire in one scene at the expense of Communist intellectuals. Before the visit of the Home Office official, Rice tells Brunton it would be better to accept the job, to adapt himself to circumstances, but afterwards he is anxious that Brunton should become a martyr in order to provide useful propaganda for his political line. In the third act, the play deteriorates, and grows tediously improbable—it turns out that the authorities were not really serious, that the Home Office official is a splendid fellow after all, as Brunton was being used as a "guinea-pig" to test security measures, and in order to trap Rice, who has been helping people to escape to Moscow, and was trying to persuade Brunton to go to Italy for a holiday to put him in contact with a Russian agent. If the author wanted to write a hackneyed spy melodrama, why did he write two acts first of serious discussion? Why did he spoil the play's vital theme? Jack Allen's subtle performance as the bullying Home Office official provides a scene of tense and interesting drama. Raymond Huntley, as James Rice, is as effective and amusing as he was in the recent play by Peter Ustinov, No Sign of the Dove; his skill makes the dialogue sound much better than it is. Leo Genn is competent, if somewhat monotonous, in the part of Brunton. The Bombshell is as good a play as The Burning Glass, by Charles Morgan, which has been running for some months now at the Apollo Theatre, and has a similar theme about a scientist who discovers a terrifyingly destructive weapon, but this is not saying much. The Burning Glass is a thoroughly pretentious, bourgeois piece of work; it is not quite so insufferable as The River Line, but there is still far too much sophistry and pseudo-philosophy in it. Mr. Morgan is gallantly persisting in his career as a playwright despite a total inability to write a worthwhile play. D.M.M. Since going to press this play has been withdrawn.

OUT-OF-THIS-WORLD DEPARTMENT J MAY NOT READ T

Primitive Heritage: Writings in Anthropology ed. by Margaret Meade & N. Calas 21/-A Handful of Blackberries Ignazio Silone 12/6 The Origins of Psycho-Analysis Sigmund Freud 30/-A. S. Neill 9/6 The Free Child A. S. Neill 7/6 The Problem Family That Dreadful School A. S. Neill 7/6 Reprints . . . The Old Wives' Tale; The Journals; Clayhanger Arnold Bennett each 3/6 Anna of the Five Towns; The Grand Babylon Hotel; Riceyman Arnold Bennett each 2/-Herodotus 5/-The Histories Christ Stopped at Eboli Carlo Levi 2/-Second-Hand . . . Sex in Civilization (ed.) V. F. Calverton and S. D. Schmalhausen 7/6 A Dominie's Log A. S. Neill . 3/6 Intruder in the Dust William Faulkner 3/-The Valley of the Moon Jack London 4/-The Kempton-Waca Letters Jack London 3/-Publications . . . Organomic Functionalism, No. 3 The Struggle, No. 4-May 1954 Postage extra on all items.

Obtainable from

27, RED LION STREET,

LONDON, W.C.I

RUMOUR swept through the Roman countryside last week that the world would come to an end on May 24th. (As we write these lines on that very day, we cannot be certain they will ever appear in print. If they do not, then FREEDOM readers will know that the worst has happened—or will they? . . . but in the best traditions of journalism, as of the sea, and just as Drake went on with his game of bowls, and Nero fiddled etc. . . . so we continue at our typewriters—to record what may be mankind's last hours on this unhappy planet.

The source of this rumour—this inspired vision, this celestial advance notice of doom—has not been discovered. The Italian authorities suggest that the plans to repair Rome's famous Colosseum may have been taken as a portent. Our own guess is that the inspired singing of 120,000 souls, damp but ardent, at Billy Graham's London farewell appearance, may have been carried by favourable winds to the

Roman countryside, and mistaken for angels calling them to everlasting happiness. But be that as it may, the portents were such that vast crowds of black-robed men and women invaded Vatican City wanting a last glimpse of the Pope before the fatal hour. To us, this seems a logical thing to do. Who could be better informed than God's personal representative on this planet; what better sanctuary than the house of the Vicar of Christ? But these spiritually-inspired children of God were met, not by the Pope, but by his Swiss Guards—in battle dress, we assume—who according to press reports, proceeded to "drive back the crowd". -

Inside the Vatican there was no panic. Indeed, the News Chronicle's correspondent presents an almost anachronistic picture when she writes: "Phones rang in the Vatican all day asking if the report is true", and we can well imagine one of those undignified anarcho-Atheists

suggesting that while the telephone bells were ringing, the Pope's secretary was in constant touch with the hereafter by short-wave radio to obtain first-hand intelligence. But that is not the truth. The Pope is a man of the world—if you see what we mean—and moves with the times, and evolution, light years and such jargon are no longer heresies, and it is not surprising therefore that to the black-robed mob, tormented by devils and terrible portents he brought comfort with sober, matterof-fact truths. Through the lips of one of his officials he declared (and we would like to think that the statement was made from the very balcony of the House of God and relayed by microphones and loudspeakers:

"Since the year 1000 we have been told the end of the world is here, and we are still waiting."

And to such an incitement, the Gods remained silent. The Muts!

K. J. KENAFICK :

Michael Bakunin

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 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? Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications : Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute cloth 5s. Journey Through Utopia cloth 16s. (U.S.A. \$2.50)

Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian

Revolution Betrayed) cloth 12s. 6d.

VOLINE:

Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx 27, Red Lion Street, London, W.C.I.

Vol. 15, No. 22

May 29, 1954

SOLIDARITY WAGE STRUGGLE

IT is one of the most obvious requirements of solidarity that when workers of one industry are on strike for better wages that workers in other industries should support them. In practice however one finds that the issue is not quite as simple as it seems for "wage increases" can be a most imprecise term. Thus if an entire industry is on strike and secures an increase, the increase is not applied equally to all members. An increase of one pound a week may make very little difference to a man earning £40 a week but it doubles the income of the man who earns £1 a week. Such an example is exaggerated, but it does show that the distribution of wage gains becomes a complicated matter where different wage levels occur.

Class divisions also complicate the picture. Very few workers must have been deeply concerned at the "excessive" earnings of dentists in the early days of the National Health Service, or at the pay-cut they soon received. The fact is that wage struggles to attract support seem to need the appeal of justice—using the word to mean relief for the needy. Wage improvements should affect first those whose pay does not lift them out of dire poverty.

It is however unfortunately true that the better paid workers are also usually the better organized. Judges for example usually have little difficulty in getting periodical advances in salary despite the complicated legal and administrative processes involved, whereas the very menial sort of tasks are commonly done by men with little organized apparatus at all.

The idea that justice demands advances for the poorest paid as the most urgent wage relief, is a social one, and springs from the feeling le that in a society men are all one with duties towards the less fortu-Such ideas are very deep seated. They are present in early Christian thought and in the charity of the Mediaeval Church, as well as in the feudal idea that the rich and the great have a duty towards the poor. Capitalism has no such philosophy, but a proportion of rich capitalists have applied the idea, in a rather coldly theoretical way, it is true, by financing "good works"— Lord Nuffield's projects, and the Rockefeller Foundation are examples.

One may apply these musings to the recent decision of Parliament to increase the salaries of its members from £1,000 to £1,500. This is a very large increase—a 50 per cent. rise in fact. But since M.P.s were paid £600 before the war it is not out of tune with the rise in the cost of living. It cannot be a new thing for members to be preoccupied about their official salary, since they have been paid since the reign of Edward III which is a long time ago.

Supporters of the Bill for Increase argued that certain M.P.s-mostly Labour—suffered real hardship. The political correspondent of the Observer paints an almost Dickensian picture: "That there is genuine hardship among some Members, particularly Labour Members, could not be denied. There are perhaps as many as 100 M.P.s who eke out their lives in obscure hotels or apartments, and as the cost of living has risen have been increasingly haunted by debts. So desperately are they placed that the Labour Whips have discovered that they have little chance of defeating the Government on any Thursday unless there is an all-night sitting. The impoverished Socialist has had to catch the last train home because he could not afford an extra

night's board and lodging."

Solidarity demands that the richer workers, like the miners or the barrow tradesmen should not be indifferent to the plight of their poorer fellow workers at Westminster.

And yet another point of view was widely supported—that expressed in an amendment put forward by the Conservative Sir Thomas Moore and 18 others. This recommended that no increase in members' salaries should be made "until the needs of other particularly hard-pressed and needy members of the community have been first dealt with." In the debate Sir Thomas urged that no money should be paid until "the hard-pressed and the pensioners" had been dealt with.

Here however we come up against one of those practical difficulties which bedevil the ideas of justice and doing the right thing. There are only 600 odd M.P.s. To give them a rise of £10 a week each costs only £300,000 a year. There are thousands of old age pensioners, and to give them a few shillings increase costs a very large total sum. Unhappily in our society the Chancellor of the Exchequer takes as much account—perhaps, indeed, more—of such practical considerations as he does of natural justice.

If we put aside the unworthy suspicion that certain Conservative M.P.s can well afford to be objective about proposed pay rises, because they do derive income from other sources—if we refused to meddle with any such uncharitable probing into motives, we cannot but sympathize with the amendment of Sir Thomas Moore. After carefully considering questions of mutual solidarity among wage workers, among "workers with hand and brain"; after weighing up the increase in the cost of living, and assessing degrees of hardship, there still remains an uncomfortable picture of legislators who invoke the national interest to block pay increases among certain workers, but by a majority of 280 votes to 166, give themselves £500 a year extra. Somehow it is not a very elevating scene.

TF human life is sacred there is no reason why any other life should not be sacred as well. Albert Schweitzer's "reverence for life" extends even to bacilli and disease-carrying insects. He tells in his autobiography how once he was given a young eagle which fed on fish, and he was faced with the moral dilemma of either letting the young eagle die of starvation or be responsible for the death of thousands of litle fishes with which to keep him alive. The dilemma, however, saddening as it was, did not lead him to despair, and he accepted moral responsibility for the choice he made. Men are capable of a sense of solidarity and kinship with all living beings, but the argument against human life having any special value is not usually brought forward to vindicate such feeling of solidarity and kinship but to draw the conclusion that since human beings cannot help and do not worry about destroying other living creatures in order to live themselves, human beings could also be destroyed without qualms for similar reasons. Ridding a house of flies with Flit and ridding a country of Jews with gas chambers are deeds that have been put in our time exactly on the same level.

If the killing of a chicken or a pig is not deemed a crime, and indeed is considered highly meritorious, why should so much fuss be made about the killing of a man? Is there any definition of crime other than its being a punishable action? If a monopoly in the administration of punishment has been secured one can kill with impunity and amidst the general applause. Only the weak can be criminal; the strong have only to make sure that they remain strong, and God will

be on their side. It is part of Socialist propaganda, at least on the continent, to say that God and the teachings of the Church were a clever device on the part of the strong to keep the weak in subjection, and with the myth of heaven and hell, to refrain the latter from seeking justice in this world. According to Nietzsche, instead, Christian religion was a device of the weak to keep the strong in check and so enervate them as to bring the whole human race to the same level of cowardly and hypocritical renunciation of strength. As a matter of fact, religion can be an instrument both to afford protection to the weak and to consolidate the dominance of the strong. Apart from the use that can be made of the idea of God; however, is there a relation between God and evil which the human mind could, be it never so faintly, comprehend?

Human beings, and all other species of animals, cannot live without killing, without destruction of vegetable life. This is the strongest argument, if not against the existence of God, at least against that of a God on whom we could found our ideas of good and evil. It rather supports such views as that of Schopenhauer's unintelligent and amoral 'Will' or of the Marquis de Sade's creator delighting in murder, torture and destruction. Against such pessimistic conclusions there stands, however, a thought-challenging, willshaking fact. There is no doubting the great spiritual and pragmatical advantage of a belief in God, yet man's sense of good and evil and his condemnation of killing as evil are such that he is ready for their sake to forgo even this great advantage.

To speak of man's quest for the absolute will appear to many students to-day as meaningless and idle. Yet is not the school of thought they are following also striving for the absolute in the precision of the statements they make and in the demarcation of the facts to which their statements refer? The rejection of God as absolute goodness because of the evil found in creation can and does proceed from a quest of the absolute even if this quest should turn out to be no more than a mental habit, and even if it should yield no other result than concluding on the hopeless badness of man in order to obliterate all moral efforts and distinctions. The same quest, pushed a step further and still in the same direction can lead to the choice of absolute evil, as recently testified by Sartre's "Saint Genet, Comedien et Martyr".

Evil is a problem that cannot rationally and satisfactorily be solved. It is unaccountable, the same as existence. It is, in particular, impossible to account for it logically when the existence of God as absolute goodness has been postulated. For if God is absolute then there should not be a single speck of evil untouched by and therefore setting limits to God's goodness. Also, if God is absolute goodness, no work in His creation should bear the stamp of evil. If all that is has been created by God, even non-being, to which evil is sometimes approximated or identified with, must have proceeded from God. The biblical myths of Lucifer and the Fall are no answers to the problem for when it is said that Lucifer and Adam were created free their freedom meant potential evil and this potentiality could only be given them by God who had it in Himself contrary to His attribute of infinite goodness.

Soloviev's idea of God as non-being as well as being, the Manichean belief in a co-eternal struggle between good and evil, and romantic conceptions of a God prisoner of His own creation suffering and labouring with man towards a cosmic redemption can be emotionally and even logically more satisfactory, but they demand a reliance on revelation and a theological concern which only a few individuals, especially in our time, are capable of.

Excursions into theology, however, are not necessary. Evil and good can be accepted as data of human existence, as data of mystery, and can be considered as a purely human affair. It is only by considering them as a purely human affair that something can be done about them on the basis of human responsibility. Any moral endeavour, otherwise, is soon engulfed into the abyss of determinism, fatalism or predestination. The problem of good and evil, in other words, as a human and not a cosmic problem has to be tackled as if God were not.

Human society is a particular case in the order (or disorder) of nature. It would be a mistake to apply to it the crude biological normality by which each species prospers on the destruction of others. It is equally a mistake to apply the concept of good and evil to the biological world. For good and evil are rational and ethical concepts, and although the individual mind is the seat and source of all morality and reason, it is through the social fact, through the intercommunication of individual minds that ethics and rational thought have developed. Without society there would be no language, which is the life-blood of reason, nor would there be faith in reason of sufficient strength to resist the lure of impulse and imagination. There would be no morality, either, good and evil being merely categories of passively experienced pleasure and harm, and never actively and responsibly chosen modes of behaviour. Good and evil are social concepts and meanings made possible by the social fact. It is only by extrapolation that they assume cosmic proportions. To apply them to God is to conceive God in the image of man, and to forget that God, whatever idea we may have of Him, even as a trinity, is not a social being in the same sense as man is, in the sense, that is, by which good and evil have sense. Both the scientific and the religious outlooks, insofar as they attempt to reach for an objective, impersonal, impartial and unconditioned viewpoint, are destructive of human values, both end by setting human life at naught, and erase all distinctions between good and evil.

GIOVANNI BALDELLI.

VEHES OF RECOGNIZATION CADINGS VIEW VIEWERS McCARTHY HEARINGS SEES AS THE THEM Continued from p. 4

ing his behaviour on television. The most obvious is his violent resentment of any remark or action that could possibly be construed as adverse criticism of himself, which he shows by an immediate "counter-attack", justifying his whole self with words of indignant emotion. He jumps at any opening to justify himself. The second is the rôle of Saviour that he adopts of the American People. which is a way of justifying his life and actions: without Me you would be utterly lost. The disintegration of logical thought, the fear of attack from a hostile world and the delusions of grandeur are symptoms of a severe character disorder, one that is known to be found, though usually less marked, in active political figures, not of course confined to politicians in the U.S.A. Mr. ROBERT STEVENS is an equally

plainly demarcated character. He is said by newspaper writers to be a successful business "executive" and to have raised the fortunes of his family business which has to do with cotton manufacture. He was made Secretary of the Army in 1953 when the Eisenhower cabinet was formed. [Members of the Cabinet are appointed by the President and are not elected by vote to any legislative organization. Some newspapers have attempted to show the hearings as a dispute between the legislative and executive branches of government, a theory that does not hold water]. He is held in common consent here as a "finishingschool boy" who doesn't know a scamp when he sees one, a man who has led a sheltered life and has views on life that are straightforward and based on the Ten Commandments and the ideals of democracy. McCarthy said, "Yes, Bob, I do think you are anti-Communist but very unintelligently anti-Communist," and one is inclined to agree. As he sits in the witness chair he looks like a frightened child who has suddenly been confronted with a policeman. He has never had to face this sort of ordeal before and does not know how to handle it. The stand he makes against Mc-Carthy (and, as I said, it is McCarthy and Cohn who have kept him in the seat

for thirteen days) is of the feeblest possible. He evades a question by answering another, yet pleading with the Chairman that he honestly wants to answer to everything-so that the American People may know the facts; he allows insults to pass unnoticed; he either "recalls some talk along those lines" or "positively does not recall any such thing". By his appearance of timidity he disheartens the anti-McCarthys and gladdens the press. His evidence reveals that he has acted all along as a man frightened of Mc-Carthy and eager to placate him, and possibly from this fact has answered McCarthy's suspicion (as stated in the countercharges) that "the Army" tried to "buy off the Committee's investigation' by offering preferential treatment for Private Schine. Observation of his behaviour does not indicate that Stevens could himself have brought matters to a head by issuing the charges accusing

McCarthy of improper conduct. Mr. Roy Cohn is less easily discussed. He was known as a "brilliant" young man and was described by McCarthy, for whom he works as Chief Counsel as "one of the most brilliant young fellows I ever met." His school record was a succession of tops. He did the four year Law course at Harvard University in three years and graduated too young to sit for his Bar examinations. His legal activity seems to have consisted of prosecuting people charged with espionage or conspiring to overthrow the U.S. Govt. by force (the charge, legal under the Smith Act, that can be raised against members of the Communist Party). He took a leading part in prosecuting the Rosenbergs three years ago in the New York District Court over which his father, Judge Cohn, presided, and the prosecution seems to have brought him to the notice of the Senator. I regret the need to warn readers at this point against their emotions in the Rosenberg "case", yet it is necessary in the interests of clear thinking to insist that this man and woman were legally electrocuted after legal conviction of a crime, even though the crime was defined as illegal after its commission, a common legislative device, and that to expect a legal reprieve under such conditions is plain superstition. Cohn's connection with the case is significant only as an indication that he too might then have considered himself as an anti-Communist expert, and have become a natural for McCarthy. For similar reasons it is necessary to point out that it is significant that the Cohn family is Jewish because of the fact that the Rosenberg-Glasshouse trial tended also to produce a defensive anti-Communist bias on the part of other Jewish people.

To this extent then Cohn is a helpless creature of environment. A further possible fact makes it necessary to think very clearly about Cohn. This is the precise nature of his relationship with Mr. Schine. Schine, the ghost behind everyone's words, has figured little so far in the investigation, but from the beginning it was clear that almost the whole of the "pressure" considered by "the Army" to be "improper" had its origin in Cohn. It was Cohn who telephoned, wrote, consulted and produced the reasons which made it appear necessary for the "good of the nation" that Schine first not be drafted into the Army, then be appointed instead to some elusive position in other government investigating agencies; then when it became obvious that he would have to join the Army that he be appointed as an adviser to Stevens; failing that that he should be given special time off to go to New York; that he should not be sent to Korea, and so on. It was also said by Mr. Stevens that he had heard that McCarthy himself had no particular use for Schine and in fact wanted him drafted to avoid compromising his own position. So far it has not been brought out to what degree Cohn was able for personal reasons to manipulate McCarthy. What has evolved is the ridiculous position in which Mc-Carthy has found himself maintaining that Cohn's supplications, to which he was himself opposed, were in fact perfectly justified.

Evidence has been given of Cohn's reactions of hurt rage to situations where he thought himself slighted and this

taken with his observed behaviour as a cross-examiner-furtive glances to the Chair for approval while asking hostile questions with a humble mien-does not produce the impression of a normal or stable personality. The nature of his motives must be evaluated by the reader.

MR. ADAMS, a civil servant at present the legal adviser to the Dept. of the Army, is the fourth member of the contending quartet, and has so far been the only one to come out with clear and uncomplicated statements. He is charged by the McCarthy side in association with Stevens of concealing Communists from the Senate Investigating Committee. His testimony remains to be heard, but I think it probable that he has foreseen the brewing storm from the first shift of wind and has been careful to keep an exact account of everything he was connected with.

The present situation in the hearings is that McCarthy has failed in his marathon attempt to so exhaust the committee members that they might (1) agree to coninue the hearings in "executive" (i.e. secret) sessions or (2) agree to hear Mc-Carthy in the witness seat and then call the whole thing off. What happened was that his obvious threat of exercising his right to continue to question Stevens indefinitely was scotched by Stevens' counsel's, (Mr. Welch) announcement that his client had succumbed to a virus infection and was getting penicillin. He was therefore excused from attending temporarily, and the Committee decided to call Mr. Adams.

The reason for this lengthy description of the scene lies in its value as a revaluation of the characterological basis of the behaviour of political figures, or, if that is too long-winded, of the private reasons for public actions. To what, if any, extent Cohn was using McCarthy, or Adams Stevens, as well as the trickery of both sides will probably now come out. To the observer on television the hearings are of extraordinary interest. They have put politics under the micro-

New York.

JOHN SWINTON.

Our Resolutionary Unions

THERE is no doubt that when it comes to passing resolutions—all strictly according to the best points of order and congressional procedure - the British Trade Union is experienced, expert and very militant. At congress after congress the delegates go home with a glow of pride and self-satisfaction in the knowledge that they have left behind them a job well done—that of rendering innocuous and futile the desires of the rankand-file to express their points of view on important matters.

At the recent conference of the Amalgamated Engineering Union, for example, resolutions were passed indicating opposition to rearmament and the H-Bomb. The engineers, we are led to believe, really deplore the manufacture of weapons of war. But which section of the working class-throughout the world -works harder in the production of war weapons than the engineers?

In passing resolutions calling for the banning of the H-Bomb the A.E.U. can be said to be dabbling in International, if not Foreign Affairs, but one looks in vain for any indication that this powerful and influential section of the working class has any thought of effecting any international action in co-operation with engineers of other countries to prevent their talents and skills being wasted on the production of weapons for their mutual destruction.

Preparing to Destroy Each Other

Engineers in Britain are engaged now in the production of weapons for the destructions of engineers in-well, the next enemy country. In that country engineers are preparing machines for the killing of engineers over here. But the A.E.U. can think of no more effective action to take to prevent the coming slaughter than to appeal to the present Government to ban one particular form of armament,

Are there any members of the A.E.U. employed at Harwell, or at any other of the Government's atomic research and atomic bomb production plants? If so, are they being called out by the Union until such time as our peace-loving Government has agreed with all the other peace-loving governments of the world not to produce the A- or H-Bombs? This would seem to be a minimum requirement for a sincere attempt by a working class organisation to express its

condemnation of government production of horror weapons. But we look in vain for such direct action by the A.E.U.

Mouthpieces for Governments

Is the A.E.U. going to appeal to the engineers of other countries to cease work on weapons to destroy their own class brothers? If, as one of their resolutions show, they are opposed to the rearmament of Germany, do they call upon the German working class to refuse to make war weapons, or to go into the proposed new Wehrmacht? Not a sound of any such direct appeal to fellowworkers do we hear. Instead an appeal to a capitalist government which has a keen interest in rearming Germany-for economic and military reasons which have nothing whatever to do with the interests of the working class in this country or in Germany.

To such servile and ineffectual depths have the unions of Britain sunk to-day. And in this, of course, they are not alone. Throughout the world the official unions are mere mouthpieces of their respective governments-like the "socialist" parties in opposition we referred to last week, holding their futile international conference in Vienna. These organisations are not, genuinely, in opposition. They do nothing more than to represent certain sectional interests within a capitalist state, but although the section they purport to represent is, according to Marx, always in a state of struggle with the ruling, capitalist, class, that struggle has been completely subverted, together with the interests of the working class, to the needs of the capitalist class and its exploitative economy.

Set an Example

The British trade unions have done more to ally the British working class to the British capitalist class than any force or organisation working from "the other side" could ever have done, just as the Labour Party has done more in the last fifty years to bolster up British capitalism and imperialism than the Tories. They have been able to do this because the workers have listened to their leaders, and accepted without suspicion policies and practices which they would never have accepted—at least without close examination or a struggle-from the employing class.

organisations which have the power to

do so much more about it if they only had the courage or will. If the engineers here are so concerned with the effects of rearming Germany, why do they not set an example to the German workers by taking direct action themselves against rearmament in this country? They could then take steps to let the workers in other countries-particularly the potentially enemy countries - know that Britain's ruling class has not the support of a most essential section of the workers in its plans for war. Then there would be a fair and legitimate reason for asking the world's workers in general to reject the lunatic policies of their governments and move towards taking over the means of production themselves to use for peaceful purposes.

But the A.E.U. would no doubt argue that to call out its members from armament work would bring great hardship upon them and would endanger the national economy. Since the national economy itself, however, always brings great hardship for the working class, that would be no great loss; the sooner it is endangered, the sooner it is got rid of, the better for the engineers and everybody else. And if calling engineers out of armaments entails loss of livelihoodonly the revolutionary answer remains.

Refuse this Production— Take Over the Factories

The organised workers of this-and every other-country should be called upon to refuse to produce the weapons of war. This does not mean that they should walk out of the factories and workshops, leaving them empty and idle while the workers will starve. It means that the workers should organise themselves to take over the factories and workshops and turn them over to the production of all the peaceful goods of which they are themselves always so short.

But while the shaping of policy is left in the hands of reactionary and fearful misleaders and politicians; while the workers are so careless of their own futures and so apathetic and confused, real and useful action will remain a dream. Instead of social revolution we shall get anti-social resolution; instead of a drive for life—the march to death, with So now we get pious resolutions from the banners of the trade unions well to the fore.

I.C.I. Workers to 'Share'

AT last the mighty I.C.I.—Imperial Chemical Industries—have decided to do right by their workers.

Announced last week was a scheme by which this tremendous industrial empire was going to share its profits with the people who actually earn them.

Proudly announcing that it will cost £1 million a year, I.C.I. outline their plan as follows:

Workers who have been with the firm for two and a half years will have I.C.I. shares paid in to a trust fund each year. When individual holdings reach £25 they will be transferred to the worker personally for saving, or selling on the Stock Exchange.

The profit-sharing will be based on anything over a five per cent. dividend paid to shareholders.

shares worth 2½ per cent. of the worker's pay will be bought at current market

A man earning £500 a year will thus be entitled to £12 10s, worth of shares (less tax)—2½ per cent. of his pay—on a dividend declaration of $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

About 75,000 of I.C.I.'s 105,000 employees will become eligible when the scheme starts, based on this year's profits.

What Does it Mean?

Very generous it sounds, doesn't it? A million pounds to be distributed among the workers! Until one begins to break the figures down to see what they mean in terms of reward for individuals.

In the first place, note that of I.C.I.'s 105,000 employees, only 75,000 become eligible. This means that about one in every three have not been working for the firm for $2\frac{1}{2}$ years. If that is the position to-day, it is most likely always the position—that there is a turnover, probably among the labourers and unskilled workers and girls and young women-of one-third of the labour force within every 2½ years. Of course the promise of a share in the profits may encourage workers to stay longer.

We say may, because what in fact does the cash value amount to? 75,000 sharing £1,000,000 works out at an average of £13 6s. 8d. per year—or 5s. a week. At an average. The figures given above are for a worker earning £500 a year, but in fact the average wage for the workers in I.C.I.-105,000 sharing a wage-bill of £40,000,000—is £380 per year. Or £7 10s. 0d. per week.

Two Shillings a Week!

A worker earning the average will therefore be credited with shares (on a dividend of $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.) to the value of about £9 10s. 0d. This he will not actually receive until they total £25-about 2½ years. So that a worker has to work 5 years for the I.C.I. before he gets £25 of shares—£5 per year, or 2/- per week!

It looks better and better, doesn't it? Add to that the fact that these shares will be taxable and it becomes a very attractive proposition indeed.

Against this must be set the fact that I.C.I. dividends are usually much higher than $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. In fact the paid dividend for the year ending Dec. 1953 was 15 per cent. The actual earned dividend was 35³ per cent. Gross profits for the year were more than £52,092,668 and the net profit after tax, £17,712,035.

If then, the workers' million comes out of the gross profit (which, note, is more than the wages bill of £40 million) it means one million out of fifty-two. If it will be distributed out of the final net profit, it will still leave a mere £16,712,035 for the shareholders.

Plenty of Money Available

We don't know how many I.C.I. shareholders there are. We do know, however, that there are many people only too anxious to become shareholders.

Two months ago fifty thousand separate applications were made for £30 million worth of a new I.C.I. 4½ per cent. unsecured loan stock. These applications totalled £300 million! Ten times more than the issue!

In other words, investors are standing by with enough money to finance the I.C.I. profit-sharing scheme for the next 300 years!

For the workers in I.C.I., the scheme means very little, as we have shown, in terms of cash. What it will do for them is to give them a stake in the firm. This is calculated to make them docile—to make them want to stay there, and to avoid getting the sack. The worker who stands to gain by the profits will want to see costs kept down. And costs include wages—his own wages!

Those who will benefit most will be the technicians—already highly paid and the permanent staff. The 30,000 short-term employees, already most likely the lowest paid, will receive nothing from the profit-sharing scheme, but it will be in the interest of the permanent employees to keep down the wages of the temporary workers, so that costs are lower, profits higher.

Divide and Rule

So will the workers be divided. And this is a very important function of schemes like this. It costs the firm nothing. All the profits-all of themcome from the labour of the workers anyway. To toss them back a tiny fraction costs nothing but has the very useful functions of making them docile, "loyal to the firm" and divided among themselves.

Such welfare schemes do not operate If the yearly dividend is $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., in the interests of the workers at all. Superficially a benefit, they only cloud over the real exploitative nature of the capitalist economy, and make confusion worse confounded.

ANARCHO-SYNDICALIST.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LGNDON ANARCHIST GROUP

THE MALATESTA CLUB 155 High Holborn WCI

(Nearly opposite Holborn Town Hall) L.A.G. LECTURE DISCUSSIONS EVERY SUNDAY AT 7.30

MAY 30-Rita Milton **REASON & ROMANTICISM**

JUNE 6—No Meeting JUNE 13-E. Peeke on

LAW & CUSTOM

Aspects of Anarchism (3)

OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Informal Discussion Every Thursday at 7.30.

Weather Permitting HYDE PARK Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

NORTH-EAST LONDON

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

GLASGOW OUTDOORS

(Weather permitting) MAXWELL STREET Every Sunday at 7 p.m. Speakers: Hugh McCutcheon Mark Kramrisch.

INDOORS

at Workers' Open Forum 50 Renfrew Street, Glasgow. Every Thursday at 7 p.m. MAY 27.—Hugh McCutcheon on THIS I BELIEVE

EXETER ANARCHIST GROUP

An anarchist group has been formed in Exeter. Readers in the area are invited

Meetings every Wednesday at 7 p.m. at 109 Portland Street, Exeter. Correspondence to: Philip Holgate, U.C.E.W. Exeter.

READERS IN HERTS

If any readers residing in Herts would be interested in weekly discussion meetings, to be held in either Welwyn Garden City, Hatfield, St. Albans, or Hertford, will they contact:

> G. HILBINGER, 89 Hollybush Lane, Welwyn Garden City, Herts.

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.I England Tel.: Chancery 8364

The McCarthy Hearings

Continued from p. 1

The second group is small, about 4 out of the 20-30 varied people I am considering. One thinks that McCarthy will come out of this a greater man than he was before. Another 2 think he is "winning", and the opinion common to each is that Communists are spying in secret, unknown to all but a few in "top places" who are protecting them. Alger Hiss and Dean Acheson are examples of those people thought to be "super-Communists" who are protecting the spies and saboteurs. While no conclusions can be drawn from a small group of 4 it may nevertheless be pertinent to remark that all of them are unopen to unemotional discussion on any subject, 3 are practicing Roman Catholics, 2 have psychiatric troubles and in fact 2 are not Americans.

The remaining third group is what one can call anti-McCarthy, to varying extents and for different reasons. Some think he should not be in the Senate and welcome an "exposure"; others look at the "harm" he is doing abroad and so on but in general there is an active hate which has been aroused by the television performance of McCarthy, the cunning of his approach, the irrelevance of many of his rhetorical questions, his contempt of committee rules except when he is suited, his quoting without context, deliberately misleading, evading, procrastinating, and always justifying himself down to the smallest details for what may or may not have been charged against him.

Being a visitor to this country may help a more accurate appraisal of the hearing and having sketched in the audience I will turn now to the stage. It will be remembered (by those who have followed the affair) that for some months before the committee sat, Senator Mc-Carthy, as its permanent chairman, had been making increasingly widespread, specific and derogatory attacks on people and groups of people who appeared to him to stand in the way of his "Investigation of Communism", an onslaught which was directed at those associated with any powerful groups, such as the Protestant Church and the Army. In and apart from Committee sessions various people were accused of perjury, blackmail, embezzlement, protecting spies and Communists, these figuring highest in the Senator's canon of crime. So long as adherents of the Democratic party were involved their political opponents,

McCarthy himself being one, were noticeably quiet, in much the same fashion as were capitalists, etc., in the Labour Party when Mr. Bevan was charging heinous crimes against capitalists, etc., in the Conservative Party, but with the range of targets opening up there has been a closing of the ranks in the Republican party, assisted by Mr. Eisenhower, with the consequent extrusion, or rather a tendency in that direction, of Mc-Carthy's sympathizers, a normal protective device of political parties.

McCarthy however, and again the analogy to Bevan is not inaccurate, can not allow his attack to slacken, and has been compelled to seek more and more dangerous targets. By some sort of unexpressed jungle law a political body must defend itself at that point where feats of loyalty to the Chief become more amazing than the Chief himself, or at any rate before that point is reached where the unbalance may occur. It is therefore significant that the majesty of State processes has confronted McCarthy after his charge of incompetency and treason against generals and the secretary of the Army, and that it should take the disguised form of an enquiry into the charges levelled by certain people against certain people. In cruder political systems suicide or assassination would have put an end ,if anyone had the power to put an end, to McCarthy's career. The charges against McCarthy are that he, Cohn (his legal counsel on the Committee) and Carr (a chief clerk) tried to get special treatment for Schine, the "chief investigator", when Schine was called up by the Army. The countercharges against Stevens are that he, Adams (his legal counsel) and certain as yet undiscovered Communists are building up the Schine case to prevent Mc-Carthy's Un-American Activities Committee from investigating Communists and spies in the army. The case against Carr appears to be quite subsidiary; let us therefore examine the personalities and possible motives of the 4 principal contendants.

SENATOR McCarthy before the last war was a small-town lawyer and judge. As a judge he is reputed not to be remembered for leniency. During the war he worked as an Intelligence Officer in one of the services and when demobilised he campaigned for one of the Senate seats in the State of Wisconsin and won with the help of clever publicity, one of

his posters showing him in uniform resting against the tail end of an aeroplane, smiling the friendly smile of "Tail-Gunner Joe". He became a Republican Senator and came soon to see in the 20 years of Roosevelt-Truman cabinets the hand of the "Communist Conspiracy" and when he obtained the permanent Chairmanship of the then not very active Un-American Activities Committee, a sub-committee of the U.S. Senate, he was at last able to hunt down the Communists that he saw to be traitors and spies. As we know, there existed (and may still exist) certain people, who, whatever may have been their motives, are properly defined as a spy and an agent for the U.S.S.R. against the U.S.A. What is equally clear is that McCarthy's definition of "Communist", with which he equates "Communist sympathizer", is one that carries meaning only for himself and those of similar mental characteristics (formerly given the name of clerico-fascist).

The most vivid illustration came out during Mr. Adams' testimony when to a certain person McCarthy applied the description "a Communist sympathizer who indulged in fund-raising activities, and who deliberately employed a known Communist". McCarthy asked Adams if this were not true and asked Adams to read a certain part of this person's testimony to the Committee some months earlier. Adams obliged by starting several pages before the passage intended by McCarthy and the following equations became clear:-

Communist sympathizer = one who 10 years ago helped in the work of the "Green Belt Co-operative Housing Association", a co-operative building society on the outskirts of Washington.

Fund-raising activities=the permission to a little known acquaintance to use the lawn in front of his house as a picnic ground once 4 years ago, proceeds to go Communist-front organisation = a group

of Spanish regugees from the Civil War, who now needed help. As "subversive" the Spaniards may well be cited. So is the I.W.W. Employment of a known Communist

=sponsoring (apparently the engagement

as physician to this building society a

doctor who was a Communist. This excerpt is offered as an example of the compulsive nature of McCarthy's thinking but two still more significant characteristics are made plain by watch-

Continued on p. 3